



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, March 26, 1964 — Friday, May 7, 1964



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, March 16, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Monday, March 16, 1964	
Condolences on death of Mr. Herbert Robarts, Mr. Cass, Mr. Oliver, Mr. MacDonald	1621
Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton	1622
Recess, 6 o'clock	1651

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1964

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Harwood Public School and Queen Alexandra Public School, both of Toronto; and in the west gallery, students from Swansea Public School, Toronto and members of the junior council of the town of Penetanguishene.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of the Legislature I know, will learn with regret that the absence from the House today of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is occasioned by the death of his father, Mr. Herbert Robarts of Galt.

One does not like to see parents go, Mr. Speaker. Their passing is always a matter of such keen personal loss that no words of sympathy suffice.

A very close and affectionate relationship existed between our hon. Prime Minister and his father, who would have been 80 years of age next month.

During his lifetime, the late Mr. Robarts followed a career in banking, which commenced in Galt and took him to western Canada, where he served in Banff and Winnipeg. Then he returned to Galt and later was transferred to London, where his talents were also devoted to the work of a number of community organizations which included the Canadian Red Cross Society and the Victorian Order of Nurses. Upon retirement, he again took up residence in Galt.

Hon. members of the Legislature will join, I am sure, in an expression to the hon. Prime Minister of our sorrow in the passing of his father, the late Herbert Robarts.

To him is paid the highest tribute by all who in any way were associated with him,

in view of his acts of kindness, his homely philosophy, his business acumen and integrity of character, and his keen interest in the everyday affairs of the people of his native province of Ontario.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would want to join with the hon. Attorney General on behalf of my hon. colleagues, in saying quietly and reverently that we extend to the hon. Prime Minister our deepest sympathy on the occasion of the death of his father. Insofar as it is given to us, we share that sorrow and the passing of one who was very dear to the hon. Prime Minister of the province.

It is true, as the hon. Attorney General has said, that over four decades he has lived a useful and a productive life. But even having lived for four score years, it still leaves a void and it still brings the occasion for those of us on all sides of the House to extend to the hon. Prime Minister our sympathies at this time.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, the burdens of public office are great enough as it is, particularly for a person in the position of Prime Minister of the province of Ontario and I am sure that I express the wish of not only those of our group, but of all hon. members of the House in joining with the hon. Attorney General and the hon. leader of the Opposition in expressing our deep sympathy to the hon. Prime Minister on this, the occasion of his bereavement.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to bring to the attention of this honourable House, that once again athletes from the province of Ontario showed their superiority over the rest of Canada this past weekend when the University of Windsor, a new university in the first year of its existence, won the Canadian collegiate basketball championships, defeating the University of Nova Scotia—that is Acadia University in Nova Scotia—on Friday night and following through with a victory over the University of British Columbia on Saturday.

It is very fitting, because this is the first year of this new university, and in their first year they have been successful in winning the Canadian collegiate basketball championships.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I have submitted to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). I understand that he is involved in some important meetings at the moment. Perhaps I can put the question on the record and when his commitments permit him to return to the House he will be able to reply to it.

My questions were: has the government any further statement to make on the hospital bed shortage in view of the emergency meeting of medical doctors with representatives of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission on Friday evening?

Further, what answer has the government given to the convalescent homes of the Metro area on their offer more than a week ago, to make 1,000 beds available?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 50th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, it is usually helpful in reaching a better understanding of what an organization is trying to accomplish in its over-all operations to know something of its basic philosophy or principles. For that reason, I should like, at the outset, to state that a primary principle of The Department of Highways is simply this: all road mileage, wherever it may be—and regardless of the jurisdiction responsible for it—forms part of the whole. Accordingly, in the department's planning, the close relationship and interdependence between all segments and the department's provincial road system is always given due recognition. To put the matter in another way: all our studies and observations over the years have established beyond doubt that the King's highway system can reach full efficiency only when augmented by an efficient municipal road network in all parts of Ontario.

The report I am about to make on some of the work carried out last year and new work planned for 1964—condensed as it must be—together with the new measures of assistance for the municipalities implemented in 1963, will amply substantiate that The

Department of Highways operates in full accordance with a total roads concept.

On the trans-provincial Highway 401, 98 miles were opened to traffic, permitting a through drive of 502 miles from Windsor to the village of Lancaster, eight miles west of the Quebec boundary. Construction is continuing on the sections where only two lanes are now in use to provide, as a minimum, four lanes throughout as soon as possible.

To recap in brief the sections opened last year, they were, in sequence from west to east: from Highway 2, east of Tilbury, to Highway 4, south of London—71 miles; from two miles west of Marysville to Napanee—nine miles; and from the Aultsville Sideroad to Cornwall—18 miles.

Permanent service centres were opened at eight strategically located points on Highway 401 between Belleville and London. The success which attended the opening of these facilities and the numerous expressions of appreciation received from many quarters is most gratifying to report. As announced in this House on January 23, the department has decided to open four new service centres in western Ontario as the result of the opening of 71 miles of Highway 401 in 1963 in that part of the province.

Similarly, the opening to traffic last fall of two new sections in eastern Ontario made possible a through drive of some 185 miles on Highway 401 easterly from the service centres west of Trenton. As a result, tenders have been called for two new service centres in the vicinity of Odessa.

An interchange numbering system on Highway 401 was implemented and a new strip map published showing the location of each interchange by number. The purpose in each case was to assist motorists, especially tourists and others not familiar with Highway 401.

I should like to refer for a moment to the department's ambitious project—over a five- or six-year period—to widen the Toronto by-pass section of Highway 401 to 12 lanes between Islington Avenue and Highway 48, a distance of 17 miles. The work is proceeding well on schedule thus far.

Seven major contracts were awarded in 1963 for the reconstruction of interchanges between Yonge Street and Highway 400. A contract has been let for the construction of the Spadina Expressway interchange, one of the first three-level interchange complexes to be built in Ontario. Last September a contract was awarded for the construction of the Highway 401/400 interchange, another three-level facility.

One innovation was the department's introduction of a 24-hour emergency road patrol to minimize delays resulting from accidents or breakdowns during the reconstruction of the Metropolitan Toronto section of Highway 401 and to assist motorists in trouble. During the first seven months the patrols were in operation, they travelled more than 200,000 miles, made more than 25,000 stops and provided some 1,200 gallons of gasoline. The operators also changed 847 tires, assisted 1,734 drivers with mechanical problems, assisted at the scene of 104 accidents, called a tow truck 737 times and made 18,261 other checks on stationary cars.

The contributions which these patrols have made to safety and to the orderly movement of traffic in the midst of an extremely large and intricate construction programme is obvious to anyone who travels with any frequency the section of Highway 401 concerned.

The patrols operate in complete liaison with the Ontario Provincial Police but do not have police authority. Many expressions of appreciation of this service have been received, as well as for the continuation of the winter patrol on other sections of Highway 401 where emergency service is not available.

The most spectacular construction opened was the Garden City Skyway over the Welland Canal at St. Catharines, thereby ending the last major bottleneck on the Queen Elizabeth Way. This magnificent structure has a total length, including approaches, of close to 3.5 miles. It is noteworthy that during the construction of the new skyway the longest continuous box plate steel girders ever fabricated in Canada up to that time were used.

Highway 405—a new, four-lane, controlled-access freeway providing a direct connection between the QE Way, in the vicinity of the Garden City Skyway, and the high-level Lewiston-Queenston international bridge, was opened in September. The six-mile long freeway is a significant addition to the choice of routes for traffic travelling between the northeastern United States and the most heavily populated sections of Ontario.

Still another link with the QE Way was forged in December when the first stage of a new multi-lane, controlled-access highway, No. 403, was opened to traffic from Longwood Road in Hamilton. This six miles of new expressway, built at a cost of more than \$7.5 million, opens a highspeed route between the Queen Elizabeth Way, near Burlington, and Highway 2, in the west end of Hamilton.

Just five days later, on December 9, controlled-access Highway 126 was opened. This freeway runs northerly from Highway 401 for three-and-a-half miles to connect with Highbury Avenue in the eastern end of London. The new artery, built at a cost of \$2.5 million, will relieve the heavy flow of traffic over Wellington Street, until now the only direct route between Highway 401 and the downtown area of London. The new Highway 401 connection is also significant for the roads network in the area because of the popularity of Highbury Avenue and connecting east-west roads north of Highway 2 or Dundas Street as a convenient by-pass to many points north and west of London.

Another controlled-access facility—with a similar purpose of providing a faster, safer, connection between a metropolitan area and Highway 401—the Freeport diversion section of Highway 8, had been opened in September. This new 2.5 mile freeway, costing close to \$2 million, by-passes Freeport en route between Kitchener and Highway 401 on a new alignment which is a pronounced improvement over the section of highway it has replaced.

Work progressed favourably on stage three of the Ottawa Queensway, the 2.5-mile section from Carling Avenue to Bronson Avenue, where six lanes are being constructed. The controlled-access Queensway, as many of you know, forms part of the main trans-Canada highway through the province.

Another project of a high order of importance in the Ottawa area is Ontario's part in the construction of the Macdonald-Cartier bridge across the Ottawa River between Ottawa and Hull. The structure and approaches at Sussex Drive in Ottawa were opened in January. The estimated over-all cost to the province for this phase, known as stage one, is \$12,275,889. The work for stage two, consisting of the Ontario approaches to the new bridge from Sussex Drive and King Edward Avenue, is scheduled to be awarded during the 1964-65 fiscal year.

Dealing with the main route of the trans-Canada highway through Ontario, satisfactory progress can be reported. There were 138 miles under construction in 1963 to bring sections up to the required standard for all trans-Canada highway mileage, most of the work being concentrated in northern and northwestern Ontario. By the end of the year, 46 miles had been paved and completed and reconstruction of the remaining 92 miles was well advanced. Of the 1,453 miles of trans-Canada highway in Ontario, 1,095 miles were constructed to the required standard by the end of 1963.

One of the highlights of highway development in northern Ontario last year was the opening to traffic in September of a new 12-mile section of Highway 11, known as the Tri-town by-pass. This is the longest by-pass built to date in northern Ontario—one of the longest anywhere in the province. Constructed at a cost of close to \$3 million, this new section provides a by-pass for the towns of Cobalt, Haileybury and New Liskeard and saves approximately five miles over the old route of Highway 11 through the three towns.

Closing of the gap on Highway 101 between Wawa and Highway 129, south of Chapleau, has been proceeding apace during the year. Grading has been completed from Highway 129 westerly for some 22 miles to Big Pine Lake and new grading is in progress for a further 10.5 miles westerly from that point. A clearing contract for 11 more miles of the right-of-way was awarded in December last. At the Wawa end, grading, drainage and other extensive work is in progress easterly from a point eight miles east of Wawa and a clearing contract from Highway 547 southerly was recently awarded.

Last November a new international bridge across the Pigeon River between Canada and the United States was opened to traffic. The new structure was built as a joint project between The Department of Highways, Ontario, and the state of Minnesota. This border crossing is located at the southern end of King's Highway 61, south of Fort William. At the same time, Ontario opened an entirely new five-and-a-half-mile section of Highway 61, providing a new approach to the bridge, located east of the former structure. The cost to the department for both its share in the bridge and the new section of highway was approximately \$1.2 million.

By the end of last year all contracts for grading the 80 miles of new Highway 11 between Atikokan and Fort Frances had been awarded. At the western end of the new highway, paving of the \$6 million Rainy Lake Causeway is now under way and will be completed by the summer of 1964. In line with the previously announced policy of giving the Fort Frances-Atikokan highway extension a special priority, the new road will, it is hoped, be open for winter travel during the winter of 1964-65.

Another example of the way in which the department practises, as well as preaches, a total roads concept can be found in the ambitious roads-to-resources programme. Under this programme, roads have been constructed since 1958 into areas of potential mineral, lumbering and other natural resources, many of them of great scenic beauty. Under the

agreement between the federal and provincial governments to share the cost of building roads of this type, 272 miles of new road in northern and northwestern Ontario have been added to our road mileage, thereby opening large areas for development and recreation.

Specifically, the state of progress on the four resource roads now under construction is as follows: on the Savant Lake road from trans-Canada Highway 17 in the vicinity of Ignace to Savant Lake.

Forty-six miles of this route have been completed and an additional 12 miles are now under construction. Clearing of the remaining 22 miles of this road is now under way.

Construction is in progress on the remaining 11 miles of the 75-mile Spruce River road from trans-Canada Highway 17, near Port Arthur, to Cheeseman Lake. This road should be completed by the fall of this year.

We have also completed the first 15 miles of a new road from Central Patricia to Lingman Lake. Clearing of the right-of-way for an additional 15 miles, to make it the most northerly road in the province, is now under way.

The fourth road in the quartet of the roads-to-resources programme involves a seven-mile northerly extension from Highway 108 to provide a direct route from trans-Canada Highway 17 and Elliot Lake to the Mississagi Provincial Park. This was completed and opened to traffic last summer. An additional seven miles are now being constructed to provide a link with secondary Highway 546. Plans to extend this road to connect with Highway 129, under the same programme, were announced in October.

During recent months we announced significant plans for the opening of still more regions in northern Ontario through new roads. We went further and got work started on 104 miles of new highway to directly link Sudbury and Timmins. The first stage, now under way, involves clearing for 12 miles southerly from the junction with Highway 101, eight miles west of Timmins, and from Gogama northerly for 12 miles.

Work has also begun at the Sudbury end on the grading of eight miles, previously cleared, of a completely new section of road between Levack and Cartier, both of which communities are located on the new Sudbury-Timmins highway link. Following an improved alignment, the new section will offer a much more direct route.

This programme is being scheduled in such a manner that the Gogama to Highway 101 section will be the first to be completed,

thereby giving Gogama a direct highway link with Timmins.

Another major project which will open up virgin territory for the mining and forest industries, tourists and outdoorsmen, is planned through the linking by road of Smooth Rock Falls, on Highway 11, and Fraserdale, a distance of some 40 miles. This new highway—the result of meetings between Ontario Hydro and The Department of Highways—will provide access to remote Ontario Hydro projects in the James Bay watershed.

The road will open the door to Ontario Hydro's growing community at the Abitibi Canyon Generating Station on the Abitibi River and it will also link up with a 27-mile access road now under construction to Hydro's Little Long Generating Station, first of three hydro-electric stations to be built on the Mattagami River.

We should not overlook, in considering this expanded programme for the north, the greatly increased potential for recreational opportunities and the development of enterprises catering to tourists and sportsmen. In that connection it is a pleasure for me to record the welcome given the department's new folder on northern Ontario incorporating a map of that part of the province on a scale larger than those previously published. The folder, launched last April, appears to be accomplishing precisely what it was intended to do: namely, to encourage greater tourist travel and a more intensive examination of business and industrial opportunities in those regions.

Turning southerly again, on the Brantford by-pass section of Highway 403, grading was being carried out for four miles westerly from Highway 2, just east of Brantford, by the year's end and work on five structures was in progress.

The first contracts for construction of a new, controlled-access highway known as Highway 406, were awarded in January, 1963. Initially, this freeway will conveniently connect Welland and the adjacent heavily populated region with the QE Way at St. Catharines and later additional construction will extend the link to Port Colborne.

While referring to this part of the Niagara Peninsula, may I observe that the twinning of locks in the Welland Canal system will pose many serious road problems for the local municipalities and for not a few others. May I assure the hon. members that The Department of Highways will co-operate to the utmost in the seeking of solutions equitable to all concerned—as far as is humanly possible—working closely with the municipi-

palities, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and others directly concerned.

A striking illustration of the department's—what I like to refer to as the—total roads concept is the realistic recognition of the part played by the airlines in the overall transportation requirements of the province. In line with an established policy of improving road facilities between airports and the areas they serve, the department in January opened 1.5 miles of new, four-lane, controlled-access highway between Highway 401 and the new international air terminal at Malton, northwest of Metropolitan Toronto. This will afford a high-speed connection to the airport when connecting access roads have been completed by the federal Department of Transport.

We also assumed the airport road at Earlton last August. Surveys are being made to see if this road link, entering secondary Highway 571 and connecting with Highway 11, requires improvement to bring the road up to the required standard for a secondary highway.

This round-up of some of the more noteworthy highway construction projects completed in 1963 and report on the progress made on others, lengthy as it may appear, represents only a small part of what was actually accomplished. Just to put that observation in proper perspective, I should point to the fact that, before the 1963-64 fiscal year ends, the department will have approved, during that period, final payments to contractors carrying out departmental contracts for not less than 450 contracts.

I should like now to talk about the matter of qualification. In connection with the department's awarding of contracts, and payments to contractors, it is pertinent to comment at this point on the recent extension of prequalification procedures. The many advantages which have accrued to the department as a result of the decision to prequalify contractors bidding for specific contracts prompted a decision to extend these procedures to apply on other types of contracts not previously covered, the change becoming effective on contracts advertised on and after February 26 of this year. From that date onward prequalification will apply on all capital contracts, regardless of the amount involved. A specific example of one classification not previously covered is the fabrication of steel for structures. In addition, all large maintenance contracts—such as for resurfacing and winter sanding—will now be subject to prequalification procedures.

The objective of these extensions of prequalification is the same as that at the time

prequalification procedures were first introduced: To ensure the carrying out of the department's programme on schedule to the greatest possible extent—allowing for the weather and other factors beyond control—by contractors qualified to do the work involved in such contracts.

A criticism which was heard during the early years of prequalification, but less frequently now, was that prequalification tended to favour the larger contractors to the detriment of the small. This is not borne out in facts and we are convinced that a sound system of prequalification is good for every part of the industry, both large and small.

Road assumptions in the fiscal year 1963-64, over and above those referred to in my estimates address of 1963, added more than 80 miles of King's and secondary highways to the provincial road system. The longest section of road assumed as a King's highway was the former Lambton county road No. 3 between Courtright and Alvinston, which, in August, was designated as a 30.5 mile extension of Highway 80. Other assumptions as King's highway mileage were: five miles in connection with construction of the Sarnia by-pass, signed as Highway 40-A; 14 miles of Essex county road No. 12 between Leamington and Highway 401, which, on April 1, was designated Highway 77; and in eastern Ontario, approximately one mile of township road was assumed to form part of a new route for Highway 41 which will cross the Bay of Quinte via a high-level bridge.

In the matter of roads assumed as secondary highways—and not referred to in my 1963 estimates address—some 30 miles were so assumed, the longest being 20 miles of local roads between Highway 28, near Lakefield, and Highway 36 at Buckhorn, which became Highway 507 in June.

An additional 98 miles of road, assumed during the fiscal year, was designated as tertiary road mileage—a relatively new type of road, of which the Spruce River road, mentioned previously, running northerly from Port Arthur, is the best known—and assigned numbers in a newly created 800 series.

On maintenance, I should like to say that the ever-increasing importance of the provincial system of highways for the economic and social well-being of Ontario, and the steadily rising volume of traffic using them, has placed constantly growing demands on the department's maintenance section. In terms of new mileage alone, this increased by some 320 miles either as King's highway or secondary highway additions between December 31,

1962 and the end of 1963, plus a further 98 miles added under the tertiary road designation.

These additions resulted in a new grand total of some 12,630 miles of road being under the jurisdiction of The Department of Highways by the end of 1963.

To convey an idea of the volume of work which the new tertiary road mileage has created for the department's maintenance forces—to take only one example—I shall simply observe that the only difference in the work load for roads so designated and for secondary highways is that the department does not carry out winter maintenance on such roads, although agreements may be made whereby it contributes toward the cost of any such work. Including earlier designations, there are now some 120 miles of tertiary road mileage.

In the overall increase of approximately 420 miles in the province's highway system in the 1963-64 fiscal year were nearly 40 miles of multi-lane highway, such as 403, 405, and so on. These additions in 1963 brought the total of multi-lane pavement to some 740 miles. The placing in service of the Garden City Skyway, last October, in itself represents a major maintenance job for the department's maintenance crews, as does any particularly large bridge.

Over and above the maintenance of mileage under the direct control of the department, to a standard not excelled on this continent and equalled by few jurisdictions anywhere, a very considerable amount of maintenance work is carried out on extensions of King's and secondary highways known as connecting links. All told, more than 275 miles of roadway are now covered by connecting link agreements and it is a fair statement to say that, by and large, the department's maintenance crews perform the lion's share of the maintenance, regardless of the rate of contribution by the department applicable to the connecting link concerned. When it comes to winter maintenance, most of the ploughing on these connecting links is done by DHO personnel and equipment.

The most efficient deployment of men and machines, particularly in the annual battle with snow and ice, is greatly helped through the effective use of two-way radio communication. With the extension in 1963 of the department's own radio system to the districts of Bancroft, North Bay and Sudbury—and the addition early this year of Cochrane and New Liskeard—15 of the department's 18 districts now have such facilities in operation. Some 140 stations are being used, and approximately 550 vehicles are now carrying

two-way radio equipment. Pre-engineering of the three remaining departmental districts which as yet do not have two-way radio systems is now in progress.

I should like now, Mr. Chairman, to comment on roadside tables and picnic sites. The use of the department's roadside tables and picnic sites by both residents and visitors alike is such that I wish to devote a moment to these much appreciated free facilities. An examination of the record and a comparison with what other jurisdictions have done prompts these two comments: First, the department's facilities are as numerous, as well dispersed, and of as high a standard as can be found in any other province or state. Second, the department has more than kept pace in expanding both the sites and the number of tables as the total mileage in the King's highway system has grown. So much so that today there is an average of one picnic site for every 12 miles of highway. In the three-year period ending December 31, 1963, more than 600 picnic tables were added, swelling the total to approximately 3,850.

As to the selection of sites, the emphasis is placed on the major travel routes across Ontario, the purpose being to have these facilities for nourishment, rest and relaxation available at fairly frequent intervals, especially for those on long trips. In recent years, many improvements have been made to existing sites, while others have been relocated in safer or more attractive surroundings, or both. During the present winter the department expects to spend some \$61,000 in this way, as well as in the creation of entirely new sites, all within its "Make Winter Work" programme.

A new development, which I am pleased to mention, will be the opening this year of picnic areas adjacent to the eight service centres now in operation on Highway 401. Some landscaping has already been done in preparation and each site will be opened at the earliest possible date.

Before leaving the general subject of maintenance, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the men who do the 101 day-in day-out jobs of maintenance—some of them not too exciting, at that—without which our highways would not be anywhere near as safe nor as pleasant to drive.

Obviously, the way in which our provincial highways are maintained is something which directly affects everyone who travels them and so the standard of "highway house-keeping" is the norm by which the overwhelming majority pretty well judges The

Department of Highways as a whole. However, maintenance, vital as it is, constitutes but one aspect of the department's work. As Minister, I have had an opportunity to see just how great a number of facets there are to this department. It is a most complex organization indeed, requiring many different types of highly specialized skills, engineering ability and talent generally. Even the day-to-day direction of a department the size it is presents a formidable administrative challenge, and I here wish to express my appreciation to those in management functions—beginning with the deputy Minister, his two assistant deputy Ministers, and right down the line.

A ship, of course, is no better than its crew and I hasten to extend this tribute to a dedicated staff, both at head office and in the district and regional offices. Without the devotion to duty and the spirit of pride in the work at hand, which it has been my pleasure to observe all over this province, The Department of Highways simply could not accomplish what it does in so efficient a manner.

In reporting earlier on road assumptions, I referred to the assumption of the former Lambton county road No. 3 over its full distance of some 30.5 miles between Courtright and Alvinston as a King's highway. The reconstruction of the road to the standard of an ordinary King's highway, from one end to the other was done, as a development road project, at a cost to the department of approximately \$3 million. This road was assumed because of its obvious importance, and proven popularity, as an east-west route in this part of Ontario.

The department's development road programme—under which the department bears 100 per cent of the cost for reconstruction, with the exception of any property purchases and fencing required—again brought about significant improvements on sections of township and county roads throughout the province. Direct aid of this type is provided in the case of roads important in the local road network requiring reconstruction on a scale beyond the financial resources of the municipalities involved. When these considerations apply, The Department of Highways steps in and lends the necessary hand to enable such roads to perform their proper role adequately. Here again is evidence—to the extent of an estimated expenditure of \$10,125,000 for 1963-64—of the tangible ways in which The Department of Highways acts in accordance with the "total roads concept" to which I have referred; that is, the department appraises all roads in the light of their part

in the over-all road requirements of the area concerned.

Before the end of the 1963-64 fiscal year, counties and townships to the number of 199 will have received this type of assistance in the period, spread over 191 individual development road projects.

It is the policy of this government to effect, as conditions permit, progressive changes in legislation relative to the division of responsibility for and the financing of municipal roads and streets which will have the greatest long-term benefits. Factors which influence the degree of progress which can be made in this sphere are, of course, fiscal limitations and the adoption of more advanced administration techniques on the part of those we are trying to assist.

I make that observation of general policy by way of announcing that legislation will shortly be introduced to enable the formation, under a new Act, of local roads boards where desired in place of the present statute labour boards. The establishing of such boards will be on a voluntary basis and will not, in any way, be imposed in any instance.

At the time the new legislation is presented to this House, the manner in which these local roads boards will be formed or constituted and administered will be carefully detailed. Broadly speaking, the local roads boards will perform a function similar to that of the present statute labour boards, but with significant advantages. At this time I shall confine any elaboration on that point to the disclosure that The Department of Highways would, under the new Act, contribute on a two-for-one basis to road work carried out by local roads boards, compared with the one-for-one basis for statute labour boards.

Here, once more, is a case of action being taken to implement constructive measures for roads under other jurisdictions, the type of action which confirms the department's concern with the total road requirements of Ontario.

The manner in which the department is "moving with the times" in the allocation of expenditures is shown graphically in the 1964-65 table of proposed expenditures. The record amount of \$112,450,000 budgeted for road subsidies and other forms of assistance to the municipalities represents an increase of almost 14 per cent over the corresponding 1963-64 figure. In comparison, the increase in the sum proposed for the department's own capital expenditures is just over five per cent.

An important component in the proposed financial aid for the municipalities is a much higher allocation for the development road

programme, up to a record \$15,150,000. Many municipalities, rural and urban alike, have serious road problems and the budget I am presenting is concrete evidence that The Department of Highways is both aware of the situation and is prepared to implement the maximum amount of assistance.

With reference to the capital construction programme, the increase of approximately \$7 million for capital expenditures on King's highways in the 1964-65 programme we have proposed will enable the awarding of a high volume of work. In the interest of conserving time I shall refer to only a few examples.

In northwestern Ontario as mentioned, work will be carried forward to close further, the "gap" between Atikokan and Fort Frances. The reconstruction of Highway 105, already completed over the 49 miles between the town of Red Lake and Ear Falls, will be extended southerly. New contracts will be awarded on Highway 101 between Wawa and Highway 129 to hasten the linking of these two highways south of Chapleau. As mentioned previously, work will go forward on the new Sudbury-Timmins highway, for which 104 miles of new road will be required. Clearing of the right-of-way is now in progress, both northerly from Gogama and southerly from Highway 101.

A good volume of work, either grading or paving, will be in progress along sections of the trans-Canada highway to bring it up to the required standard of some of the older sections. On the Ottawa Queensway, which forms part of the trans-Canada highway, stage 3—most of it six lanes—will be opened to traffic as early as possible this year and work on the fourth and final stage, begun in 1963, will be continued. In eastern Ontario, it is expected that construction will begin on the new high-level bridge across the Bay of Quinte near Deseronto, to form the key part of a newly located section of Highway 41. In southern Ontario, work will be under way on many sections of Highway 401 to bring existing two-lane sections to four in an uninterrupted programme. The last remaining "link," an eight-mile section from the Quebec border westerly, will be opened to traffic in 1964.

Widening of Highway 401 on the most critical sections of the Toronto by-pass will be carried forward with the degree of dispatch dictated by the need. On Highway 403, it is expected that it will be possible to open the section from Longwood road, in the Westdale section of Hamilton, to the Aberdeen Avenue interchange. Also forming part of Highway 403, work will again be in full swing on the Brantford by-pass section. On

another freeway, Highway 406, in the St. Catharines area, new contracts will be awarded to extend the large volume of work completed in 1963.

The tendency of people in any given area to consider their highway needs as being among the most pressing in this province is, of course, understandable. However, if there is to be any reasonable relationship between expenditure and revenue, some deserving projects must necessarily be deleted in the sifting process and placed on a future programme.

On the subject of revenue and expenditure, the figures for the 1963-64 fiscal year show that the government of Ontario will once more have spent considerably more on roads than it received through the operation of motor vehicles. This can readily be seen from these tabulations:

Estimated total revenue derived from the operation of motor vehicles, all sources	\$271,625,000
Estimated total expenditures:	
Department of Highways	277,400,000
Department of Transport	6,477,000
	<u>283,877,000</u>
Pointing up an excess of expenditure versus related revenue of	12,252,000

Another way of stating the \$12.25 million deficit or "over-spending" is to say that revenue amounted to only 95.6 per cent of expenditure.

However, the comparison between revenue accruing to the government of Ontario from the operation of motor vehicles of all types and the total roads expenditure in any given area is by no means consistent throughout the province. On the contrary, if The Department of Highways operated on the principle of a dollar of expenditure for every dollar collected, the most heavily populated parts of Ontario would by now have considerably more road facilities of all types than they do and the more sparsely settled regions would have infinitely less. The "total roads concept" of the department dictates a much more enlightened use of the revenue coming in, namely, to keep pace, as far as possible, with the steadily rising demands in areas of great urban growth, and at the same time, set aside a generous allocation for new construction or needed improvement in the rural areas and the far-flung northern regions of the province in order to promote their development and prosperity.

As I said in my opening remarks, The Department of Highways views all roads—

regardless of where they are or the jurisdiction responsible for them—as forming part of the whole road network of the province. To distribute the expenditures of this department as equitably as possible over the length and breadth of Ontario, according to need, is to match action with that fundamental philosophy.

By way of illustrating how the department adjusts according to the changing road requirements of the municipalities, I would refer to the far-reaching modifications in road subsidy legislation effected in 1963 through amendments to The Highway Improvement Act. Some of the principal extensions were increased subsidies to rural townships in cases of demonstrated need, direct aid on specific major projects, and increased participation in connecting link facilities which tie in with the King's highways. By way of comment on the first of these modifications, more than 200 townships have been advised that a higher rate of subsidy became applicable in 1963-64.

Many of the hon. members represent ridings in which the growing traffic volumes on urban main arteries of all types—both within towns and cities and adjacent to them—impose demands which are frequently beyond the capacity of these roads. I need only mention the traffic loads placed upon such roads by "suburban sprawl", as it has so aptly been described. That, however, is but one aspect of the trend to urbanization in Ontario—especially from the end of World War II onward—so that by 1961 more than 79 per cent of Ontario's population was classed as urban.

Urban municipalities have truly formidable road problems. The adequate solution to them is, in not a few cases, beyond their financial resources unless assistance is forthcoming on a scale and of a type not available prior to the subsidy amendments of 1963, and supporting changes in policy in this field by The Department of Highways.

By way of extending this line of thought I would now like to draw to your attention the following facts: In an ever-growing number of cases, and to an ever-increasing degree, whenever The Department of Highways embarks on a programme to construct new, or to expand or improve existing King's highway road facilities in urban regions—or equally, to share in some major road project initiated by a municipality—a great many more people benefit directly than merely those living within the particular municipality where such work is carried out.

The most obvious "outside" beneficiaries are those who already travel over such roads

—or promptly switch to a new road facility upon completion—en route to and from work. These people—and their numbers continue to grow as more and more of the population tends to travel by car, farther and farther, between home and the place of employment—benefit equally from new road construction or reconstruction in the heavily populated areas of the province. Advantages which they share are: savings in time in commuting to and from work; easier, safer, more convenient driving; less wear and tear on the car, not to mention the driver!

However, improved road facilities in urban areas are likewise important for a much wider cross-section of people, a considerable number of whom use such facilities daily, such as deliverymen and servicemen of every description. Moreover, many urban arterial roads are also frequently used as by-passes by traffic originating outside the area.

It was a forthright appreciation of these and related facts which led the department to announce in 1963, at the same time as the subsidy legislation amendments to which I have referred, new measures of financial aid for the municipalities with respect to the construction of extremely costly, controlled-access urban expressways.

Provision was made in the department's estimates for 1963-64 for financial assistance on a much more generous scale to some of the larger urban centres in the construction of such controlled-access expressways. In the interval since I presented those estimates, two such applications by cities for participation by the department have been approved.

Port Arthur and Fort William, jointly, were the first to apply for such participation, in what they refer to as a ring road, to serve both cities. Shortly thereafter, Kitchener and Waterloo received approval for a similar type of ring road, 15 miles long. In both cases, The Department of Highways will subsidize both construction and property acquisition at the rate of 75 per cent, a notable increase in the former rate of 50 per cent on construction and 33½ per cent for property purchases.

Discussions relative to similar urban controlled-access expressways are now in progress with the cities of Windsor, Hamilton and Peterborough. In view of the undiminishing growth in traffic in and adjacent to most of the larger urban centres, it may be expected that similar applications will in time be received from most of the major cities in Ontario. Because of the considerable sums required for projects of this type—75 per cent of the cost of property, construction and maintenance now being borne by the depart-

ment—it is obvious that each application will be examined most thoroughly.

A word about freeways and what they mean for Ontario: Freeways, such as Highways 400, 401, 403 and 405 and the Queen Elizabeth Way mean many things for a great many people—far more than is generally realized—and, to a lesser extent, bring benefits to all the people of this province.

At the time the figures were compiled, which was late in 1962, it was estimated that some 5,350,000 people, or 84 per cent of the total population of Ontario, were living within a 50-mile radius of Highway 401. Narrowing down the "corridor" to a ten-mile belt on either side of Highway 401, the same survey indicated that more than 3.1 million people, representing some 49 per cent of the population, lived within this 20-mile band. There is every reason to believe that today both percentages would be even higher; and they will continue, we believe, to get higher.

From such statistics it is obvious that anything done to open new, or improve existing, sections of freeway in the more heavily populated areas of Ontario benefits a very high percentage of our people in a direct way. Also, as with every major highway improvement—but more so in the case of Highway 401 and the other freeways which are so important for our American visitors, regardless of their final destination—a stimulus is given to the tourist industry every time a freeway is built as new, or improved.

Commenting on the opening of a section of Highway 401 in western Ontario last fall, a newspaper in that part of the province observed that, "Toronto became five miles and 1.5 hours closer" to Windsor and Chatham as a result. The item also said, "The decreased travelling time, achieved through by-passing of low speed zones in and near municipalities, means hundreds of dollars saved in time and other expense of road transportation."

Similarly, this direct quotation from a Kitchener industrialist, as to the economic impact of Highway 401 for that area: "The mileage between here and one of our plants in eastern Ontario used to be about 180 miles, which took well over four hours to drive. When Highway 401 from Highway 8 easterly was opened, the distance shrank to 165 miles—which can be driven easily under three hours. Transportation costs have been reduced materially."

Wholesale businesses and light industry dependent on truck transport have gravitated toward Highway 401 and other freeways to take advantage of substantial savings in both storage and delivery costs. Because freeways

like 401 cut hauling time so appreciably, plants located conveniently adjacent to them can serve a wider area from a single operation. This, in turn, means less investment in buildings and reduced operating costs all down the line.

As might be expected, the extent of the sprouting of industrial plants and other enterprises alongside the major freeways is usually related to the length of time a particular section of freeway has been in service. For example, business concerns of one type or another line the QE Way at many points between Niagara Falls and Toronto and the rate of new locations is rapidly increasing. Similarly, a complex of manufacturing concerns straddles both sides of Highway 400 at Barrie which, by the way, has never looked back since it was by-passed by Highway 400 some years ago. The same type of new industrial growth has been evident on sections of Highway 401 and, generally speaking, the pattern has been the same, namely, the greatest development has occurred on those sections which have been in use the longest.

In any consideration of the economic impact of freeway construction the resulting creation of job opportunities should not be overlooked. Upon the completion of each new section of freeway, employment possibilities are opened for people, many of them living in rural areas, for whom the travelling time would otherwise make these jobs unattractive, if not out of the question. In this connection I was pleased to note, in a report recently received from the Eastern Ontario Development Association as part of a survey, that one of the benefits of the opening of new sections of Highway 401 in eastern Ontario in 1963 which they listed was the reduction in travelling time for many employees who drive 30 miles to their work at a plant in the Prescott-Brockville area.

A report from the Kingston Industrial Commission states, in part, "In this area we have located some eight industries, all of which were to some degree influenced by the nearness to 401, and in at least two cases it was a decisive factor."

The Ontario Seaway Valley Industrial Development Association also favoured the department with a report, dated January 28 last. After commenting on new industrial growth in the region, the report refers specifically to the construction now under way on "a very large warehouse" on a 250-acre site adjacent to Highway 401, east of Morrisburg. The accompanying comment, and I quote, was: "There is no doubt at all that Highway 401 has contributed to this company's decision to locate in this area."

Finally, on this line, the report from the Cornwall Industrial Commission concluded with this telling observation:

We fully expect the development along Highway 401 in the future will be similar to those communities where the highway has been in existence for a number of years.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I have dwelt at some length on the economic impact of Highway 401, it has not been without reason. In this province we have reached a stage where the importance of our freeways for the province as a whole should be fully understood by people everywhere in Ontario—regardless of the way various segments earn their livelihood.

The concrete examples I have just given of commercial enterprises of many different kinds locating along Ontario's freeways to so marked a degree is clear-cut evidence of one of the most valuable benefits resulting from freeway construction, namely, the decentralization of industry.

Freeways put all the adjacent country through which they pass "on the main line," so to speak, in much the same way as railroads, but with far greater flexibility in so far as the locating of plants is concerned. It has been established beyond any measure of doubt that the freeways, such as Highway 401—in conjunction with related highways and other road facilities—create new values by opening up undeveloped areas, by putting land to more profitable uses and by encouraging industry to disperse or decentralize, as well as to expand. Thus, new business and new jobs, with resulting general prosperity for the regions served by freeways, can be attributed directly to their construction.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss briefly the matter of the county needs study and simply say that the study, now in progress, is further convincing evidence of how The Department of Highways concerns itself with the over-all requirements of Ontario. About a year ago we asked all the counties to undertake a new needs study which will re-evaluate the road requirements of each county road system in the province. The department is paying a 50 per cent subsidy in each instance.

The purpose of the new study is to up-date the data compiled in the course of a previous departmental study which included an appraisal of the county road systems generally and their relationship to the over-all road needs of the province. The findings of that study were published in a 1959 report entitled, *Ontario's Roads and Streets*.

In the interval since the 1957-59 needs study, many of the county road systems have changed noticeably due to higher standards of construction necessary to handle greatly increased traffic, changing traffic patterns, the effect of annexations and other causes.

The county needs study is designed to bring the road inventory and other information compiled in the earlier study up to date, thereby providing a more current guide as to the needs of the county road system over the next five to ten years. Thus, the counties and the department may, together, prepare construction programmes in which the funds available will be directed to the areas of greatest need. Here again, is a striking example of The Department of Highways acting in accordance with its "total roads concept"—that is, taking positive and effective action to the end that all roads will contribute the maximum level of service for the common good.

As I made clear at the time of writing to the county councils a year ago, and now wish to repeat, the study techniques being employed will in no way reduce the authority of the counties to determine their yearly expenditure. Rather, a basic objective of the study is to organize the data on county road requirements in such a way that the counties will be in a much better position to prepare realistic programmes for the next five or six years.

Precisely because up-to-date factual information on the counties' needs is necessary for the most effective application of direct aid of the development road type, there is a natural and close relationship between the county needs study and the total development road programme. The department intends to use the information so compiled to evaluate requests for development road aid, bylaw submissions and also for long-range estimates of subsidy requirements.

It is our sincere hope that each county will use the resulting report as a guide in setting a reasonable road levy; to increase the "lead" time for pre-engineering; to revise the county road system where necessary—both additions and deletions are included here; to make the road committee and the county council more keenly aware of the necessity for financial and physical planning beyond the current year; and, finally, to encourage everyone, including county engineers, county councils, county taxpayers and users of county roads to take a more realistic view of the need for adequate county roads for the good of the economy of the province as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted in these

remarks to convey to the House something of what I like to consider the "total roads concept" in Ontario, which includes roads of every description, whether under the jurisdiction of The Department of Highways or the municipalities—whose road and street facilities are subsidized so extensively by the government through the department.

I would say to the House that it is difficult, if not impossible, to see any lessening of the demand for adequate transportation and communication facilities—if we are to keep pace with the development that we all hope will continue. But I would also suggest to the House and to the people of Ontario—and to road authorities at all levels of government across this great province of Ontario—that we can start today to examine every conceivable means of getting more for our "roads dollar."

In The Department of Highways we have recognized this fact to the extent that our capital expenditure for road construction in the year ending March 31, 1960, was in excess of \$147.5 million. This, incidentally, was an all-time high, and you will notice in the figures presented here today that we are estimating our expenditures for capital construction on King's highways for the year ending March 31, 1965, to be \$141.5 million. During this levelling-off period, and of course, previous to this, the portion of the highway budget applied to direct subsidies to municipalities has increased by leaps and bounds. For example, in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1961, our municipal assistance totalled \$80 million. We are estimating for the year ahead of us that the total for this purpose will reach \$112.5 million. What we must now examine, together, are the various means by which we can make this amount of money, along with the amounts raised by the municipalities, do at least as much and, desirably, more work in the ensuing year and probably for several years to come.

If we are going to preach—then it is only fair that we should practise, so I will describe two of several methods by which we in the department are endeavouring and succeeding in the "tightening-up process" at our level.

For the past three years a thorough internal departmental study has shown us how to effect what amounts to a gross staff reduction with no evident impairment of efficiency. This has been accomplished largely by eliminating many redundant job classifications upon the retirement of incumbent personnel. The work loads were redistributed among remaining staff and I make the proud boast

here today that the administrative and technical efficiency of The Department of Highways still ranks as, or at least with, the best in government.

Implemented less than a year and a half ago, another area where the adoption of a new internal policy is revealing interesting economies is in the equipment section of the department. As the result of a study by a staff committee, the department is in the process of reducing many lines of construction and maintenance equipment. Our survey revealed that in a good number of circumstances the utilization factor did not warrant ownership of equipment and accordingly it is being disposed of and it is now being rented where required. The obvious and substantial savings associated with ownership are, of course, the costs of maintenance, housing, operating staff, capital costs and carrying charges. These savings can be well substantiated, in that over the past few years we have added many hundreds of miles to our provincial roads system with very little appreciable increase in our maintenance expenditures.

In other words, we maintain a constant scrutiny of our internal cost factors and will continue to explore every practical avenue of economy and develop more efficient methods of operation. I would therefore earnestly urge all road building authorities—cities, towns, counties and townships—to re-examine the various areas of their operations and effect those economies that are possible without impairment of the efficiency of their respective programmes. In this way, the premise of a “total roads concept” will keep Ontario in the forefront as the jurisdiction with the finest road system on the continent—or, for that matter, in the world.

On vote 801:

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I just do not know where to start in here, this afternoon.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): Just dive in.

Mr. Bukator: There are a lot of places to dive in, I can assure the hon. Attorney General. I might start off with these two books I received this afternoon in the mail. I would like to read the hon. Minister's letter accompanying these estimates:

In deference to requests made in the Legislature, I am making available to the hon. members, the 1964-65 capital construction programme and municipal road programme books in advance of the presen-

tation of my estimates. In doing so, may I respectfully request that the material therein be treated as confidential until the estimates have been tabled.

Can you imagine anyone in the Legislature here this afternoon being able to pick up these estimates, digest them and be able to discuss them intelligently here this afternoon? I do not know anyone in the Legislature, in my short experience, who is capable of that. If they have the ability, they will have an opportunity this afternoon to display it.

I would like to say this pertaining to the hon. Minister and his officials. I am not here to condemn him or his people. I am here to condemn the programme that he has before us and I think we can find many areas in which we can debate this intelligently. So, if anyone gets the impression that I am out to try personally to crucify anyone, it is not my intention at all—at the moment, anyhow. Mind you, if needs be, one can get involved in that area too.

I find that the hon. Minister made quite a presentation pertaining to the two skyways. I think this is closer to home and so I can talk about that for a little while.

The Homer Skyway has been recently opened and it is a wonderful way of transportation. It shortens the route between Toronto and Niagara Falls, or the Peace Bridge, for trucks. The Burlington Skyway also shortens the way, and for this I think the government should be commended.

About a year ago, one of my colleagues was here to debate these issues with you. He suggested at that time that the government should consider eliminating the tolls for trucks on the Burlington Skyway. Now that argument is greater than it ever was. You have put a two per cent sales tax on gasoline and I realize it is not The Department of Highways—but you have put an additional two per cent sales tax on gas and I would think they may be paying more than their share. I think the tolls should be eliminated as far as trucks are concerned.

As far as Burlington is concerned, I think the hon. member who represents that riding is not here this afternoon, but as far as Burlington is concerned, the congestion—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): I am right here.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, I am sorry. I was thinking it was a Conservative. I do not know how I by-passed the hon. member for Wentworth East. I knew the name, but I forgot the riding.

This particular bottleneck, with which the people in that area have to contend—because there are tolls to be paid they naturally take the route along the lake front. Since the sales tax has been added on, I do believe they should be given the privilege of using the skyway because, Lord knows, they are taxed high enough.

With licences from The Department of Transport, and with gas tax and fuel tax from The Treasury Department—at the same time there is revenue coming in for road purposes—I feel that should be done away with. I do not just speak on my own behalf; I speak on behalf of the Liberal Party this afternoon.

There are many areas one can discuss in what the hon. Minister has already read off to us this afternoon, but the hon. Minister is talking about the great job your people do along the highways, in assisting the travelling public. I know many truckers have done the same service for the people; this would be one way of giving them some concession, where you can show your appreciation for their efforts on behalf of the people.

I was quite interested in the submissions pertaining to Highway 405. It is almost complete now, I gather—from the new bridge to the Queen Elizabeth Way. You will recall that a delegation came to you to consider a fly-off, or a way into the industrial area of that particular district. It would be in Lincoln county. I wish the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch) was here to assist me in my effort this afternoon. I still hope your engineers are looking in that particular area, and I do hope that they will see fit to make some concession to that riding.

I was very much impressed with the trip we made about a year ago into the north country. We were put on the Ontario Northland Railway, and took a trip out to Timmins. From Timmins we wound up in Cochrane, and from Cochrane we wound up in Moosonee. As we drove along, or rode along in this train—am I on the right route?—I was amazed at that immense country, and its natural resources. I was impressed with the mining possibilities, and I was impressed with the timber land. I was impressed with the fishing and hunting, and the tourism. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) was boasting about his area for tourists, and I think he had something.

But let us take it from a development standpoint. We were speaking to a group of people in one of those towns or cities. They advised us, on that particular trip, that Quebec, bordering to the east of us, has

roads up to the boundary of the province of Ontario, and yet we are not tied in with them at the moment—except for the completion, about a year ago, of 101, I believe it was. That is only one. There are many areas which could be developed. The two provinces could do business across that particular boundary, because they have roads up to the boundary, but we do not—from what I gathered on that trip. It would appear to me that that would be an avenue you should explore a little more thoroughly.

The people of that particular group, I recall—I guess you would call them unorganized municipalities—from the board of trade or chamber of commerce, did an exceptionally good job, early in the morning, trying to convince us these roads should be opened up.

The only road you have beyond Cochrane is at Gardiner. They have moved up that far. It would appear to me that the road could be opened further up, because two of the trains which travel through the Ontario northland have recently been cut off. You are not opening up the northland. If anything, you are closing the door. I believe that should be looked at.

I understand that on the other boundary, in Manitoba, they, too, have roads adjoining our province, but we do not have connections to them.

I could give you many arguments pertaining to the north-south roads you were talking about. You were talking about the job you did in the north country in the riding of my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha). I remember that, on two or three occasions, he talked about opening the road from Foleyet to Chapleau, and then to Wawa.

I understand that portion of road has been opened from Foleyet to Chapleau and Wawa. It is being worked on now. My hon. colleague suggested that there may be a chance to open a road from Timmins to Sudbury, a direct north-and-south artery, so that people would not have to travel many miles to get to those two points. While the hon. Minister is at it, he could even put a branch off to Chapleau from the Sudbury road which goes to Timmins.

The hon. Minister says that this is in his programme. I have watched programmes come to the Legislature on many occasions and I find, too, that the departments have, for some unknown reason, a habit of changing their plans.

If I may be permitted, this afternoon, to say that the government, The Department of Highways in some instances—not too many

of them—have used a bit of imagination, it would appear to me that the man who tugged at your sleeve in an area where they are bottled up is the man who was listened to. Naturally, he has to be. There are people there, and there are votes there, and there is the possibility of retaining or getting new seats. So, when the time comes, before an election in many cases, the hon. Ministers of all departments of government go to those areas to see what is needed. That does not apply to the hon. Minister of Highways, he claims. He shook his head, "No." I will accept that for the time being until we come to areas where maybe we can confirm it.

There is no imagination used, in my opinion. Someone said this road must be in because if you do there may be a chance that we can retain or get another seat.

Now this has happened. Not in the hon. Minister's term of office, let us say, just to be good to him for the moment, but this has happened.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Never in my term.

Mr. Bukator: It never happened? Why, they tell me, I would say to the hon. Attorney General, that it even happened while the Liberals were in for nine years.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Oh, that could not be!

Mr. Bukator: Wait until we come to the individual votes and I get a little closer to familiar in my own backyard.

You know, I feel that there are areas where you cannot use politics. I feel that there are areas where you cannot consider the fact that there are only a few people. For the good of this province you must expand the roads system; if you want to get to the natural resources you must put in highways with a bit of imagination.

Look at your Quebec map, if you will, and see the roads that butt up against this province and then look at the ones that we have in between, and we do not have too much.

If we are going to develop this great country of ours, we have to have highways. If you open the highways, as you have found in many areas, people will build along them. It brings traffic in and gas is used up and taxes do come to the hon. Minister. All across the country, you cannot get away from it, it improves the economy.

I feel that this would be a good time to touch on the wage question in your contracts. I remember one of my first arguments in the political field back in 1955. They were doing a bit of work in the riding at that time and

the contractors were paying the employees 87.5 cents an hour.

Now, if the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) would have considered that the people of the province should all be treated alike recently when he made his announcement to the press that there would be an increase in the minimum wage from Oshawa to Hamilton, certainly he could have spread that across the province. Certainly he could have said that for construction workers there should be a minimum of at least \$1.25 an hour. Basically speaking, this is where the contractors would start to bid if they were going to bid on unskilled labour in their contracts with the province.

I know this: anyone who gets \$1.25 an hour certainly does not hoard that money. He spends every nickel of it and winds up owing money at the end of the year. So there should be an increase from the bottom at least. I think construction workers should be paid well and I think The Department of Highways should set the pace. This is worth considering.

Mind you, possibly your hands are tied; but if the hon. Minister of Labour had done what he should have done when he came into this House with his estimates, he could have said that \$1.25 an hour across the board for construction work in the province of Ontario should be it and not from Oshawa to Hamilton only.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We had better than that.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, even better!

The hon. Minister can answer this question when we come to it. Yes, he can answer this. If you ask in your contracts that they give a minimum, at least, then you are on the right track. I will tell you that it must have been a fairly recent proposition that has not been in effect too long.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: One year. Would you like me to comment on it now?

Mr. Bukator: No. You will have a lot more to comment on when I get through. You might have a few more things to discuss as time goes on.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I imagine we will.

Mr. Bukator: I feel that under no circumstances should people work on that type of work for low wages. I realize that it is unskilled labour but they should get much more money than that.

That was not the case when I referred to 1955. It was 87.5 cents an hour and it is not too long ago that they got their minimum of \$1.25, if they get that from The Department of Highways.

In making reference to suburban and county roads, I think this is one I can dwell on for quite some time because I am acquainted with the subject. I was on the county road committee for some six years and I found that originally suburban roads were built to assist the traffic to the centre of population. I understand that the roads were not too good into a certain municipality and the people would not come there to trade. So the people of that municipality felt that they should make some contribution and assist by way of finances. They originally used to help get wagons out of the mud en route to their municipalities. This was the basis later for them to contribute a portion of money and suburban roads came into existence.

I am going to say this for the suburban roads commission: they do a good job. Their work is supervised and administered by the county engineer in most cases, so the county roads committee has one job to do and the suburban roads commission has another job to do.

Now then, I could take it right off the top but I think this bears reading into the record. On the county suburban roads, let us take, for instance, Brant. In the counties of Brant and Brantford, 61.1 miles of county roads are maintained. The approved expenditure was \$242,000 and the government gives a subsidy of \$135,000. In other words, 50 per cent or a half of one mill is borne by the county of Brant and the city of Brantford.

So this has been in existence for many, many years. I was with many delegations and many groups that came before the former premier from municipal bodies asking why they maintain that cost to those municipalities and counties. If we are concerned about the individual in the low income bracket or on a fixed income with a low pension, I do not know why they should have to bear a half a mill on their taxes to maintain suburban roads.

Now the money total is not too great. The total at the end of this particular column is \$6,947,000. Half of it is borne by the municipalities, that is something like \$3,663,000. This particular tax on the shoulders of the wrong people is unfair and should be eliminated.

Now, let us go down the list a little fur-

ther and find that in Carleton—and I read this for the hon. members who may not be acquainted with suburban roads and how they operate—Carleton maintains 108 miles; their expenditure is something like \$946,000; the government subsidy is \$508,000. In other words, Carleton and Ottawa is bearing a cost of \$508,000. Again, people of that area and those counties are bearing an unfair tax burden.

I would think that with the increase in expenditure over revenue of some \$7 million, it would be a good place to put some of that money.

Take Elgin, if you will, Elgin county and St. Thomas. They have only 25 miles to maintain and they pay \$255,000. Those municipalities bear \$134,000 in suburban road costs. Essex and Riverside, with only four miles; \$22,000 is borne by the taxpayers of the county and that particular municipality. Frontenac and Kingston, 41 miles, \$66,000 again is borne, if you will.

If you would like to take your annual report for 1963, you will find those figures on page 65. Grey and Owen Sound—these are coming into familiar ground—the people of Owen Sound have to bear a half a mill, some \$33,000 borne by the county and that municipality.

Hastings and Belleville, 16 miles; \$40,000 and \$21,000 is borne by the people who should not be paying the bill. Kent and Chatham, 27 miles that is outside of that particular town; and they have to pick up the tab for that amount of money and they have absolutely nothing to say about it.

The suburban roads commission wrote to that municipality and said: "Your assessment is, let's say, \$100 million, you will give us \$50,000." Then they go out and spend that money, where and if they see fit to spend it.

Lambton and Sarnia—the new hon. member here might be enlightened to something if he has never been in municipal affairs. His particular municipality, along with the county, bear the cost for suburban roads to a total of \$68,000.

This is an unjust tax of the people of his area, an unjust tax to the people of the province as a whole. It is a method which was put into effect many years ago, and it is about time that was put on the right side of the ledger. The province of Ontario, The Department of Highways, should pay the whole cost. Suburban commissions can still maintain their positions if need be but at least I do not see any reason why the people of the hon. member's municipality should

pay that kind of money for no reason at all. This should be a provincial matter.

Leeds and Grenville, Brockville and Gananoque, Prescott and Smith's Falls all have a portion to pay. They maintain a lot of highways and their portion is \$7,000, \$8,000 and \$5,000. Then we come to Lincoln county. Lincoln county and St. Catharines have 46.8 miles to maintain and the cost there is \$246,000, and Lincoln county has to bear with the city of St. Catharines a cost of \$128,000.

Middlesex and London, where our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) comes from, may do something about their costs. He finds himself in the position where the people of his city, along with the county, have to pay \$243,000 for suburban roads. Northumberland and Durham, along with Trenton, only pay \$13,000. I think that is fair amount of money.

In Ontario county and Oshawa, \$212,109 is borne by the county and the municipality. Oxford and Ingersoll pay only \$3,000, and the municipality bears \$1,600 of it. I do not know what happened there. I would think that the county council road committee should look into this matter. There is more there for them under the present system and I think they are entitled to it.

I will move on down to more familiar ground. I might say to the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter), that his people in Galt have to pay \$58,000 a year toward suburban roads. Niagara Falls has to bear \$47,000 for suburban roads, some 17 miles. The city of Welland in the riding of my friend, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) has 15.8 miles. The county pays \$105,000 and the city of Welland in the county of Welland, for the benefit of the hon. member, \$62,000. We complained when we sat on road committees for many years, we complained during our experience on county council together, and I am continuing to complain. I hope the hon. member for Welland picks up the argument on his side of the House for us.

In Wellington and Guelph, \$36,000 is borne by those two. Wentworth and Hamilton—here is quite a figure of money—bear \$230,000 of the cost. And the Toronto Yorks, their portion to the municipality and the county is \$1,019,000. This is an unfair tax on the people and an obsolete way of collecting it, especially since the gas tax has been raised. It would appear to be that that is the proper place to put that added cost and take it off the people's shoulders. People who are on a fixed income and on pensions, who own a little piece of land, certainly should not have to pay a mill or a half a mill

on their taxes, and many of them do not drive at all. I think this is an argument well taken. I hope the hon. Minister will take a good look at that, and that in another year it will be eliminated from the records, particularly from that group of people who should not be paying the cost for that purpose.

All the arguments that I had planned on giving and putting before you this afternoon seem to be dwindling. I did not prepare myself too well. Something that the government should think about is The Department of Transport with its \$80 million. The Department of Highways, I understood, was \$218 million. The hon. Minister said the total revenue was \$271 million and the expenditure is going to be \$277 million, or there would be a deficit of some \$7 million. For the life of me, I cannot see why The Department of Transport could not be merged with The Department of Highways and operated through one office. I do not think it is necessary. I realize the federal government, mind you, touches on many more fields. But provincially there is no need whatsoever for The Department of Transport not to come under the heading of The Department of Highways. I do not say this to offend my friend, the hon. Minister from Ottawa South (Mr. Haskett), but the facts are that it is not necessary.

I was hoping someone would ask me what we were going to do about that \$150 million that was going to be cut off if we get a new leader.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): May I ask the hon. member what he is going to do with—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He has 15 pages of speech prepared in reply.

Mr. Bukator: No, I do not have. I was going to say that if you recall in his speech he said it was a personal opinion and nothing to do with the party that he represented or that he is a part of at the moment. So you see it is not our opinion at all. We need not only the \$150 million but many more millions of dollars. And it is going to be revealed to you as the votes are debated. There are many roads that have been neglected and should be looked into, and you cannot do it by cutting the Budget in that particular department. This I say on behalf of the Liberal Party.

Why does not someone ask me the question about the subways here in the city? How do we feel about the subways, especially in Niagara Falls and Wentworth—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): If the hon. member will give me a list of his questions, I will ask them.

Mr. Bukator: My friend, the hon. member from Owen Sound (Mr. Sargent) is not here this afternoon, but just to get it on the record, we do not object to Toronto—

Mr. Bryden: Are the hon. member and the hon. member from Owen Sound in the same category?

Mr. Bukator: There are some people in our party who are free thinkers, I suppose, the same as in the NDP. If the NDP get together, they might make a concerted effort in what they are going to do. But it would be rather interesting to see—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member means they never get together.

Mr. Bukator: How can you catch up to him? But I wanted to make this clear, we are not opposed to assisting the subway and the cost of the subway. We realize this, that if that particular road was put on top rather than in a tunnel, the government would be paying 50 per cent toward the cost of that. There is no question about that. The thing we object to is that there are many areas of the province of Ontario that have been neglected by the hon. Minister, and I say this as sincerely as I know how. The hon. Minister has looked at the political atmosphere in that particular riding. All one has to do is go beyond the limits of Lincoln county, all one has to do is go into many areas, and let us take Highway 401—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I take back the question.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Too late.

Mr. Bukator: Let us take 401 if you will.

An hon. member: The price is right.

Mr. Bukator: I think it is from Tilbury to Tempo—70 miles of a four-lane highway that has never been completed. Our colleagues on this side of the House have constantly got to their feet, year in and year out since I have been here, asking for the completion of this highway. Seventy miles and it has never been touched.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Dead wrong.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. member will have to take it up with my hon. friend. My hon. friend informs me that there are 70 miles

there that are not completed—not the four lanes, there are two.

Mr. McKeough: You said there were 70 miles that had never been touched.

Mr. Bukator: Well, all right, two lanes are completed and there should be four. And so the two lanes have never been touched.

Mr. Singer: How much straighter do you want than that?

Mr. Bukator: And the two lanes have never been touched. Not only in that area—

Mr. McKeough: They have been touched. They are all graded. Why does not the hon. member read his books? They laid the dust on it.

Mr. Bukator: I drove over that highway; and since we are on 401 I will give a bit more—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: They are young and are active, and they have to say something. I am a very tolerant individual—they are naturally having a bit of sport with me. But I assure the hon. members I will be going to the Falls and I will be coming back here and I will be going to the Falls for many more years than some of these people will be doing.

Mr. McKeough: Those are good highways too, George.

Mr. Bukator: No, they are not good highways. They are not good highways; not as good as they are in some areas.

By the way, I would like to get that clear, since the hon. member seems to know so much—he is from Chatham, and the hon. member should know. The two lanes which are not completed—are they in good shape?

Mr. McKeough: They could be better.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. member not only does it with a smile on his face but has a tendency to shoot a little bit.

The hon. member says there is only eight miles incomplete. Is that the far easterly portion of 401 beyond Stormont? I would like to get that clear at the moment so that I shall know.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are eight miles west of the Quebec border with nothing yet. This is to be completed this year.

Mr. Bukator: This is according to the book which the hon. Minister had sent to us.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But the hon. member is quite wrong about that section in western Ontario. There are 71 miles, with two lanes of pavement and two lanes of grading, and the final contracts for those remaining unpaved portions will be let this construction season.

Mr. Bukator: This is according to the book of the hon. Minister but this has happened before. I have heard remarks similar to this before.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member has not heard it from me before.

Mr. Bukator: At least we can check the record another year and see whether the hon. Minister is a little more truthful than some of the Ministers in the past.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wish the hon. member would.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, I will. From Cornwall east to the Quebec boundary, I see it here in the book with the many colours. There is a portion between 32 and 24 which has only two lanes; the hon. Minister mentioned that earlier. Has the hon. Minister looked at Highway 16, from 401 to Ottawa? Is that not in a deplorable condition? Counties build better roads than that.

I was over that not too long ago, and I do believe to tie that in with Ottawa, that particular strip—I do not know how many miles it is—I drove on it not too long ago. There is a certain government in Ottawa which looks favourably on my requests, and I drove on that particular bit of road and it is not at all a safe highway.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Carried!

Mr. Bukator: The hon. member for Welland says "Carried". If everyone contributed as much as he does on the floor of this House we would have been out of here two months ago. We might have had nothing done.

Mr. McKeough: The hon. member means he wasted no time.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. member wasted no time doing it.

Well, I have touched on the minimum wages, I have touched on 401, I have touched on the skyways, on the gas tax, and it would appear to me that, all in all, if I have an opportunity to do this another year, I will be prepared for the hon. Minister, he may rest assured. When we get into the votes, my hon. colleagues will get into some of the

problems, and the hon. gentlemen to my left can rest assured I will take care of Niagara Falls. I always have done.

Mr. G. E. Gomme (Lanark): Just under the wire, Don.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, Mr. Chairman, I was within reaching distance.

Mr. Chairman, in making an introductory statement to these estimates, I want to pick up at the outset a comment the hon. Minister made in the course of his remarks. He was referring, I suppose, to the inevitable competition for the dollars which are available for highways and the feeling, in some parts of the province, that they are being neglected, while other parts of the province are being provided almost with a surfeit of roads and the equivalent thereof.

One of the things I find very disturbing is the tendency to indulge in this kind of thing—pitting urban against rural areas. In my view, it is about as close to a clear revelation of bankruptcy in policy that one could get. It is divisiveness without any real accomplishment, because it is just really trying to make local political gain out of pitting your little area—presumably the little "David" which cannot cope—with the great giant somewhere else.

We have had an example of it which the last speaker tried to cover up a little in the course of his remarks, from the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) who, on two occasions so far this year, has referred to the fact that the subway in Toronto is being paid for by two-thirds of the people in the rest of the province. In so doing he provoked, quite understandably, the open objections of some of his own members. Indeed, if the hon. member for Grey North had been here last year he would have heard a regular song and dance—and I agreed with it—from the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) that, generally speaking, the city areas have tended to be neglected in being provided with facilities commensurate with their needs.

My thinking was moving along these lines because for years I have been conscious of it, not so much in "rural versus city" as in "north versus south". In fact, some years ago when I was on the select committee looking into toll roads or highway revenues, I recall a figure given to us at that time which has always stuck in my memory; on many occasions I have used it in northern Ontario, when one faces the inevitable complaint in northern Ontario that all the roads were being built in the south. The figure given to that committee was that, on Labour Day weekend alone—and this would be some seven or eight years

ago now—more cars travelled the Queen Elizabeth Way from Hamilton to Toronto than did on the old trans-Canada, the No. 11 route, in a whole year, from, say, the Cochrane area through to the Lakehead.

This is not to argue that northern Ontario is not entitled to the construction of roads; but I was interested, in trying to pursue this and get some facts on it, to get from the department—after I called the deputy Minister—a little booklet put out by the department entitled, *Annual Average Daily Traffic*. In glancing through that, I discovered just a few illustrations of, I think, the basic reasons why more roads have to be built in the south. I am not arguing against them being built in the north where the need is—not so much for traffic requirements as for economic development, because that is the main reason for the development of roads in the north.

For example, I discovered, in looking through this booklet, that if you travel No. 11 highway from Barrie to the Timiskaming area the average annual daily traffic counts range from a low of 1,600 to 3,500 or 4,000 where there are junctions with other highways, and reach a peak of 8,500 in the vicinity of North Bay. Or, if you take No. 11 highway from Cochrane to the Lakehead, they range from a low average daily count of 600 to 800, to a high of only 3,000 as you approach the Lakehead. Or, if you take the trans-Canada, from Ottawa through to the Manitoba border, you will find that it ranges from a low of 1,000 to 2,000 or 3,000 in more developed areas like Sturgeon Falls or the Spragge area leading into Elliot Lake, or Dryden and finally it reaches to a peak of 7,000 to 8,000 only for areas like North Bay or Copper Cliff or the Soo.

Or, if you come back to a rural area, such as is so often mentioned by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) or the hon. member for Grey North, if you take No. 6 highway from Arthur to Tobermory you will find that the average daily traffic counts range from a low of 350 at Tobermory to 1,000 or 2,000 for most of the built-up areas, and reach a high of 5,000 in the area of Owen Sound. In other words, the peak figures on these highways are 5,000, or 7,000-8,000—on the trans-Canada, for example, in the North Bay area and the Soo.

Contrast that with the kind of situation you have on the Queen Elizabeth Way between Toronto and Niagara Falls, where the low is 14,000—double the peak of those other figures I was talking about—and it ranges up to a high of 50,000. Or, if you take Highway 400 from Toronto to Barrie, where the low is 11,000 and the peak is 19,000—I wonder

where they get that 19,000 peak, because if you ever travelled that road on Sunday evening in the summertime, when they are coming back, you certainly think there must have been a lot of blanks in the road traffic during other parts of the year to even out at 19,000.

Or finally Highway 401, where it ranges, for small towns, from 4,000-8,000, to cities in the range of 12,000-22,000—by cities I mean areas like Oshawa and Preston—and finally to the Toronto area, where the average count is anywhere from 20,000 to 73,000 cars per day.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is pretty convincing proof of why money is being directed to the south. In fact, once again I recall an observation made to that committee some years ago when they pointed out that despite the cost involved in building a highway like 401, for example from Toronto up to Barrie, that this highway pays for itself in eight to ten years—out of the gasoline tax alone—this highway will be paid in an eight- to ten-year period.

Let us face it, there are some highways in the rural parts or in the north of this province which will take a generation or perhaps two generations before they will pay for themselves by gasoline tax alone. Indeed, this is in effect what the hon. Minister was saying when in the course of his remarks, if I have jotted it correctly, he said:

If The Department of Highways operated on the principle of a dollar expenditure for every dollar collected, the most heavily populated parts of Ontario would by now have considerably more road facilities of all types than they do and the more sparsely settled regions would have infinitely less.

In other words, the highways in the high population concentrations are paying for themselves in less than 10 years most of the time.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not suggesting that this does not mean there should not be a more rapid development of highways, particularly in some parts of the north where, heaven knows, they waited for a generation to get a single road—if I mention Atikokan or Manitouwadge or Caramat or Nakina. I think the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Ward-robe) from up in that area, and his hon. colleagues in the Conservative Party, have been fighting elections for a generation on the prospects of opening some of those roads and finally he had the opportunity to cut the ribbon.

However, Mr. Chairman, the general point I wanted to deal with in my introductory remarks is to ask this question of hon. members: are we getting true value from the hundreds of millions of dollars we are spending in highway expenditures?

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not know. And what is more important as an Opposition leader I have no way of finding out.

These estimates are presented to us in three huge blocks. If hon. members have looked at them, you will find that there are about \$4.5 million for main office estimate; your second sum, \$86 million is for maintenance. True, it is broken down into a number of subdivisions; and finally you have a whopping \$127 million for construction and other capital projects.

But there is no way of assessing in any detailed way how this money is being spent and if we are getting full value. All I can do is engage in something of a cat-and-mouse game with the government. The government being determined to hide some of the facts, I am equally determined to get them; but I will confess right at the outset I am licked in this kind of a game. Because it is not possible, in this kind of an uneven battle, to get the necessary details. To the extent that I do not get the details, I submit that I and every other hon. member of the Opposition is not fulfilling his responsibilities.

However, this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I want to try to raise two specific cases. I recognize that I am taking two cases which represent only a small fraction of the multi-million dollar budget, but they will shed some light on the department's operations and I think they will at least provide some glimpse, a partial answer, to the question of whether we are getting full value for the money spent.

The first case relates to the accusations in the early stages of last year's election campaign by two former soils inspectors in the Owen Sound area contending that the contractors in that area had been cheating on contracts by substituting lower grades of material than called for in the specifications. Now the nub of the issue in this accusation and in this case, Mr. Chairman, the nub of the accusation is that inferior materials were used. Nobody, including the department, disputes this.

The department's first reaction was that this was a defensible procedure. While later maintenance cost may be higher because of the inferior material used, they explain, this is balanced out by the lower capital costs in

the actual construction of the road. Perhaps I can put the department's views in a direct quote from Mr. H. W. Adcock, deputy Minister in charge of engineering, and the hon. Minister himself as quoted in the *Globe and Mail* of August 21. Mr. Adcock said:

The current economic theory in highway construction is to make the best use of available material.

And the hon. Minister said:

In other words, you have to equate the capital costs of construction against the maintenance costs that may follow. I am satisfied that the proper procedures were adopted right down the line.

The important point, Mr. Chairman, that is evaded in this explanation is that the contractor benefits from the lower capital costs in the construction of the highway, but the public Treasury has to foot the bill for the higher maintenance costs in subsequent years. What I would like to put to the hon. Minister, and shall in a moment, are some questions to clarify to what extent there is some protection of the public interests in this.

In face of this, I want to suggest that it is entirely unsatisfactory for the hon. Minister and his department to investigate the situation themselves and, not surprisingly, come up with the conclusion that all is well. In fact, the hon. Minister dismissed these charges, in headlines that got considerable space, to the effect that they were "irresponsible and frivolous." But I suggest that more pertinent than the hon. Minister's dismissal of it was the comment of one of these soils inspectors, Mr. Molock. I am not interested this afternoon in dealing with the personal grievances of Mr. Molock, I am interested in the underlying principles involved in the operation of this department.

Mr. Molock's comment was this:

The easiest way to make extra money on a contract is to substitute unsatisfactory material for specified material. This business is too lucrative to let a \$3,600-a-year inspector get in the way.

Here obviously is one easy way in which highway contractors can reap the extra profits which enable them to make the expected contribution to Tory election funds.

The other way is to receive payment for extras arising from inadequate pre-engineering. Exactly how these extras are handled when you come to cope with inadequate pre-engineering, and on whose decision they are paid, I am not certain. All of these are intriguing questions. I would just say, in passing, that there is a case before the courts of

the province of Ontario at the present time, and perhaps, in the fullness of time, there may be some light shed on this particular business of how extras are handled and who makes the decision on them.

But, in a *Maclean's Magazine* article some years ago, dealing with party funds, Blair Fraser made the flat assertion which I have quoted many times in this House:

—that the heart and soul and spinal column of old party funds at the provincial level come from those who get contracts from the government.

And there is no doubt that, from their profits, highway contractors are expected to, and do, make contributions to Tory election funds.

In fact, I know of one contractor who was told that he was expected to kick back two per cent of the contract figure. He was, frankly, informed as to what party official he should direct the monies. I cannot prove it, for the reason that if I did the future livelihood of this contractor would be seriously jeopardized. But that does not alter the fact that the practice continues.

It raises a number of basic issues and basic questions relating to policy. How good is the pre-engineering on contracts? This is one of the issues which grew out of the highway scandal in 1955—the desperate need for adequate pre-engineering so that you would not be moving in almost blind and having to revise your tendering and your contracts all during the course of their fulfilment.

When extras are required because of inadequate pre-engineering, what are the procedures for dealing with them? And when the department permits a contractor to use materials inferior to those called for in the contract specifications, how often does the government withhold those savings so that they might be available for the higher maintenance costs which will inevitably arise in later years? In fact, did that happen in the specific case which was raised because of public charges of these two men out in the Owen Sound area? Some time later, I hope the hon. Minister will comment on it.

The second case, Mr. Chairman, which I want to discuss is that of a claim against The Department of Highways by a Port Arthur contractor, Anton Omichinski Limited, with reference to contract 60-246. I am sure that the hon. Minister is familiar with this, perhaps painfully so. The matter has been before the department's special claims committee for some time, with Peter White of Toronto acting on behalf of the contractor.

The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Ward-

rope), the local member involved, has recently told the contractor that he can do nothing for him—at least so I have been informed — so I would conclude that the department is standing firm.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, to give hon. members some details on this, because I repeat, this is in the context of my basic theme this afternoon—it is impossible for us in the Opposition to judge whether or not we are getting value for the money being expended in The Department of Highways. I raised some questions in the instance of the case up in Owen Sound. I am now going to raise some questions in some detail with regard to this contract, because if this contract is in any way an indication of how The Department of Highways operates, then there is no doubt in the world as to what the answer to the question is as to whether we are getting full value. We are not.

Let me set the stage for this, to begin with Mr. Chairman, by quoting from—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I hope you are sure of your facts.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I think I am sure of my facts.

I want to quote to begin with from a précis of the claim that has been made to the department. In fact it was submitted, I understand, some weeks ago to the local member, the hon. Minister of Mines. This is entitled, "Brief Facts Relevant to DHO Contract 60-246, Omichinski Limited and The Ontario Department of Highways."

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): You have got that now, have you?

Mr. MacDonald: It reads as follows:

The contract advertised for tender in November 1960, for 125,000 tons of crushed rock at a DHO quarry, Hearst, Ontario. The contractor was awarded contract 60-246 in December, 1960. The contract commenced late in December, 1960.

In February, 1961, the contractor complained verbally to the district engineer, Mr. Jones, and by phone to Mr. Tackaberry of The Department of Highways, in Toronto, of the enormous amount of overburden and deep crevices encountered at the quarry, which delayed his crushing programme.

In April, 1961, Mr. T. Muir, contract control engineer in Toronto, informed the contractor's bonding company of the contractor's lack of progress in fulfilling his crushing contract. Early in May, 1961, the

contractor went to Toronto to see Mr. Muir, and accompanied by Mr. Mitchinson of the bonding company, explained to Mr. Muir why he was making such slow progress in crushing. Mr. Muir apologized for calling in the bonding company and told the contractor that the difficulties he encountered were not his [the contractor's] worries, but the department's. Mr. Muir specifically opened the contract to page 213 relating to claims, and told the contractor that if the conditions at the quarry proved to be different from that of normal quarry conditions, to put in a claim against the department. This was substantiated by letter from Mr. Muir's office.

As the work at the quarry became progressively worse, due to the scarcity of rock, and as the financial strain on the contractor became unbearable, the contractor and his accountant on May 31, 1961, went to Toronto to see if the DHO would assist the contractor in his financial difficulties. Mr. Muir informed the contractor that before the department could assist him, officials from the department would have to investigate conditions at the quarry. Subsequently, Mr. Panter and Mr. Tackaberry made their respective investigations.

As the contractor was leaving Mr. Muir's office, Mr. Muir thanked the contractor for putting up with such abnormal quarry conditions.

After Mr. Panter and Mr. Tackaberry made their investigations, Mr. Omichinski and the accountant again went to Toronto to see the officials of the DHO. They were told by Mr. Muir and Mr. Panter to submit a claim against the department. An interim claim up to May 31, 1961, was duly filed with the department in July, 1961.

Later in July, Mr. Panter advised that this interim claim had to be submitted to the special claims committee. The contractor complied with this request. A special claims committee was held in August, 1961, before Mr. Mitchell, with the resulting offer of some \$16,000 to the contractor. The contractor completed contract 60-246 on October 1, 1961.

Early in December, 1961, the contractor appointed Mr. Peter White of Toronto as his solicitor and to act on his behalf in connection with contract 60-246. Mr. White rejected the award of the special claims committee on December 28, 1961. A claim covering the complete contract was submitted by Mr. White in June, 1962, to the DHO, and to Mr. C. L. Dubin, QC.

Two auditors from The Department of

Highways audit department conducted their audit of the contractor's records in November, 1962, and established that the contractor had lost \$173,000 in completing contract 60-246.

A meeting was held in the office of the Minister of Highways in April, 1963, and a review of the contract was made. The contractor was told by the Minister that a further look would be made by his officials and that he would be notified in due course of their decision. To date the contractor has received no notification of any decision in this matter.

The contractor wishes another meeting with the officials of The Department of Highways so that a final settlement can be reached, or failing that, another special claims committee meeting, as he is entitled to, can be held, according to the terms of the contract. If these two requests are rejected, permission to sue the government will then be requested.

The department has admitted verbally during the claims meeting of August 29, 1961, and during a meeting held in the latter part of April, 1963, between Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Omichinski, Mr. White, Mr. Dubin and other officials from DHO, and by letter, that the following directions were given to Mr. Omichinski by the departmental engineers:

1. Drill, blast and crush every large rock in the pit as no rock could be wasted. The fulfillment of this direction alone cost the contractor \$56,000 in round figures, in labour, equipment and loss in production.

2. Discontinue the drilling of the area beyond the quartz showing; refusal to allow the blasting of the holes already drilled in the quartz area, thereby forcing the contractor into a second lift operation. The result of these instructions to the contractor in down time and loss in production amounted to \$88,000 in round figures.

We are listing only two of the numerous instructions or directions that were given to Mr. Omichinski. However, the subsequent costs to the contractor in fulfilling these two instructions amounted to \$145,000—in round figures.

That is a précis of the statement of claim, so to speak, against the government.

Involved in this case, Mr. Chairman, are a number of basic policy issues; if not policy, at least procedures in the operations of the department that relate directly to the expenditure of public monies and the question: are we getting full value? What I

want to do at not too great length, I trust, but at some length, is to go back into this whole statement that has been presented by Mr. White on behalf of Anton Omichinski Limited to this government, and just indicate to hon. members of this House at least what went on in the instance of one contract. Then, in light of whatever the hon. Minister has to say about it, we will have to come to the conclusion as to how widespread is this kind of slipshod unprofessional kind of approach.

The first point I want to make—and I am quoting from this brief—is paragraph 1, which says “the call for tender, including all tender documents and the contract itself, calls for a production from the DHO quarry [giving the location] and there was no quarry at this location.” The explanation for that, without going into lengthy reading from the brief, Mr. Chairman, is simply this—that apparently the department had specified a certain area that it thought was adequate or suitable for a quarry—and I shall draw attention to it in a moment—they had drilled one hole only and blasted it to test the rock. But when the contractor came into the picture, he had a piece of territory which was The Department of Highways property, which was the quarry designated in the tenders, and yet in fact there was no quarry there at all. One question I want, at this early stage, to put to the hon. Minister is: Was this property owned by The Department of Highways? If so, how long have they owned it, and from whom had the purchase originally been made?

On page 2 of the brief you have these comments:

On this branch of the claim there are the following major differences between “the quarry” The Department of Highways of Ontario said to have been located as stipulated in the call for tender and contract, and a quarry, as that term has been defined, namely, (1) the quantity of rock called for by the contract just was not available at the location; (2) there was a vast depth of overburden; (3) there were numerous crevices, seams and other apertures in the face of the rock which didn’t permit cleaning by machines nor by any other method except by pick and shovel; and (4) this latter condition extended down to the floor of the lift, and crevices narrowed to a point where even pick and shovel could not clean it.

The quantity of rock originally called for was 125,000 tons. Ultimately the department contented itself with approximately 107,000 tons. And this quantity included a number of boulders, drilled and

blasted, which would not normally form part of a quarry operation because of the cost involved. These were being bulldozed to one side when the department—Mr. Billings and Mr. Zebрук—ordered all boulders to be drilled and shattered; if this was not done the contractor would run out of rock.

And there is an affidavit in this statement of claim to document this. A little later:

The contractor claims the cost of clearing, stripping and grubbing additional acres, over what would have been required to produce the rock from a quarry. The claim in this respect is increasing because of having been required by the department to relocate in an area on which blasted and grubbed material had been piled, upon and under the direction of the department—Messrs. Jones and Billings—thereby increasing the original overburden substantially and the expense of that additional work so ordered.

Turning now to page five, we come to another aspect of the situation as documented by as responsible a solicitor as Mr. Peter White:

The call for tenders was publicly advertised on October 28, 1960, with a closing date and tender opening of November 30, 1960. The contractor visited the DHO quarry in November, 1960, at which time the ground was completely covered by snow. Neither the tender documents, nor the specifications, nor the contract documents, specified or stipulated that any portion of the area designated as a quarry could not be used or that material therefrom could not be accepted.

The department, through the said documents and their engineer—Birch—inferred on the one hand and stated on the other in the month of November, 1960, that the department had tested the rock from the quarry with the result that it was acceptable to the department laboratories at Downsview. It was stated to the contractor that one test hole, of 5 feet in depth, had been blasted and found satisfactory. This was in practice, and obviously assumed by the department to extend across the area of the whole quarry.

It is of interest that there had been no clearing or grubbing prior to the work of the contractor, only one small test shot in an outcrop as above, and that the department engineers—Billings and Birch—prior to tender and subsequent to tender, stated that there was practically no overburden—and, when the contractor commenced operation, indicated the area for

excavation at the point where the one test hole had been drilled and shot.

It is submitted that, after the contract was let and after the contractor had started his work as directed, the department in February of 1961 located their road along the south of the work and located their stockpiles in the exact location where they had subsequently directed the contractor to strip 'as that is where the rock is'.

Again, later in the statement of claim we get to some comments on the question of overburden:

It is further pointed out that, during the continuing complaint of the contractor to Mr. Jones as to the depth of the overburden, Mr. Jones claimed that tests had, in fact, been taken, which was in contradiction to an earlier statement by Mr. Birch that the soils branch had taken no tests. It is submitted that the contractor, bearing in mind the condition of the ground at the time of the call for tender, was entitled to rely upon the statements of the department's own engineers, notwithstanding a provision in the contract which purports to guard against such a statement.

Then another part of this claim gets into the question of the poor rock which was available from this so-called quarry of The Department of Highways:

Work continued during the month of February, upon the direction and at the order of the department, and as work progressed the following difficulties emerged. The rock was of a seamy, schisty, blocky type with sheers that bent steel. The estimate the contractor had received, as to the quantity of anticipated drill footage in this type of country, was about 500 lineal feet per machine per ten-hour day. The biggest day per machine was 230 feet on a 12-hour day, which is approximately one-third of the production estimated. There was a great loss of drill steel, far in excess of the estimated quantity. This was contributed to by later being ordered to go back into the location from the four previous blasts, and further costs were incurred by having to timber the drilling and other machinery so as to provide a level platform.

Crushing commenced on the second day of March, 1961, much later than the volume of work done to that point had hitherto indicated. There was not sufficient rock from the quarry to occupy the crushing equipment for a full one shift, steadily throughout the month of March,

let alone a two-shift operation of that crushing equipment on which the bid had been promised. There was continuing complaint to the department through this period, following a telephone conversation and complaint by the contractor to Mr. Tackaberry on February 21.

While working in a generally easterly direction, toward the area where the quartz subsequently developed, and having stripped and drilled a good few patterns in the latter area, the department, through the district engineer, Mr. Jones, advised that they were concerned about the production of the aggregate. Mr. Jones wrote on March 6, and again on March 17, emphasizing in the latter instance his idea that there was need for additional crushing equipment, notwithstanding the experience of the contractor on the ground, as above related, which demonstrated it was not the lack of crushing equipment but a lack of rock which occasioned the problem.

In April, The Department of Highways—Jones and Billings—ordered the blocks to be drilled and blasted, notwithstanding that this was not the normal practice and would involve the contractor in excessive costs. The contractor was not only ordered to drill and blast these boulders, but told to do so or the engineer would shut the job down.

Drilling and shooting of these boulders started about April 11 and continued daily up until July 21. This occasioned the contractor additional and unnecessary expense in drilling and blasting, additional equipment required for this purpose, the shutting down of equipment, and the moving in and out of locations when these boulders or blocks were shot. This further impinged in a direct way on the crushing equipment, which could not be used to its full advantage because of the time lost.

During the latter part of April the department's Mr. Muir wrote the contractor's bonding company in connection with this contract.

We now get into another interesting phase of this rather sorry tale:

No copy of this letter was sent to the contractor; or, if so, it was not received by him. In the result, the meeting was arranged in Mr. Muir's office on Monday, May 1, 1961. The problems of the inadequate supply of rock, the total unsuitability of the area as a quarry, the bouldery blocky nature of the formation containing

seams and crevices, clay filled, and the abnormal amount of overburden were all explained. Mr. Muir advised the contractor that if the abnormal pit conditions existed to the extent indicated, the contractor should submit a claim. This was substantiated by a letter of May 2 written to the contractor. Notification of intent to claim was forwarded May 9.

At no time throughout the length of the contract was the contractor in a position of having a stockpile of shattered rock available to keep the crushing plant working to one shift, let alone two shifts capacity. The contractor continued in an easterly direction during the month of May until having drilled preparatory to shooting an area not far from the stockpile, the contractor was ordered by Billings not to load the holes. When asked why, he stated the rock would not be acceptable. The contractor had to shut his crushing operation down at that point.

In the latter part of May, and in the next phase, Mr. Muir agreed that the quarry conditions were poor and specifically asked if there was another quarry in the vicinity.

In other words, here is a department official at this stage acknowledging that conditions were poor and asking if there was another in the vicinity.

It was stated at the commencement of the meeting that the quarry problems were not those of the contractor, but those of the department, and it was suggested that one or two engineers from Toronto should attend the site.

Mr. Chairman, if this goes on wearisomely, I just ask the hon. members to put themselves in the position of the contractor who had to deal with conditions like these in these repeated pleas to the department, and repeated visits from departmental officials.

On page 11 there is another portion of this claim that I would like to read into the record:

In the latter part of June the contractor was contacted by the bonding company advising him that they had been asked to meet with the department. There was no request to the contractor to be present, and as a result there was a meeting at the department on July 5 between the contractor and his office manager, and Messrs. Muir, Panter and Jenkins from the department. Mr. Muir again suggested the contractor put in a claim. The matter of drilling and shattering boulders was discussed and it was agreed that this was a

foolish and expensive procedure on the part of the department and this practice was discontinued.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that just a moment ago I read from this claim to the effect that some weeks, indeed, a couple of months or so before, the contractor had been ordered to drill and blast these boulders or else the department would shut down the operation. Now they realize it is foolish.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I could point out to the hon. member that this is only one side of the story.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, fine, this is a rather impressive side of the story and if there is another one, perhaps we shall have an opportunity to hear it.

A further factor which materially and adversely affected the contractor was that the second lift deepened the initial cut to the extent that it took on the appearance of a narrow and deep canal. There was no normal access to the face of the work. Machines and trucks had to move in and out, one at a time, over the work which provided a very uneven floor, thereby further slowing down production. One truck would proceed to the area where it would be loaded; it would then have to back out over the length of the cut created by the second lift. Only then could a second truck approach the loading area, as there was no room to pass or turn. In addition, machines had to be moved in and out of the location as shooting occurred. This is not part of a normal quarry operation and resulted, in this location, in further shutting down of work.

This condition was so bad that the road which was used by the contractor to haul material to its crushing plant was denied the contractor. On the orders of the department an alternative route closer to the lake had to be made into a road and the department accepted the cost of this alternative road.

In a normal quarry operation, it is submitted, as one truck is loaded and pulls away, the next truck is in a position to be loaded by the time the shovel has taken its next swing, with no loss of time or loading. This presupposes sufficient hauling equipment and the contractor had ample trucks and other equipment on the job. The loss of production was plainly, it is submitted, not because of or controlled by any lack of equipment. The crushing plant could not be located near the face

where the work was being done because of three factors, namely, a lack of room, a lack of rock, and danger from blasting. In the result, the cumulative effect of the above-described conditions meant that there were two-thirds of lost time for one-third of productive time.

Drawing to a close in this part of my remarks, for the benefit of the hon. Minister from St. Andrew (Mr. Crossman), I now come to page 14 in which I quote:

A meeting on the claim was held on August 29, 1961. The contractor attended this meeting, accompanied by Mr. Fikis and the Canadian Industries Limited representative, Mr. Patrick. Representing The Department of Highways were Messrs. Mitchell, Panter, Flintoff, Jones, Gillespie, Billings and Tackaberry. Mr. Panter had this to say—

This, to my mind, is astounding; this is a departmental official—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, why does not the hon. member say, "This is what Mr. Panter is alleged to have said"?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, all I know is that this document has been—just a minute, we will get to what it is in the document.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, all right.

Mr. MacDonald: From the reputation that he has achieved up until now, I would think that if Peter White prepares a statement of claim he is going to document it. The original presented to the government is replete with affidavits and references—as I will come to in a moment—to the fact that there were tape recordings of certain portions of these discussions, and presumably they are available in the department and so on.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What is that, a statement of claim again?

An hon. member: That is it, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: To continue:

Mr. Panter had this to say: (a) The quarry was too small; (b) the "quarry" resembled a rock cut on the highway; (c) there was no room to work in the cut; (d) there was not sufficient room for a truck to turn; (e) he produced pictures that he had taken of the "quarry area"; and (f) he produced pictures of McNamara quarry to show a proper quarry.

Mr. Mitchell picked up the picture of the "quarry", and showing it to the contractor, said, "It looks as though you have

lots of room to work there." Before a reply could be made, Mr. Panter said, "No, there definitely was not room to work." Mr. Mitchell turned to the highways personnel. "This is a question for engineers, what have you to say?" Mr. Billings' answer was, "It was not a quarry." Mr. Tackaberry was not asked a question during this meeting and neither did he volunteer any information. There was a tape recording of this; this would be available to the department, so it clearly must be indicated whether this was a misrepresentation.

Following the meeting with the claims committee a letter from Mr. Mitchell dated September 21, 1961, advised that the committee had awarded \$16,156.73 in settlement of the claim submitted. This was not accepted.

There is one final point that had naught to do with the actual operations of the quarry, Mr. Chairman, but rather with procedures that the department uses of its relationship with the contractor. I want to read this, because it raises some very interesting questions as to whether or not, once again, this is normal. Apparently this obtained from the very outset of the operation.

Had the contractor been permitted without interference by the department to develop the area in its own way and without limitations, the attitude of Mr. Flintoff and the department and the claims committee would be understood. If those mistakes were made by the contractor without interference or alterations in methods in areas worked, in quantity and type of materials and equipment force used had been effected by the contractor, this would be one thing. What actually occurred, however, was quite a different thing—a thing far different from what had been contemplated by the contractor or the contract—such changes, alterations in methods, extensions and increases, rendering useless as they did work already done and materials already furnished by the contractor, were the sole responsibility of the department's engineers who assumed and maintained control and direction of every move of the contractor throughout the entire period of work.

In general, the contractor's position with respect to running his own operation was that he had no control at any time throughout the length of the contract as to the disposition of his drilling or other equipment in order to get maximum efficiency, under the conditions that were imposed

upon him by The Department of Highways and the engineers' direction. The Department of Highways, through the actions of its staff and its agents, ignored the right of the contractor to plan his own work and use his own methods for the production of the aggregate in location and with access and methods of his own selection. The Department of Highways in its controlling and directing, and placing of the equipment, and its direction of the method of operation throughout the length of the contract, effectively completed usurpation of the contractor's right to decide where, when and how the various phases of the work were to be done within the scope of the specifications.

These were not minor incidents but the exercise of complete control in all major respects. The methods used in order to obtain the product required under this work should have been entirely the responsibility of the contractor. The disposition of equipment and the method to obtain the required aggregate should not have come under the direction of the engineers, but by their direction to the contractor they controlled the method of operation and, although outside the authority or what was contemplated, the threat of closing down of the work and exercising the penal provisions were both used.

The contractor in effect, in this contract, was nothing but the servant of The Department of Highways, doing its bidding from time to time in detail and without regard to whether it was normal, reasonable or indicated by the circumstance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that covers most of the relevant portions from the claim that I think are necessary to underline the three points that I want to make to the hon. Minister in trying to sum this up.

To sum it up, Mr. Chairman, the department specified the DHO quarry in tenders; in fact there was no quarry. The department specified this quarry in the belief that the area had been engineered; in fact only one hole had been drilled, blasted and the rock tested in the Downsview lab.

In relation to the overburden, one departmental official claims soil tests had been taken, another contended that no test had been taken. It was the department which instructed the contractor where to quarry his rock; and then when not enough was available, it was the same department which ordered the contractor to move operations to precisely the site where the overburden had

been piled. The department ordered the contractor to drill and shatter all boulders or have his operations shut down. The same department months later reversed its order in view of the cost involved.

The department ordered extra crushing equipment installed, yet the conditions under which the operation was carried on never permitted its full use.

And so on, and on and on the story goes.

Let us face it, Mr. Chairman, obviously as one reads this—and I would like to hear any other side of the story, if there is one—the department “boobed” on this contract and the question is: how indicative of general departmental practices was the experience in this one case on which we happen to have the full details?

With that in mind I would like to put these questions to the hon. Minister. What explanation can the Minister give for tenders designating a quarry where pre-engineering was restricted to a single boring? What assurances can the hon. Minister give the House that this case on which we happen to have full details is not indicative of the quality of pre-engineering generally practiced by the department?

Second, what explanation can the hon. Minister give for repeated instructions by his departmental officials in the fulfillment of this contract—instructions which had to be varied or reversed repeatedly throughout the time of the contract?

Third, is it the normal practice of the department not merely to supervise contracts, which would be understandable, but virtually to take over the managerial responsibilities so that the company involved was not in any real sense an independent contractor, but rather an employee or servant of the department working under day-to-day directions?

Finally, in view of the basic responsibility of the department for the near comedy of errors in mismanagement, on what grounds does the department refuse to compensate Mr. Anton Omichinski for losses that have been, or can be, audited from the company's books?

I might add that I am aware of a comparable situation—if this gives the hon. Minister any comfort—involving a contractor on a project for the federal government, building a road through rocky areas into a radar station, in which the pre-engineering had been mismanaged in much the same way. The federal government submitted the whole matter to a special tribunal which verified the losses involved and the responsibility for them, and compensated the contractor at

what, interestingly enough, was almost precisely the figure he had submitted. In view of The Ontario Department of Highways' major responsibility in this instance, why is the same procedure not adopted on clearly auditable expenses and expenditures in the books?

These are just a few of the many questions I would like to put to the Minister in trying to get a clear picture of how this department operates and, therefore, to what extent we are getting full value for the money we are spending.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed to discuss the detail of the votes, I must make certain comments on the observations of the hon. member for Niagara Falls. With reference to the matter of tolls on bridges, I recall, as he does, that we discussed this at some considerable length a year ago. I propose to give him some information on that at the moment.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, pointing out a year ago that these so-called high rates on trucks did not seem to inhibit the traffic over the Burlington bridge to any considerable extent, in that the percentage of usage of the bridge by all classes of vehicles had showed a substantial increase over the preceding year. I think, when I give some information here, I will be able to indicate to you that that increase by classes 1, 2 and 3, which involve automobiles and the various sizes and descriptions of trucks, continues to show a very substantial increase.

I also was able to point out, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member a year ago, that there is an alternative free route which is available to trucks which do not choose to pay the toll to use the bridge facility. I will have some facts and figures here in a moment to substantiate these.

It is interesting, I think, when we hear these figures once again, to point out that in 1962, which was the year under review when we discussed it in the House a year ago, the amount of class 1 vehicles using this facility was 7,183,682; whereas, for the comparable period for the year now concluding, the usage figure is 8,008,028, a rather substantial increase on the order of 11.48 per cent.

Class 2 — these are passenger cars with trailers, and trucks with two axles and capacity of one ton or more—for the year hence, the figure that is revealed to us is 191,508; and for the year presently being reviewed it is 223,013, an increase of 16.45 per cent.

Class 3—trucks with three axles or more and public vehicles—the comparable figures

here are 7,505,848 versus, this year, 8,385,568, for a percentage increase of 18.27.

The point I am attempting to make, Mr. Chairman, is simply that our tolls do not seem to be inhibiting the use of this facility to any appreciable extent. Not only do the figures related to the volume of vehicles alone show these substantial increases, but the toll revenues earned in each of the classes show a similarly sharp increase. Whether this is the answer the hon. member is pursuing or not, I do not know, but I repeat the use of this facility does not seem to be seriously inhibited by tolls at the moment.

The figures, I hope you will agree, are rather substantial. Eight million vehicles in class 1, 223,000 in class 2, 154,000 in class 3 — a total of 8,385,568 versus a total of 7,505,848 vehicles a year ago does not look as though traffic is falling off too seriously.

Mr. Bukator: Well, I never questioned whether the traffic would increase or not. That was not the point I was trying to make, Mr. Chairman.

The point I wanted to make was that I think the trucks are paying sufficiently large amounts of money for their licence, and now there is the added burden of gas tax and the second bridge. I felt tolls should be lifted from that because they are paying through other channels. I am interested to notice that the figures have increased and that there are more people using the bridges because this will help pay the deficit you have on your toll concessions anyhow. I believe you have deficits there even though you are taking in more money. My concern was that the truckers have been paying sufficiently large enough sums now without the added burden of a second bridge, too. That is the point I tried to make.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Associated with that side of his question, I would say, Mr. Chairman, is the rather interesting fact that the revenue accruing from these tolls, I think it can be safely said, is not altogether paying for the operation and the carrying charges and the capital debt associated with the bridges. But to get back to the matter of revenue accruing from gasoline tax, it can still be stated that there is what might be called a short fall of revenue versus expenditure. In other words we are still spending more on roads and bridges and all transportation facilities than accrues to the government in revenue from the use of these facilities, so that I think until we reach that happy situation where the revenue side exceeds the expenditure side, it is a little difficult to ask

the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) to let us reduce some of these forms of revenue.

I might discuss briefly the observation he makes respecting roads in those areas of the north adjoining Quebec. I do not think he is quite accurate there. We have recently called another contract which will extend the road easterly from Cochrane during this upcoming construction season for a distance of some 12 miles. It will connect with the Abitibi timber limit roads and provide satisfactory road service connection through that area to the Quebec border. We have the other highway, of course, which goes easterly from Matheson, I believe, and connects with the Quebec border and Highway 66 from Kirkland Lake.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): There are five.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are five actual highways leading easterly in that area connecting with the Quebec border.

Mr. Bukator: From that point south.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no. East. Cochrane, for instance.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. Minister says there are five connections from the boundary but the five roads are from 101 south. I would like an explanation. That is why I asked the question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Some of them are north from 101. The hon. member pointed to the desirability of opening up the north, with which I completely concur. I think if I could have a print of that map here now, this would be interesting to all hon. members.

This glossy print of a road map shows the roads in northern Ontario in 1944. The mileage shown of King's highways in 1944, 20 years ago, was 1,896; the mileage of secondary roads was 1,540, for a total of 3,436 miles. Today as we look at this map, the mileage of King's highways in the same area has increased to 2,360 miles; secondary highway mileage has increased to 2,861 miles. We have highways committed and under construction of 530 miles, so we see that in this period the total mileage has increased from 3,436 miles to 5,750 miles.

Mr. Singer: How much has the motor vehicle registration increased in that period?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think probably if you will refer to my general remarks as commented upon by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) you will find that if we built roads and allocated

funds on the basis of revenue earned they would not have nearly the mileage they do.

Mr. Singer: No, but if you are comparing 1944 to 1964—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Of course. Of course, you are right.

Mr. Bryden: In other words, the hon. Minister has not proved anything.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have proved that there is a substantial increase in the road mileage in the north—very graphically we have proved it.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Remember that you rebuilt every foot of the roads you had 20 years ago.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is correct. I might observe to the hon. member where he makes mention of wages on contracts, that we implemented into our general conditions and contracts a year ago, a minimum wage of \$1.30 per hour. This was threshed out rather extensively last year in the House. This is unskilled labour but it is at least the basis for a minimum wage, which was referred to a year ago. It probably did not please everybody then and it will not now but it is the answer to the question that the hon. member raised. All our contracts have this condition written in them.

Mr. Bukator: If I might interject, and the hon. Minister is very good-natured, I only wanted to make that point because the hon. Minister of Labour took in such a small portion from Oshawa to Hamilton. The hon. Minister of Highways has done it overall and I think general legislation should be across the board, \$1.25 for construction workers. I felt at this point I could get it in because there is no more Budget debate nor Throne Speech debate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I should like to comment generally on suburban road commissions. I might say that I share the hon. member's opinion to some extent but I think I would go back and agree with him, with the remarks he made at the outset, that is that suburban road commissions were set up to relieve the burden of expense on counties for maintenance of what might appropriately be called market roads, sir. These market roads were carrying an extensive volume of traffic which did not originate in the jurisdiction from which they had to raise revenues.

So, simply then, it was felt sensible, and I think it has employed a very useful service,

in that it enabled these counties to obtain revenue from jurisdictions which were being serviced in that manner. The formula, of course, is that a one-half mill maximum can be levied by a suburban road commission; 50 per cent of these costs is paid by the department, and the remaining half is split in two. In other words, an eighth of a mill accrues to the one jurisdiction, an eighth to the other and the remaining portion is paid by The Department of Highways.

I am prepared to agree with the hon. member that this form of subsidization is becoming somewhat obsolete. It is under careful scrutiny and study at the moment. It has been proposed by some that we might effect a degree of parity, if you will, if we made it applicable to the equalized assessment. This also proposes many problems. I think this was suggested by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) a year ago. We have been pursuing our investigations ever since, but we find that those jurisdictions, where there are suburban road commissions, are almost split down the middle. Quite a broad number of them are assessing substantially in excess of the equalized assessment, and a similar number are assessing at something equally as much less than the equalized assessment.

So you can readily see that if we make this applicable to the equalized assessment, some municipalities would benefit rather extensively and others would lose out.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but your colleagues produce an equalization table every year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is what we are using.

Mr. Singer: He says it works.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister not think, for the sake of fairness to all municipalities, that it should be on an equalized assessment basis? I mean, in spite of the fact one municipality may be assessed more than the other; but for the sake of fairness alone, it should be on an equalized assessment. It is not fair to ask one municipality to pay, one year, twice what it did the previous years, solely because in their wisdom they decided to reassess their properties.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was leading up to the point, Mr. Chairman, of saying to the hon. member that these are some of the things which are being thoroughly investigated, because we realize this thing is out of joint. We realize it needs updating. I am just suggesting to you some of the problems that have to be considered in the process.

Mr. Chairman: Order! It is now six of the clock. I will now leave the chair, and we will resume at eight of the clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, March 16, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Monday, March 16, 1964

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1655
Credit Unions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	1679
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Cass, agreed to .	1679

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

On vote 801:

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned for dinner I was discussing a few of the points raised by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator), and I think I have got down to almost the last of them.

With respect to the reference of the hon. member to the section of Highway 401 between Temple and Tilbury, I would repeat what was said this afternoon: That is, that the north lanes are completely paved; the south lanes are graded, and some of the granular material is on the grades ready for paving.

I would say to the hon. member, and to the House, that all contracts for the completion of the south lanes of that section of Highway 401 will be awarded within a matter of a few weeks. If we get a few breaks with the weather, and the other associated breaks needed, it is quite possible that the section can be completed in 1964. If we run into some adverse weather, which characterized our operations a couple of years ago, a situation that is well known to the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence), then certain delays may well be involved. All contracts will have been awarded for the completion of those south lanes in the course of the next few weeks.

I believe that essentially deals with most of the points raised by the hon. member for Niagara Falls and we now come to the observations of the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald).

I would comment on some of his observations as follows: The hon. member made reference to the substitution of materials, specifically stating that, with the approval of the department, some substandard material was used in the construction of a certain bridge, pointing out that approval was given because it was stated by the Minister

and officials of the department that the use of the subgrade material would cost an estimated \$10,000 whereas the use of better quality, granular material would have cost in the order of \$60,000 to \$70,000. I say this was done with the full approval of the officials of the department for good and sufficient reasons. Savings associated with this do not accrue to the benefit of anybody other than the Treasurer of the province. The suggestion that substitution of materials on contracts provides a method of some form of reward to a contractor is, of course, completely incorrect.

Substitution of materials on contracts of any description can only be done with the approval of the department, and the contractor gets paid only for what he puts into the contract. In this instance he would get paid an appropriate unit price for the substitute material, no more and no less, so I fail to see how the point raised by the hon. member has any validity or sense in fact whatsoever. No benefit can accrue to the contractor; the only benefit that accrued was the saving to the department in line with the comments which have already been made, and which I have attempted to amplify here tonight.

As a matter of fact, on the matter of patronage, which appears to be a pre-occupation or obsession with the hon. member, I can state without any equivocation whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, that no contractor today will fail to be awarded a contract for any reason unless he has failed, himself, to be the low bidder. There is no other basis of awarding a contract to a contractor properly qualified, and I have already pointed out we are extending our basis of pre-qualification to include almost all types of contracts. I simply say to the hon. member that there is no method, patronage or otherwise, which can result in a contractor failing to get a contract, if he is the low bidder and meets the requirements the department impose.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): May I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, you may.

Mr. MacDonald: The cat-and-mouse game goes on—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is not a cat-and-mouse game—

Mr. MacDonald: Let me come back further. How would the hon. Minister get into a situation in which inferior material would be used? For example, if specifications are stated and tenders called for—presumably it would be done on the basis of a knowledge of the materials available in the area. Are inferior materials used only when it is suddenly discovered, for some reason or other, that the material thought to be available in the area is not now available?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I would not say that. In this particular circumstance, I am sure there was some higher grade material specified, but in the cut that was required to perform the contract, material was excavated in sufficient quantity and, if of marginal quality sufficiently good in the opinion of the department, to warrant the use of it, notwithstanding that there might be some subsequent maintenance costs. But the estimates of the department associated with extra maintenance costs which might have followed and which probably did follow, were substantially less than the use of the specified material. So an election was made at the time, an agreement was made with the contractor, and the contractor performed his obligations with the strict approval of the department, otherwise he could not have done it.

We felt it was a good, economical move, and I might say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to all hon. members of the House, that up to this point it has been substantially proved that it was a measure of good economy. There has been some added maintenance, but about \$10,000 versus \$70,000. We think this was good economy. We think this is in the interests of the public and the taxpayers of the province, whether the hon. member does or not.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could answer a question. Who did the cutting and the excavating that determined this sub-standard material could be used? Did the contractor who had the original low tender or did the—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no, the contractor who had the contract, in the course of the excavation work required for the subsequent building of the grades and

approaches and so on that were involved, turned up this material.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if it occurred to the hon. Minister or to his officials, that having turned up the material and having sort of changed the whole basis, that perhaps the whole thing could have been retendered? Was the hon. Minister at that point not giving a preference to the low tenderer or to the man who had the original contract awarded to him?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, that could not enter into it because these are situations that you cannot have any knowledge of until the work is proceeded with. The situation developed in the course of the work. No material advantage could have accrued to anybody else there; I am sure the department had what it felt was an advantageous contract based on the low bid at the time, but this alternative came up and these negotiations can go on during the course of the contract under many different circumstances. It is simply as I have stated it; there is nothing sinister about what was done, I must assure the House on that because it is quite true.

Mr. Singer: I am not suggesting for a minute, Mr. Chairman, there is anything sinister about it—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I know that the hon. member is not, but—

Mr. Singer: I am just suggesting that once it has been discovered that different grade material could have been used, the whole basis of the contract is changed, and other tenderers, for example, A, B and C might have been able to produce, with the material on the scene, a far different tender than they were able to produce when they first tendered.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suppose there is a possibility if there had been any knowledge that that type of material was there before we got on with the excavation, but—

Mr. Singer: Yes, that is the very point I make.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Singer: At that point you did prefer the low tenderer.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no, no! We just made the adjustment with the contractor who had the tender.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but you preferred it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes.

Mr. Singer: It gave him an advantage over the others.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No. How could it? Well, let us just say it did not, and leave it at that, because it did not.

To get on with the principal subject matter of the remarks from the hon. member for York South. During the time that has elapsed since the committee rose and upon returning to the House, I have put on paper in general my reply to what the hon. member has said. It will not be in detail because the complete file is at Downsview, but in general this would be my interpretation of the situation. If more detail is required, we can consider the matter of providing for that later. It was impossible to get it tonight.

I would simply say, in reply, that the audit which was conducted revealed that the contractor, Omichinski, referred to by the hon. member, had lost considerable money.

I might, at this point, clarify one point too, and say that this quarry was on Crown land in the area; it was not DHO property.

The claims committee, which by the way I should explain is an independent body—they are not civil servants; they are not associated with the department—

Mr. MacDonald: Who was on that committee?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think the chairman is a man named Mitchell. There is another man named McQuaig, and the third one is Barnett.

Mr. MacDonald: Is it true that the committee is going to be abolished?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would the hon. member like to come to that again, if he wishes? We can discuss that another time.

I have simply stated, then, that the claims committee is an independent body. As a matter of fact, I would also like to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. members of the House, that I would not know one of them if I saw them. I have never met them. I have never discussed anything with them. I have passed them on the street or in the corridors, that is quite possible, but I would not know them if I met them face to face.

So then the claims committee, after reviewing the facts and assessing the merits of the claim, recommended an award for costs which were beyond the contractor's control. The amount—which has already been referred to—was \$16,000 or thereabouts; I am

using round figures. The difference between the amount of the claim and the award proposed by the committee was felt to be associated with items which were entirely the responsibility of the contractor, and which manifested themselves because of inefficiencies in his operation. There was no shortage of rock. He simply did not have sufficient equipment to do the job and to keep on schedule.

At this point, I might explain our interpretation of what a quarry means. The hon. member asked, "What is a quarry?" A quarry is simply a deposit of material, of rock of one description or another, which can be made suitable for road-building purposes. It is plainly and simply that. There are several variations of it, but that is a quarry.

The direction of the department, which you refer to as management or intrusion, was related entirely to efforts to help the contractor keep sufficient material available for the paving contract for which it was urgently required. It was required for base material on the Atikokan-Fort Frances road. He greatly underbid the contract, as evidenced by other bids, and the next lowest bid was substantially higher than the unit price employed by Omichinski. It was substantially higher in total; and the unit prices employed by the second lowest bidder for the quarrying of this type of material was substantially higher, as were bids from contractors located in, and with experience in, the area from which the material was to be obtained.

Sufficient engineering and boring was undertaken to disclose the nature of the material. In fact it was disclosed to other bidders who tendered accordingly. I repeat, that one or more of the bidders were locally based firms who had a complete knowledge of the material in the quarry. They bid substantially higher, knowing of course, what they were going to encounter and they tendered accordingly. I have just been corrected. The material was used for Highway 17, not Highway 11.

Mr. MacDonald: I wondered how you got the material from Hearst to Atikokan.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly, you are right. My geography left me for a moment.

After the claims committee had suggested that award, and at the request of Mr. Omichinski and his solicitor, I met them both and gave direction to the solicitor representing The Department of Highways to review the file with a fine-tooth comb, and I say with a fine-tooth comb, to determine whether beyond the engineering facts related to the

claim, any legal validity could be attached to the items under review. This was done in an exhaustive manner, and again upon direction of the Minister, the benefit of every reasonable doubt was to be resolved in favour of the contractor—every reasonable doubt where anything could be associated to the advantage of this contractor in view of the unfortunate circumstances, and they were unfortunate. A higher award was then proposed than the one approved by the claims committee. It was something in excess of double the amount proposed by the claims committee, after this exhaustive survey by the solicitor for the department. This was refused by the contractor.

I would simply conclude this general statement in which I have explained—I do not have time to go into the complete detail of it as the material was not available to me, this was largely from memory—by saying, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member that it is my opinion based on advice from senior staff, based on the claims committee's original award, based on the advice and findings of the solicitor referred to on the terms of reference that I have stated to you and to the House, that every valid compensable item in the entire claim has accordingly been provided for.

This, Mr. Chairman, is all the statement I am capable of making tonight, but again, if you wish further documentation of the items that are in here, I can only ask you to be patient and we will try to produce them.

This allows me to lead up to something else. I am of the opinion that the hon. member completely contradicts himself, when you contrast this statement with some of his earlier remarks associated with a *Maclean's* article of a number of years ago on the matter of providing funds, out of approval for claims or approval of over-runs, or approval of this sort of thing. I have already explained that this is absolutely impossible. On the other hand, I would like him to contrast the observations he made in that sense of getting party funds from contractors, percentages off the top of contracts. Contrast that, if you will, with the attempt of the department to be fair with the contractor who has encountered a series of unfortunate circumstances associated with the claim.

I would like the hon. member to tell me this. Does he think that it is the responsibility of the Minister of this department, or the officials of this department, to use the public's money, the taxpayers' money, for payment of claims that cannot be substantiated? How, in the same breath, do you

suggest that this is the way in which party funds are obtained?

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute, now—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is what you say. Leaving that aside, I would simply say to the hon. member—and we will deal with this matter of the claims committee now, it is as good a time as any—that I hope you will recall that just about a year ago now, we introduced and eventually proclaimed an Act known as *The Proceedings against the Crown Act*. I thought, and I am sure the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Cass) thought, and I am sure all hon. members thought that this was a just piece of legislation.

Mr. MacDonald: They established it 15 years ago in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that at the moment this is beside the point. We got it done and we got it done about a year ago.

Prior to that, Mr. Chairman, prior to the introduction of that legislation, the procedure related to claims was that they were first examined by the claims branch of The Department of Highways. If they were satisfactorily resolved there, as far as the departmental people and the contractor were concerned, that was an end of it. If the parties could not reach a satisfactory solution, the claims committee at that time was one more avenue of appeal. But with the introduction of this new legislation, I think it will be obvious to the hon. member and others that the general conditions of our contracts had to be changed somewhat against the possibility of claims finally going to the court where they have every right to go under this new legislation.

Our general conditions of contract, or procedures associated with general conditions, then were changed. The contract documents were rewritten. As a consequence, the function of the claims committee, as it is presently constituted, began to disappear somewhat. Its terms of reference are such that their decisions would not be as valid in court as they should be. The claims committee will continue to exist, to adjudicate claims arising from contracts entered into before the proclamation of *The Proceedings against the Crown Act*; and it will be some time before those contracts are completely off the books. Meanwhile, it is the intention of the department to change not only the contracts procedures but the job inspection procedures; in short, we hope to align all our procedures against this new legislation.

I would like to make to the House the statement I have made on a number of occasions to interested people—the Ontario Roadbuilders Association — that we are flexible. If, on a reasonable trial basis, there seems to be some deficiency, I am quite prepared to say to the House tonight that I, as Minister, if that still prevails, am quite prepared, along with the officials of the department and representatives of the industry, to review the position. At that time, if there is a need for any intermediate basis for settling claims, I am quite confident that something can be established which will satisfactorily take care of the situation. But I think we would like some experience before we make that move; consequently, it is the present intention of the department to move in the manner in which I have suggested with respect to claims.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this perhaps I would be permitted to make a few comments in the light of what the hon. Minister has said.

First, let me deal with his comments on my observations on patronage, as he so delightfully refers to it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is what you called it.

Mr. MacDonald: Election kickbacks.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is what you called it.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not use the word "patronage". I said "election slush funds".

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have an obsession on this point.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister says I have an obsession on this point.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Of course, you have.

Mr. MacDonald: But I will tell the hon. Minister of somebody who has an infinitely greater obsession on this, and that is the Tory Party, for a year prior to an election. My obsession is an academic one to find out the facts; your obsession is picking up the \$2 million-\$3 million with which you fought the election—

An hon. member: And then keeping it quiet.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, and then keeping it quiet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I repeat what I said earlier, Mr. Chairman. I hope, Mr. Chairman, you are not going to join that chorus. I said that I knew a contractor who got a contract, who was then approached and told that a two per cent kickback was expected. He was told to which official in the provincial party organization the money should be directed.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When?

Mr. MacDonald: When? Within the last year or two. All you need do, if you have nothing to hide, is do not continue to hide it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are not hiding anything.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, then, permit an audit of your election books and then we will know it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is in relation to highway contracts and if the business is not relevant I do not know where it would be relevant. I have made the statement that the Conservative Party does not get its election funds from nowhere; you do not get money off trees.

An hon. member: Where do you get yours?

Mr. MacDonald: I have told you where we get ours. Our books are open for audit, and you can look at them any time you want—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. MacDonald: And the—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This is getting out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I shall leave it there because this is part of the cat-and-mouse game. But until you are willing to permit an audit of your books so we will know where you get your funds, we are entitled to make such statements.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Chairman, before you proceed to rule out of order

something which I submit is relevant to highway contracts, let me go on to the next point.

With regard to Anton Omichinski Limited—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I cannot hear myself speak.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

An hon. member: You should be grateful, old boy.

Mr. MacDonald: I would say, Mr. Chairman, it takes two to make an argument back here so let us not try to blame it on my hon. colleague.

Let me say this, I have made my case on the basis of Peter White's statement, and I am not in a position, obviously, to vouch for the authenticity of everything that is in this statement of claim that he made. I recognize that, as a solicitor, he is going to put the best front on his client's case. On the other hand, while I do not happen to know Peter White, my information is that he is a capable and reputable lawyer. I do not think, no matter what case you are presenting as a lawyer or otherwise, that you put up a weak case that can be battled down. Certainly throughout the copy of the statement that I have there are affidavit references, and references to tape recordings that are available in the department to authenticate what he is saying.

An hon. member: Are you trying to win his case for him then?

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps if he gets it into a court he may win it. The thing that strikes me about the hon. Minister's explanation on this is that only \$16,000 was awarded for things where the responsibility was beyond the control of the contractor himself. I would like to cite briefly by way of review, five or six points:

The site for the quarry was chosen by the department. Not only that, but where he started to do the original quarrying, according to Peter White's statement, was also indicated by the department. Not only that, but when you get into the second point, the amount of overburden, you find one official of the department said no soil tests were taken and another official of the department said soil tests were taken—to discover how much overburden there was.

Be that as it may, they took the overburden from the site where they started to

quarry the rock and they put it over here, and when they found that there was not enough rock in the place where they started, the next place that he was instructed to work was precisely where all the overburden had been put. So he not only had the natural overburden, so to speak, that was there to begin with, but all of the other overburden that was piled there and that had to be moved out. This is in White's documented case that he has presented to the department.

The third point is that the evidence apparently is documented that the department started out by saying he had to drill and blast all of the boulders which, according to contractors in the field, sir, is not done because it is very expensive. The department itself, some two to three months later, told him to stop trying to blast all of these boulders because it was too expensive a process.

There was a switch in roads. This was a bizarre business involving the running of an operation in which you could not have trucks in rapid succession to keep your assembly line working, so to speak. The truck had to go in and back out, or back in and come out, and everybody else had to wait until they had got over this one single narrow road.

The hon. Minister makes the suggestion that complete borings were taken—he rather skipped over that. In the statement that has been presented to the department it says categorically, with authentication, that only one boring was taken—one five-foot boring and blasting—and the samples were sent down to the Downsview lab. Is the hon. Minister saying that is inaccurate?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying any such thing. I am saying that sufficient boring was done and information was disclosed to permit others to bid. They all bid on the same information. It was quite satisfactory to the other bidders and they were sensible enough, I say, with respect to Mr. Omichinski, to bid what anybody can substantiate that the job should have been bid for. The problem with this man is that he simply underbid the contract. You make reference to us assigning roads. It has nothing to do with the department. The contractor lays out his own roads, works his own pit any way he likes.

Mr. MacDonald: Not according to this.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is the point, not according to that. With the greatest respect to his solicitor—I agree with you, I think he is a very capable man—but he can

only use the facts that are disclosed to him. I suggest to you that the department has another set of facts. I dealt with them generally.

You speak of affidavits. We have affidavits, too, attesting to the accuracy of what I have said in a general way. Really, all you have done is put forward one side of the case. That is all you have done. You know that.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me say this: the evidence is conclusive, and nobody has denied that one boring was taken in a four- to five-acre area; one boring and blasting, with the rock sent down to the Downsview laboratory.

I am not an engineer, but if I were going to come to any conclusion as to the quality of rock in the quarry, covering a good many acres, would I take one single boring?

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): But if you were not satisfied, you would not bid.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right!

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You would go and bore it yourself.

Mr. MacDonald: Another hon. Minister intervenes now!

A man bids on a tender which specifies a DHO quarry from which the rock is to be secured, then he finds not only all these bizarre rock formations, which make it difficult, and which the department had not surveyed adequately—furthermore he discovers the more they went the more they were getting into quartz, and so they had to keep moving their sites. What a situation! Is the hon. Minister saying that all of the others who bid were aware of the quality of rock, its inferiority, of the geographical disposition of rock and everything else, and that this is why they made a higher bid? And that Omichinski was not aware of all this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that either he was unaware of it or ignored it. The same information was available to all bidders. These borings the department makes, whether they are one or ten, are mainly to determine the suitability of the material that is to be used. How the contractor gets it out is his own problem.

Mr. MacDonald: But it was not suitable?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, but it was suitable.

Mr. MacDonald: No. There were great lots which were run through with quartz; so it was not suitable.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: One vein of quartz in this whole quarry. One vein.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it certainly was one of the areas from which they had to move it to another place in the quarry. Mr. Chairman, as the hon. Minister said, he could get more details, and I do not choose to assume to take over Peter White's job on this case.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To be frank about it, I wondered why you did.

Mr. MacDonald: All I can say is this: Is this the quality of the department's operation where in a tender you designate a quarry and then you leave the contractors to come in and do their own boring to decide on the quality of the rock in it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why not?

Mr. P. J. Yakubski (Renfrew South): How does Omichinski vote?

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell you how Omichinski voted. Up until now he has voted Tory, but I suspect he is not going to any more.

I was very interested in the fact that the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope)—who is a very ardent and very close watchdog, Mr. Chairman, of what is said and talked about in his constituency—came in here this afternoon, found I was talking about that, and we have not seen him since. I think he is still running to get away from the issue.

We will have to leave it there.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would simply hope that we are through with this. We are pursuing a fruitless course here. There is no sense in it at all.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I ask my hon. friend one question in relation to this matter?

My hon. friend has suggested that it was clear when this contractor bid that it was an uneconomic bid, and that it was almost, in the words of the hon. Minister, impossible for him to carry out the contract. Should there not have then been some consideration that that contract should not be accepted?

An hon. member: That would be against the—

Mr. Oliver: Why would it? What is the matter with you?

Mr. Singer: That is the whole purpose of pre-engineering.

Mr. Oliver: Why would it not be fair? It is not necessary to accept every contract.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the hon. member that this was not a prequalified contract? I said it once before. It may be one of the good reasons why we have extended our prequalification procedures. It was not a prequalified contract.

I would simply make this observation to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that we are pretty firmly in support of the policy of the low bid in The Department of Highways today. I rather wonder, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. leader of the Opposition or any other Opposition member might have said to the Minister of Highways if he had arbitrarily set aside a low tender for a higher one.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question before I get into the main point of the remarks I want to make.

What was the difference between the Omichinski bid and the next highest one? In round figures?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would have to confess that I do not have that exact information. That is some of the detailed information I have to get. It would be—I cannot tell you the total—but I think the difference in the unit price for removal of material was as much as 40 or 50 cents a yard.

Mr. Singer: In a total price of how much? Was it 100 per cent difference, or 50 per cent difference?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would put it on the order of, say, \$1.40 to \$1.90. I cannot vouch for the complete accuracy of that.

Mr. Singer: About a third in the overall.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, more like 25 per cent.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me say this.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 801?

Mr. Singer: No, on this same point.

Mr. Chairman: Statements have now been made by members of the different parties.

Mr. Singer: I agree that statements have been made, but surely we are in the middle of a point and please let me try to establish it, whether the hon. Minister agrees with me or not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, surely if this is not the place to have an argument or a discussion, if our only function here is to agree with the department, we might as well go home.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to make a very brief reference to my good friend, the hon. member for Humber (Mr. W. B. Lewis). He and I at one stage in our careers, headed suburban Metro municipalities, he in Etobicoke and I in North York. It was always my impression, I think it applied equally in Etobicoke as it did in North York, that when we went out to tender, and I would think it applies equally in the province, we advertised that neither the lowest nor any tender would necessarily be accepted.

When a tender came in, certainly in my experience—and I would call the hon. member for Humber as a witness—when a tender came in substantially lower than the other tenders, in this case one-third or perhaps even more, it would have sent up sort of a warning signal and we would have wondered why one tender, in a mass of tenders, could have been that much lower than the others.

My reaction would have been, and I would imagine the hon. member for Humber would have been exactly the same, we would have called our engineers in and said why can X be that much lower than all the rest? Does X know what he is doing?

Now it would occur to me this evening, as I have heard these facts revealed for the first time, and I knew nothing about this at all, that when the hon. Minister or his officials saw that one tender was so much lower than the others, that he would have called his advisers in and said, how can Omichinski be so much lower than all the others? Does Omichinski know what he is doing and is it reasonable to expect that he can do the job?

I would have hoped that is what the hon. Minister would have done, rather than, as I gather, and I perhaps gathered quite wrongly, the hon. Minister said: "Oh, oh! Omichinski has made a mistake and we are going to fix him and we will give him the contract even though he does not know what he is doing."

Now I would like to hear the hon. Minister's comments on that.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that your explanation now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No it is not. That is your interpretation of my explanation.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is your interpretation of my explanation.

Mr. Singer: I am asking you to explain—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am going to explain.

It was a bonded contract. The contractor came from the immediate area. Even if the bid did look too low, I assure you that the low bid from a contractor in an area that should be knowledgeable about the situation, if he is substantially low and he has got a suitable bond with his contract documents, he is going to get the contract. Because it conforms, as I have said several times now, to the policy of the low tender receiving the contract award. I have no intention of departing from that policy, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Was this his first contract with the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. MacDonald: How many years has he had contracts?

Hon. Mr. Cass: He was contracting in my time and that was years ago.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot tell you tonight. I do not know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister, in his preliminary remarks, made some reference to the fair wage policy, if one can call it that. He stated that a minimum wage of \$1.30 an hour is called for on all highways contracts.

I may have misunderstood him or he may have not been dealing with the whole of the fair wage policy. We have had in the past a good many fairly heated sessions here with regard to the fair wage policy. The point I thought we had managed to establish was that on construction contracts not merely a minimum wage but a schedule of wages would be set forth for all categories of labour on a particular contract. That the schedule would be drawn up by The Department of Labour on the basis of prevailing wages in the community and wages considered to be fair and reasonable. I had understood a session or two ago that this policy had been adopted and that highway construction contracts would have schedules of wages in them, not just a minimum wage.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not recall, and I think I am correct, ever having

stated anything other than we do write into all our contracts. That has nothing to do with these areas that minimum wages are applicable to; it covers the whole length and breadth of the province. We write in a minimum wage of \$1.30. I do recall, if I am correct, that I think we suggested that if the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) in due course decided to apply certain policies related to this, then of course in the department we would naturally follow suit. I think probably this is a matter that may be related to the studies that are under way in terms of broadening out this whole matter.

But we do not write in anything but this minimum wage and there are several reasons for that. More and more of the contractors being certified—if that is the word to use—are employing union labour. I would be inclined to say that those who bargain for the employees of a contractor will have considerable to say about the rates of wages that are associated with their agreement. There can be quite some variance in this, I imagine, depending on who is the bargaining agent, where the bargaining is being done, and the area of operation of the contractor. In any case, we have not seen fit to go beyond establishing a minimum wage of \$1.30 for these other reasons.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask how the minimum wage is enforced? What sort of procedure is there for ensuring that all employees engaged in these contracts get this minimum wage? I think it is an extremely low minimum wage and I would hope no contractor would want to pay less. In the event that he does pay less, is there any inspection procedure, any complaints procedure, or does an employee simply have to go to a small claims court to collect?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, there are certain built-in safeguards. Firstly, it is written into the contract specifications that this minimum wage must apply and we make routine audits from time to time. We do not audit them all but we make enough routine spot audits and we do it in such a fashion that we are pretty well convinced that they are complying with this contract obligation.

Mr. Bryden: You do your own enforcement then, if I may call it that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We employ our own audit force, that is right.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I at any rate—I do not know about others on this side—was somewhat led astray, shall

I say, in failing to distinguish between what the government was actually doing and what it was merely contemplating. It has apparently been contemplating fair wage schedules for a long time. I had thought prior to the last election that it had finally decided it was going to do it. I judge now that it has not. How long it is going to contemplate it, I do not know, but I would suggest to the hon. Minister that this government is at least 40 years behind the federal government.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that is a matter to take up with the hon. Minister of Labour on some appropriate occasion? I have discussed the situation as it applies to The Department of Highways. I do not think I need to get into the whole policy of minimum wages.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am getting into the question of the wages paid on Department of Highways contracts. I am not getting into the whole question of minimum wages, just the wages paid on Department of Highways contracts. I think this affects the department and I think the department should be interested in seeing that—

Mr. Chairman: Order! This comes under vote 803.

Mr. Bryden: Vote 803; that is fine, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): May I ask the hon. Minister a question? Do I understand, for example, that everybody working for The Department of Highways and on contracts in Bruce county, gets a minimum of \$1.30 an hour? Is that true?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I did not say that, Mr. Chairman. I said that we write into our contracts the specification that a contractor undertaking Department of Highways contracts must pay a minimum of \$1.30 an hour.

Mr. Whicher: The only thing I wanted to point out to the hon. Minister was that on looking over the work in Bruce county there are no contracts this year. Therefore I do not think this would be applicable to Bruce county. Did the hon. Minister want to say anything about that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Whicher: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister will agree it is something like the letter—there is no answer to it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will answer that under the appropriate vote, if the hon. member likes, when it comes up.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Are we on vote 803, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: No; vote 801.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, does the item under salaries then, in 801, cover the salaries of all the employees of the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it includes the main office staff.

Mr. Nixon: The main office? I wonder if the hon. Minister then, under this item, could tell me the total number of people employed by the department? That is not just in the main office, but paid by The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The total number?

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it fluctuates. I would say, in terms of round figures, it is close to 12,000.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask one or two questions about the selection of these employees, because there must be a considerable turnover. I would ask the hon. Minister if he would explain how the personnel branch in his department collaborates with the civil service commission in processing applications for employment with the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They all require to be processed by the civil service—all applications, if they are permanent staff. The only area where they are not processed, I would say to the hon. member, is for casual staff.

Mr. Whicher: And how many casual staff would there be out of the 12,000?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: About 3,500, and that fluctuates a little bit with the season of the year, I would say to the hon. member. There are usually more in the winter than there are in the summer.

Mr. Whicher: Also, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell us how the casual staff is picked?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They apply for their jobs by application, the same as all the

other job classifications, except that they are not processed by the civil service.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I might pursue this a bit, the promotions within the department: where these are of some considerable significance, are these let out publicly, or are they usually made from people already in the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To the greatest extent possible, and I can think of few variations, if any, from within the department.

Mr. Nixon: And these, then, would be made without reference to advice from the civil service commission?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, no. If they move from one job classification to another, which involves a promotion, they have to qualify. They have to write, in certain circumstances, examinations — interdepartmental examinations. The civil service commission takes a hand in this, too.

Mr. Nixon: Then the selection resulting from the qualifying examination would be made by co-operation with the hon. Minister's personnel people and the civil service commission? Reference was made to temporary help, casual help. Is there a classification which is temporary? I know of some instances where men have worked for many years with the department and have been classified with some adjective, the same as casual or temporary; when the time comes and they are beyond the age limit, considerable hardship has resulted, even though they have worked in this capacity.

I would like the hon. Minister to comment on this, particularly as to how something might be done to clear up the difficulty, even in a retroactive way, so that men who are now no longer employable by the department might come in for some sort of assistance.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would simply say to the hon. member that retirement age is generally regarded as 65. Extensions of service can be granted up to the age of 70. In The Department of Highways, in some circumstances, we grant extensions, continuing extensions up to the age of 70. In other circumstances we do not. Circumstances in each case, I think, are carefully examined. Certainly even beyond the age of 70, where it can be substantiated that the employee who is eligible for retirement cannot without difficulty be replaced, he is retained. But this is done in usually six-month or 12-month extensions so they can be reviewed from time to time in the light of all circumstances.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell the House how the department justifies keeping casual labour, so-called, working on a continuous basis for a number of years? What is the justification for retaining this classification?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like to answer that generally by saying that much of the work of the department is seasonal. We require, certainly, more maintenance forces in the winter months than we do in the summer. In those circumstances we take on extra staff, usually around the first of November, I believe, on the understanding that when the extra maintenance work load is over in the spring, they can go back to their former pursuits. I would say that in many circumstances this works very well, because seasonal employment is all these people want. I would hardly like to think the hon. member is suggesting that we would carry on our payroll employees who are needed for peak maintenance periods, throughout seasons when they are not required. I simply say to the hon. member that is why they do not always get a full 12 months of employment.

Mr. Nixon: Can the hon. Minister assure us then that all those who are working on a continuous basis are classified as permanent staff?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Nixon: Then there is an area there that still has not been explained.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is true. There is this area of casual employees and the bulk of them are on our maintenance staff. The establishment, if you like to call it that, of the department which relates to permanent employees, is increasing. Over a period of years I would be of the opinion that we will reduce our casual forces and increase the establishment of permanent or probationary employees. When I use the word "probationary" I am speaking about somebody who is going to be a permanent employee if he passes his probationary period. In other words, if he becomes what we call a probationary employee, he can, if he performs his duties satisfactorily, look forward to permanent status. So we put those two together, permanent and probationary, because they are essentially one and the same thing. We are of the opinion that this situation will then, in terms of establishment, over a period of time, relate itself to more and more permanent employees and less and less casual.

Mr. Nixon: Do the casual employees have any access to the pension fund, that is, do they make contributions to it while they are employed on a casual basis?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They do not during their employment as a casual. At the point when they are taken on as a permanent employee they then have the option of paying their pension retroactively and qualifying for pension benefits in that way.

Mr. Nixon: Is the hon. Minister familiar with any cases of some hardship relating to the matter that I have been referring to, where men have been retained on a full-time basis, as far as my information is concerned, by the department on a casual qualification or classification, and then have left the service of the department because of their age and have been left completely high and dry after being roadmen for a good many years? Is the hon. Minister familiar with the hardship this has worked?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would think there is certainly a familiarity with that, and I think I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member, that that is the reason we are now in the process of increasing our establishment, to try to increase the relationship of permanent employees versus casual employees. We are aware that this causes hardship and we are in the process of doing this very thing right now.

Mr. Whicher: How many casual employees were taken on and made permanent this past year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have changed the status from casual to permanent of 2,300 casuals in a period of not more than three years—2,300 from casual staff to permanent staff. This is continuing, going on all the time.

Mr. Whicher: As I understand it, 25 per cent of those working for The Department of Highways are still casual staff. I would like to ask this question. Is there anybody who can be listed under casual employment who has been working for The Department of Highways for the past three years?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, my question is, why? It seems to me that after three years a man should be either permanent or fired.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot agree with that comment of the hon. member. That is not the way the situation is at all and I think I have explained to the hon. member for Brant what is being done about it. I would hope that this casual staff diminishes over the period of years to the point where what the hon. member is concerned about and what we are concerned about, is satisfactorily taken care of.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. Minister says that on November 1 they go back to their former pursuits. That, I suppose, is drawing unemployment insurance?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I did not say that.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I say I did not. I said that they are engaged usually, these winter maintenance forces, on November 1, and after the winter maintenance period is concluded they go back to their former pursuits. I could have expanded it at that time by simply saying that in the rural areas of the province there are a lot of farmers who like this winter employment but when spring comes along they like to go back to the farm. I think the hon. member for Bruce and the hon. member for Brant are very much aware of that.

Mr. Whicher: I am very much aware of it. I would like the hon. Minister to name one in Bruce county who fits into that category, just one. There is not one.

Mr. Sopha: I see that the hon. Minister has very carefully paid the unemployment insurance premiums. Do the other pursuits to which the hon. Minister referred, include going back to drawing unemployment insurance?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This was not what I had in mind when I said it.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask the hon. Minister this question: Has it ever been calculated whether the federal government pays employees of the department of the hon. Minister amounts in excess of the \$215,000 which the hon. Minister budgets? In other words, does the federal government pay out more in unemployment insurance benefits to the hon. Minister's department than is paid in premiums?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not know.

Mr. Sopha: I would think the hon. Minister would look into that to determine whether

the government in Ottawa is subsidizing the hon. Minister's department.

An hon. member: Still, the—

Mr. Sopha: Just hold on. It is all right, we do not have to hear from the zoo about this.

I have raised this before; it is not the first time, Mr. Chairman, I have raised this question and I have asked the provincial government to bear some responsibility in finding employment. Our Department of Labour is singularly lacking in having media that look for jobs for people. I would think that if the hon. Minister of Highways is going to run a department where he has a great many transient labourers who are uncertain of the continuity of their occupation, instead of laying them off and throwing them on to the benefaction of the federal government, the hon. Minister might do something about securing permanent employment for them.

I observe in going quickly through the estimates here, there are three departments that employ large numbers of casual labour—Public Works, Highways, and Lands and Forests—the only three departments that bother to pay unemployment insurance. May we take it that it is not such a problem in the other departments as it is in these three—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): That is nonsense. They all pay it.

Mr. Sopha:—of having casual and temporary work in the work force?

Well, as I say to my hon. friend the lion from St. George, they do not budget for it, they do not ask—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: You take a look at the accounts.

Mr. Sopha: But really, my request is not so unreasonable, if you think about it for a moment. Instead of, on April 1, seeing a large number of these people—and they have been in my office, which is handy, downtown. Oh, yes; I have seen a good many of them. They have been in and said, "I have got my notice from The Department of Highways." Often they are in the 40, 50 or 60 age groups. I have had them tell me, "This is my fifth, sixth, seventh or tenth season with The Department of Highways and I have not yet got a permanent job with them. And, come the ides of March, or April 1, I am going to be laid off. Yes, I am going to be laid off."

So, instead of sitting here and smiling knowingly, like the cat which swallowed the canary, the hon. Minister might consider, instead of relying upon the largesse of the

federal government's unemployment insurance programme, doing something about securing permanent employment for these people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I rather thought I commented on that a few moments ago, because I hesitate to think that the hon. member would want us to engage temporary staff, at the expense of the public, which we do not need.

I do not want to be one who burdens the federal government with the payment of any more unemployment insurance than seems reasonable; but nevertheless, in, I would say, 90 per cent to 99 per cent of all circumstances, these people to whom the hon. member refers, who are engaged in the fall, do it with the full knowledge that their employment is going to run out in the spring.

I do not think there is any doubt in their mind about it; they keep coming back and, in many cases, they do have other jobs to go to. They have farms to operate; they have summer work to do; but if I have to make a choice about involving the federal government in the payment of unemployment insurance claims, or using the taxpayers' money to keep on staff people we do not need in this classification, I think I can safely tell you what my choice will be.

Mr. Sopha: I am not at all sure that, as a sovereign government—I would have to think about that for a fortnight or so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The distinction between myself and the "Joe" is the emphasis on that word "think."

I am not at all sure that, as a sovereign government as we are, you are entitled to rely on the benefaction of the federal government in this regard.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, you are. Yes, you are. You are paying \$215,000—that is the amount that you want voted—to insure your employees against the hazards of the unemployment which you are going to give them. You are going to put them in an unemployed state come April 1. So, as a sovereign government, what in effect you are doing—and I am not sure yet you have the moral right to do it, paying \$215,000 to the federal government after you laid them off because you cannot find them employment.

Then you are saying to another level of government, "Here, you look after them."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: We are not talking about International Nickel. We are talking about the sovereign government of Ontario, the sovereign government which is sovereign and supreme within its own sphere. It has a measure of responsibility for these people. I am saying that I am not sure there is something morally wrong here when, on April 1, having paid the \$215,000 you say to the other levels of government, "It is now your responsibility."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I make one more observation on what the hon. member has said, and that is this: casual employees are not, in effect, employees of the department because they are not civil servants. Civil servants are not eligible for the payment of unemployment insurance; casual employees are. I think this just underscores the proposition I put before you already: That is, that we will always need some casuals because we cannot provide them all with full-time employment. This is why they remain; and some of them will always remain in this casual classification because we do not need them the year round. That has nothing to do with sovereignty, as far as I can make out.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, after listening for the last 15 minutes to the debate in regard to employees of the department, that the hon. Minister has made a very poor case to justify the number of casual employees working for this department in the various branches.

I think the talk and the reasoning—that many of them are farmers and enjoy having a part-time job, and that there are many who know that when they start at the first of the year they are going to be finished and will not have a job for the next year—is just a lot of nonsense.

I think that, if we have the truth from this department, we will find that there are literally hundreds in the various branches who are working steady, working shifts, and who are classified as casual or temporary. We have another group who have not been mentioned, a temporary group. I shall deal with that group on another vote. I do want to deal with the group, which works for The Department of Highways, called the checker, or maintenance and construction.

This man works steadily. His wife called me to tell me that she was struck with fear

about how they were going to get along because she had to give up her employment because of ill-health. Now, because her husband was getting only a \$1.30 an hour as a checker for The Department of Highways, she did not know how they were going to get along.

I think that if we condone this kind of payment to employees of the government it is a shame on the hon. members of this House and on the administration.

We have them all over. We have them outside the door of this building at \$1.30 an hour, very good employees who perform a service but who have to live on this kind of money. This man's wife informed me that his gross for two weeks was \$126; and when the deductions came off—including \$4.20 for his hospital insurance services, his PSI, \$6, his unemployment insurance, \$1.60, income tax, \$4.05—his gross was \$110 for two weeks.

She also informed me that, after he had worked steadily for seven months, he was given a week and four days off and told not to come back until that time had elapsed. The reason he got that was because he had worked too steadily this year, and he would have to stay home. What they meant by working "too steadily", I assume, was that if he worked the 12 months, he would come under some status or other benefits.

I think we should have a frank explanation of just what is taking place in the department in this regard. I am also informed that the pay dates are going to be changed from every two weeks to bi-monthly; and this is something we fought to get rid of in industry many years ago, because people with low incomes were faced with, many times a year, a three-week period between pays. With this kind of a pay, certainly they would have a weekend where they would be without money for three or four days. I think it is nothing but a shame on the department to be paying people, in this area, \$1.30 an hour to live on. Certainly we should take a real look at it.

I know, when I have raised this question before, during the estimates, we have been told that they are trying to reduce the casual employees and trying to get more on the permanent staff; but I do not think we are doing it right. I think there should be a regularized system of service when a man goes from casual to a permanent position where he can enjoy the benefits of accumulating pension rights and any other benefits the department might give. I would suggest that we take a real look at this problem and see if we cannot upgrade the rates and regularize the system of an employee becoming a

permanent employee so he will know where he is going.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I have already said a couple of times how we are attempting to obtain this relationship between casual and permanent employees, so I will not go into that any further.

The man you referred to as a checker at \$1.30 an hour would be strictly a seasonal employee, engaged for the duration of the contract only.

On this matter of twice monthly payments; that is in effect now. We are not going back to that, that is what we have now. What you mean is that you are requesting us to pay every two weeks.

Mr. Gisborn: I said it was information I received; it was—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The matter is being considered. It has been proposed by the association, but at the moment pays are bi-monthly.

Mr. Gisborn: The complaint I got might have meant that he was only paid twice a month, and it presents a hardship—the same difference.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, before we leave vote 801, I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on the changing of district boundaries. I notice in looking at the book here the boundaries are not entirely clear, they are rather broad and I know that he was good enough to inform me some months ago of the district changes which would come into effect a year from now, is that right? Why was this postponed? I wonder if you would comment on the difficulties?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Actually the opinion of the department, and I think a very valid one, is simply that it will take about a year to implement all these changes. We have in some circumstances, to put on more patrols, and in others take certain patrols off and assign them to other districts. I think it is strictly an administrative problem, Mr. Chairman, and we feel that we should have a good full year, shall we say, to take care of the internal administrative problems associated with it. We will make it effective a year hence.

Mr. Nixon: What will the effective date be, then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: April 1, 1965.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, has the department a policy

of overtime? Does it discourage overtime among contractors in an effort to increase employment?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not at all; just the reverse, actually. Once we award a contract to a contractor the matter of how he employs or deploys the staff is entirely his responsibility. I would say with a comparatively short construction season such as is characteristic in our country, that much overtime is the case. These people often work 24 hours, so they would employ shifts and overtime as well.

Mr. Newman: And the permanent staff of the department itself?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The permanent staff of the department itself, at the moment, gets compensating time off for overtime.

Vote 801 agreed to.

On vote 802:

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, on vote 802, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister in regards to the patrol costs. I see here you have in the estimates for this year \$12,050,000. I am not saying that the patrols are not good—you stated this afternoon in your remarks what fine work they were doing—but I see the winter maintenance is \$15 million, so the patrols are costing very close to what the winter maintenance is costing. Are these patrols confined to highways such as 401 or 400, or do they patrol all King's highways in the province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is no real relationship between the vote for patrol costs and the \$15 million that you see for maintenance, because, of course, maintenance costs include many things other than patrol costs. They include materials and a great variety of things. But these patrols you refer to cover the entire province, expressways, King's highways, secondary roads—the entire provincial highway system.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, under what vote, what part of vote 802, is the cost of salt?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is the vote.

Mr. Whicher: I mean how much was the cost of salt last year on the provincial highways of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can tell you in a moment. These are figures projected for the year ending March 31, 1963; we have

not got the complete figures for this year yet but these will illustrate it to you.

In the year that I have reference to, the cost of salt was \$3,128,205.46.

Mr. Whicher: I am sure the hon. Minister is just as familiar as I am with the criticism that has been given by many writers about the use of salt in the province of Ontario. I remember I brought this up about six years ago and one of the hon. members on the other side, the government side, said that if it saves one life, then it is worth the effort. Of course, those of us on this side of the House have no intention of having any lives lost through the lack of the usage of salt, but, nevertheless, I think the hon. Minister will agree that the cost to the people who own cars and trucks in the province of Ontario is probably several hundred million dollars every year. I would be interested in knowing what The Department of Highways is doing to experiment with other things, other elements or compounds, that might help out the situation as far as ice is concerned on the highways.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. member, that this is a matter that has been researched constantly for the past number of years, because, of course, the department recognizes the damaging effects of the use of salt. But in the course of this research we have failed to come up with any suitable alternative at anything near the same cost. There are other snow inhibitors or things that will dissolve it or melt it, or whatever you like, but they are not more effective than salt is. They have not been proved efficient as yet and they are extremely costly. While this research continues to go on, and not only in this jurisdiction but I think probably in similar jurisdictions all over this continent, no economical or efficient equivalent alternative, as yet, has made its appearance.

Mr. Whicher: May I ask the hon. Minister where this research is being carried out?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have done some of it in our own department; we assign research projects to the various universities and we assist them financially to conduct them. Metro Toronto has been studying this problem for quite some time and we have shared the cost with Metro.

Mr. Whicher: How much did your department spend last year in research as far as the matter of salt is concerned?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot relate it specifically to salt but I can say that we spent \$150,000 among the universities of the province for various research assignments, and salt at one time was one which, I think, was assigned to Queen's University. I think they worked on it.

Mr. Sopha: Less than on publicity—you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister, through you, under vote 802 what the item for \$12,000—I should not say, what it is for; it explains what it is for, it is compensation for loss of taxes to the city of Niagara Falls—but may I ask the hon. Minister what loss in taxes, that is, and how it was set and by whom?

An hon. member: How did the hon. member for Niagara Falls get in on this?

Interjections by several hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say in reply to the hon. member that this is an annual payment of \$12,000. It is authorized under The Rainbow Bridge Act of 1941, which agreement or undertaking goes through until 1980. It simply says that the bridge will for all time be exempt from taxation, including local improvement and school rates levied by any municipality, and the city gets this payment of \$12,000 in lieu of certain taxes themselves. It is a statutory thing, and the Act is in effect, as I see it here, until 1980.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): I think, Mr. Chairman, that those of us who sit in this House should from time to time bring up the items which concern our ridings. In this case I want to mention two items which are of concern to the municipalities in my riding and which I have already discussed; I believe last fall I had a discussion with the hon. Minister on a couple of these items.

First of all, I want to bring up a situation which refers to the main city in my riding, and that is the inequities which exist in the present system of highway subsidies. It is true, of course, that changes have been made in the subsidies which have benefited this city, such as storm sewers subsidies and increased subsidies on connecting links, which have been a big help. However, there still remains a basic inequity in the subsidy system.

It should be noted that towns, villages, townships, counties and Metropolitan Toronto receive road subsidies of 50 per cent of

approved expenditures, and bridge and culvert subsidies up to 80 per cent of approved expenditures; while cities and separated towns receive only a 33.3 per cent subsidy.

For example, I would point out that big cities such as Scarborough, North York, Etobicoke, receive higher subsidies just because they are called a township. I hasten to point out, of course, Mr. Chairman, that I in no way suggest that these subsidies are too high, because I also have townships in my riding. I would point out, however, that road construction in urban areas is more costly per mile than rural road construction. In addition, the needs due to the traffic demands are greater.

The Department of Highways needs study indicated that the greatest needs were in the urban municipalities, where I point out the subsidy is the least. There is a limit to the amount of money that can be raised from municipal taxes for road purposes. Urban municipalities should obtain a greater portion of the road user taxes that the government receives from its various licence fees. A high proportion of the gasoline taxes, I would point out, result from travel within cities. Increased subsidies are required in the urban municipalities if we are to meet the needs outlined in the government needs studies.

Briefly, I would say that officials of the city I am referring to appreciate very much the subsidies that they do receive, but they have gone only part way in meeting this very important need. The problem of road building and maintenance continues to be a very vexing problem to the urban municipalities and its taxation picture.

I would also like to say a word on behalf of the townships in my area and the increasing use which is being made of the township and county roads by the motorists of this province, especially on the weekends. This matter has been referred to by the hon. Minister, but I would like to emphasize that the situation is aggravated in many cases by the establishment of conservation areas and provincial parks; and whereas the road was formerly a quiet country road it now becomes a very busy traffic artery, even though it was not originally built or designed to accommodate heavy traffic.

The situation creates an undue burden to the local municipality and the township taxpayer involved; an undue burden which is out of all proportion to the benefits provided to the local municipality by the establishment of these provincial recreation areas. Some of the townships in my riding would like The Department of Highways to establish

a more equitable classification of roads—including roads primarily for local use, collector roads, arterial roads and through highways—with a parallel sliding scale of road grants established according to the use and needs of such roads so that the burden of taxation on real estate for road purposes would be only for that portion of construction and maintenance which is used by the local taxpayers.

This is a problem which is to a degree brought about, of course, by the very rapid development of our province; but I would urge the department to take this matter under consideration when subsidy on construction is under review.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, briefly, that certainly I think there is some evidence to support the fact that the department concurs with the opinions the hon. member has expressed, because we have started to move into the area of providing more assistance. I would say to the hon. member as well, and I think he would be the first to realize it, Mr. Chairman, that we recognized at least the heavy cost areas in the city associated, as he pointed out, with connecting links, expressways, storm sewers. We have moved into that area rather generously, as the hon. member for Oshawa said.

With respect to provincial parks, we do now and will continue to provide extra assistance to municipalities which are required to maintain township or county roads because of a heavy traffic flow into these parks. We will provide extra assistance to them and that has been made known to them.

I would simply conclude any observations I have to make with respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Oshawa by saying that we have now a great amount of flexibility with respect to the application of direct assistance. We can apply very generous amounts of assistance directly to urban municipalities meeting certain criteria associated with expressways.

And certainly at the level of the counties and townships, you heard me say this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that we are now in the process of this county needs study to update the information we require to pursue this thing another step at that level.

Mr. Knox: Mr. Chairman, prior to being deeked out of position by my hon. friend and companion from Oshawa, I had not finished with reference to that item for \$12,000.

The hon. Minister having answered as he did with reference to it, then I presume that this is an agreement between a bridge authority, the city of Niagara Falls and the provincial government. Is that true?

What I am really getting at is this; if one did happen to have a little old bridge around—maybe you could call it Bluewater—on which there was to be an authority appointed very shortly, and one did have a small municipality within the riding in which the Canadian end of the Bluewater bridge falls, might one instruct that village with respect to compensation for loss of taxes which they have had in the past, so that they should, when the authority is set up, ask the authority to get in touch with the province to make some such agreement, or ask the province to get in touch with the authority to make some such agreement; or in what way should the little municipality of Point Edward proceed in order to get the same consideration that is given to the fine city of Niagara Falls?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would probably, Mr. Chairman, provide a hypothetical answer to a highly hypothetical question and simply say that if the tolls are ever restored to that bridge, then the representatives of the village of Point Edward might suggest to their representative in the Legislature that he come down and discuss this matter with the appropriate officials. I say all that hypothetically.

Mr. Gishorn: Mr. Chairman, through you, I would ask the hon. Minister to inform me as to the disposition of the so-called Hamilton beach strip? Is it still under the jurisdiction of The Department of Highways or has it been turned over to the city of Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As far as I know, the designation has been revoked and the road is now under the jurisdiction of the city. That is my understanding.

Mr. Gishorn: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a minute and deal with a problem with which I am strongly concerned and which will be looked at as a serious one. If we remember, prior to the start of the building of the skyway bridge, public opinion was raised quite highly by the cry of nuisance and dirt and dust and the bottleneck created by the beach strip and the canal at the far end.

Of course when we heard news that we were going to have a skyway bridge which would relieve the bottleneck, sir, and which would in turn relieve the residents of the

beach strip from the continual chaos of traffic, the dirt and noise that they put up with for many years, we were quite happy. But we find with the building of the skyway and its subsequently becoming a toll bridge, it has not rectified the problem whatsoever.

Now there was a meeting, just about the time the skyway opened, with the then Minister, now the hon. Attorney General, and some councillors from Hamilton asking the department to put a ban on truck traffic across the beach. I think at that time the department was reluctant to take those steps; but it was said that the department would, I believe the agreement was, take the road and reconstruct it because of a lot of damage done during the construction of the skyway bridge. They have done a very good job except for a few odd spots; I notice they did build it to the specifications that would stand heavy trucks anyway.

But if it is now turned over to the city, the city is going to face this problem; and I think it is going to cause a great political uproar. Someone has to make the decision.

If they decide to ban trucks from the strip there is no alternative but for them to go through the city. Of course there are aldermen and councillors fighting for their own particular wards in the city and it is going to raise quite a political uproar when the people now know that it is back in the hands of the city. They know where to put the pressure on to remove those continual rumbles of heavy trucks across that strip.

I would suggest that it is about time that the department and the government considered removing the tolls from that bridge, if they want to do something for that section of the town. The idea of toll bridges, as far as I am concerned, and it was the decision of our party at the time, was that it was a horse-and-buggy way of raising money for financing highways. If we want to do something on behalf of the city of Hamilton and those people who have put up with the nuisance for many years, we should take the tolls off that bridge so that they can ban the beach strip to the heavy truck traffic and force the trucks to go across the bridge or up through the city and let the city aldermen fight that out.

Certainly, when you look over the accounts, the tolls on the skyway bridge are not going to make us any richer than we will be without them, and I would think that we have a responsibility to that section of the beach. It suffered tremendously from almost unbearable dirt when the construction was going on. The roads were all torn up. I do not

know yet whether the city was successful in getting the streets that run off the highway reconstructed. The last time I was talking with the people down there, they were pleased that the highway was going to be reconstructed but they had great fears that the streets running off the road would also be destroyed by the construction of the skyway. I think it is about time that we give consideration to taking the tolls off that bridge and off other bridges in this province and raising the money in the method that we do for the rest of the province's highways—by gasoline tax and other methods.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Algoma-Manitoulin has the floor.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, just a further word on municipal aid through the grants. I notice that the hon. Minister referred to what has commonly been called statute labour boards, as local roads boards. I am very much interested in this. As the hon. Minister knows, this is a nasty word in our country. "Statute labour boards" has always had a bit of a stigma attached to it and I would like a further explanation on the makeup of the new local roads boards. I heard him mention something to the effect that now the grants were two for one. I would like him to elaborate and enlarge on this a little because this is a very important topic.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I did say in the remarks I made before the estimates today that we will introduce legislation this session, and I would hope shortly, which will simply be a statute authorizing the establishment of local roads boards.

I also said briefly that the basis of cost-sharing would change from 50-50—if I might put it that way—to a contribution by the department of 66⅔ per cent, and a contribution of 33⅓ per cent by the owners in a local roads board area.

Mr. Sopha: Are they going to replace statute labour boards?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it is not and I am going to explain this, if I may. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member, that we will explain this in greater detail when we discuss the bill in the House. It will be presented very shortly. I simply want to comment on it generally today.

Generally and simply then, when local roads boards are formed, and they can be, the statute will provide that a certain number of owners in an area can apply to the

Minister for the formation of a board under the authority of this statute. When formed, there will be provision for a method of assessing the land owners. I think where the provincial land tax factor is available, this will be the basis of assessment.

Mr. Sopha: That will be only in unincorporated townships.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, in unincorporated townships. This, of course, is largely where we have statute labour boards now. We will establish a basis of assessment against which the land owners will be assessed. Boards will be appointed or elected and re-elected annually. They will appoint a secretary-treasurer. The funds will be handled altogether differently from what they are now. I am speaking very generally now, Mr. Chairman. I do not have the draft bill before me, but we can get into the detail of this. There will be another opportunity later on, I would say to the hon. member. We think it is a big step forward.

Mr. Farquhar: Thank you, sir. As you say, we will hear more about it later. I do not want to beat it now. But I would like to ask one more question. The formation of these boards, as the hon. Minister knows, is always a pretty ticklish thing, at least it has been under statute legislation. Under the formation of statute labour boards and these things, these new boards or continuations of the old boards will be formed with the help of the department. This is the big thing in these areas. One further thing is in connection with organized municipalities. I am wondering if the hon. Minister can tell me if there is a real yardstick at present that establishes the percentage of grants in various municipalities. I have run into 65-35; I have run into 70-30, and I cannot relate them to any particular rule-of-thumb or yardstick, and I wonder if the minutes can provide some explanation.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I simply say that these rates of subsidy are not arbitrarily set. They are set on the basis of a formula, and as simply as I can state it, and as briefly, the formula is predicated on the premise that an adequate amount of money for the proper maintenance of roads in townships is \$600 per mile. If a municipality on the basis of its assessment associated with its road mileage, cannot raise \$600 a mile on the basis of the basic subsidy at 50 per cent, then the department to the nearest five per cent makes up the difference. I do not know whether I am expressing this

is clearly as I would like to or not. Therefore, it can then become 60 per cent, 65 per cent, or 70 per cent, up to a maximum of 80 per cent.

But the subsidy is formulated by these factors that I have mentioned, \$600 a mile being considered adequate for road maintenance purposes in these areas, for the road mileage to be maintained and the assessment in that municipality.

If that combination of factors does not produce \$600 a mile—let us say it produces \$400 a mile—then the equivalent of the extra \$200 is made up by an increase in the subsidy. Is that explanation satisfactory?

Mr. Sopha: What I want to say on this very point before it passes, delighted as I am to hear the elaboration of this new system in unorganized territory, is that if the hon. Minister will consult the files of the department which I am sure are kept with the most thorough efficiency, he will find in there a letter several years old, addressed to the lawyer from Chesterville, who is now the hon. Attorney General. In it I said at great length that the system of statute labour does not work and never will work.

But he is a hard man to get through to, the man who is now the hon. Attorney General, because he makes up his mind often about things on a snap decision. I recall him writing back to me and referring the letter back to me and saying his department felt that this statute labour as it existed in the unorganized territory of northern Ontario was adequate. He pointed out the large amounts of government money that go into the statute labour and he actually rejected my submission. And now—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: My victory is tonight when the present hon. Minister comes and says, "Your suggestion in effect is accepted and we are going to reorganize the whole system." This is a perfect day for me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the occasion pass without, of course, commending the hon. member for his earlier proposal; but I must, in all honesty, say that during my brief tenure of office the suggestion came from the member for Cochrane South, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who was kind enough to associate with the Minister of Highways in the various details associated with the new bill. In any case, I am sure the hon. member for Sudbury will be gratified.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Lambton West stepped out.

He would like to know, sir, how you go about getting taxes for bridges which you might eventually build. This agreement that The Department of Highways has with the city of Niagara Falls and the bridge commission, which gives them a grant in lieu of taxes of some \$12,000 a year—when did it come into effect? Does the hon. Minister say it will expire in 1983?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In 1941.

Mr. Bukator: In 1941? Was that during the term of office of my very good friend? They were a lenient lot at that time because the bridge was just built, I guess. But just a year ago, for the benefit of my friend from Lambton West, there was a private bill passed pertaining to the Peace Bridge whereby, Mr. Chairman, there was an agreement between the federal government, the town of Fort Erie, and the bridge commission—and I sent for the Bill—Pr2.

The Peace Bridge will be paying, to Fort Erie on a graduated scale, in the neighbourhood of \$70,000 a year, as compared to \$12,000 for the Rainbow Bridge. The Peace Bridge does not have any stores where they collect rent, but the Rainbow Bridge has 18 stores which are rented. I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would want to admit to me the amount of rent they pay. Is that in order, or am I asking for something that a member should not have or could have—or do I have to put it on the order paper? I would like to know the rents collected by the hon. Minister's department as a comparison with when the \$12,000 is paid.

I have said to the hon. members of this House that the bridge commission, or The Department of Highways, does not pay taxes. When I said that, the paltry sum of \$12,000 is not enough when you consider the bridge is assessed at, I think, close to \$800,000, with its stores and the stand; and it is quite revenue-producing. The Department of Highways have their offices there, at least in the Bell Tower; the commission meets there; the bridge commission has elaborate offices—and I want to make clear, Mr. Chairman, that while we do get a grant of some \$12,000, by way of comparison if you would just go down one more notch—and I think maybe the hon. Minister is a member of the commission too, is he not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Bukator: The north end bridge—the Whirlpool Bridge, I think it is called—pays a grant, in lieu of taxes, in the neighbourhood, I think, of \$36,000. I stand to be corrected, but I think that is the figure. At this stage of the game, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to make the point that while there is an agreement, and it expires in 1983, the bridge commission is using up the valuable land which, once upon a time, housed the Clifton Hotel, the Queen's Hotel, the Lafayette Hotel, and many other establishments which paid many dollars in taxes to the city. Mind you, there were three grants paid at one time.

The Department of Municipal Affairs, about two years ago, paid them in the neighbourhood of \$9,200; they cut that off. The Department of the Attorney General gives grants in lieu of taxes. We will come to those estimates, and I will try to explain them at that time. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that \$12,000 is sufficient, considering the valuable land they have taken up. This is just a token amount, and I am sorry that we have to wait until 1983 for a renewal of that contract.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Did the hon. Minister plan on answering the question of the hon. member for Niagara Falls?

Mr. Bukator: About the rentals; could I get the figures on that some time?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, with respect to certain of the matters of information the hon. member has requested, I was going to propose, if I may, that we send the hon. member this information by letter. I do not have it available.

Mr. Bukator: That will be fine.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased this evening when the hon. member for Oshawa brought up the discrepancies concerning subsidies paid to cities as opposed to metropolitan municipalities, towns, and villages, and so forth.

Mr. Whicher: Which cities?

Mr. Newman: The reason for my keen interest in this is that just recently, in fact it is only two months ago, my own local municipality passed a resolution which, I assume, the hon. Minister received. If he has re-

ceived it I will not read it all. If he has, I will simply read the last paragraph. It is only two or three lines and it suggests that the provincial government be requested to equalize the scale of subsidies between urban and rural municipalities.

It costs more, today, to build a road in an urban area than it does in a rural area. The traffic generally, on an urban road, is substantially higher, and I think that the resolution, as adopted by the council in the city of Windsor on January 20, 1964, has merit.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I recall this resolution. I would simply point out to the hon. member that it was a recognition of some of the problems to which he refers which prompted me to say, in the remarks I made before the estimates, that the statute now permits, for one of those cities with whom we are negotiating now as well as certain of the surrounding municipalities, some of the direct forms of assistance. I think this is one way we can assist these situations very materially. I am sure the hon. member would be knowledgeable about this.

Windsor is one of those cities to whom we have indicated that we believe the associated criteria for eligibility is met in Windsor. Consequently, we expect to be negotiating an agreement with them very shortly for an urban expressway, or ring road as they are sometimes called. It will be a rather costly one, for which they will get a subsidy of 75 per cent across the board for construction, land acquisition and subsequent maintenance. In fact we are doing, in terms of direct assistance in these areas of need, something which I think might be much more difficult to provide for in the general sense of the word. Windsor will be the benefactor of some of this direct assistance, once we formalize an agreement with them.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, that is all well and good. We appreciate the hon. Minister's concern, but remember that we in the local community form the gateway to the central mid-west portion of the United States. There are 90 million people only 12 hours' drive from our municipality, and approximately five million people come into Ontario through our gateway every year. The wear and tear on the roads in our community, from the bridge and from the tunnel leading to Highway 401 and Highways 2 and 3, is probably much more substantial than in almost any other community.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister in regard to the property—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Wentworth East has the floor.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that there has been a great deal of unrest, and very poor employee-employer relations, on the Burlington Skyway Bridge. I understand approximately 17 employees man the tolls, excluding supervision. Would the hon. Minister—one, comment on this; two, inform the House as to the turnover of employees on this particular bridge; and why the necessity of temporary, casual and permanent employees on a job of this nature?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that it comes as news to me, and surprising news at that, that we have disgruntled employees. This is the first suggestion I have had of it, coming from the hon. member tonight on that score. I hope you will permit me to investigate this a little further and see what we can turn up for your information.

Now with respect to the turnover of employees, I am at a loss to understand that as well. Certainly there are enough applications for these jobs on file to staff 50 similar bridges, so the jobs cannot be too bad. I would simply suggest to you that for every employee that decides to drop out, for one reason or another, we can replace him ten times overnight.

The matter of certain temporary employees is associated with the fact that we are attempting to determine—by having manual staff at one bridge and an automatic operation at the other, we feel this has provided us with an excellent way of determining—whether the manual operation or the automatic, or machine, operation, is the best. Until we have reached that conclusion we will probably have a few temporary employees to round out shifts on the one bridge where the operation is a manual one.

With respect to the other matters, as I said I shall have to look into those and see if I cannot fill the hon. member in, because it is news to me, I just do not know.

Mr. Gisborn: I would give the hon. Minister some lead and he can investigate it and I will approach him later. I have the information upstairs, but I do not like to present it unless I know there is some validity in it.

If the hon. Minister will check he will find there was a meeting with his department officials in, I think it would be, approximately September, over two employees who had resigned. One had, I believe, six years service

and another three. They were called in to explain their resignations and they were quite incensed about the treatment they got. I believe they had a chance to present their case, but they did not get satisfaction and they came to me to see what could be done.

I would like the hon. Minister to look into it and I will contact him later to get the answer.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister in regard to all the properties purchased by The Department of Highways for building 401, have you had a final settlement on all properties that you purchased for right-of-way of 401? If not, how many properties have not been settled with yet?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say, Mr. Chairman, this appropriately comes up under the next vote. If I had the information, I would give it to the hon. member now, but probably between now and the time we reach vote 803, I can have some information for him.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister, how much maintenance do you have to have on a certain part of the King's highway before you might consider it for the next vote, namely, 803, capital disbursements. Because of course I could not let the opportunity pass tonight without mentioning the fact that on looking over the booklet you presented this afternoon, the capital construction programme, in the very large county of Bruce, which stretches from Tobermory away down south of Walkerton and has many miles of provincial highway, the only part that I can see that has anything to do with construction in the next vote, is a binder course only, from Southamton easterly, of 5.7 miles.

Now the reason I mention this, Mr. Chairman, is this, that the hon. Minister is well acquainted with the roads in Bruce county. As a matter of fact, as he very well knows, he attended a convention in Bruce county immediately previous to the last election and in the course of his remarks, and I think he was quite justified in saying so, he said, according to the papers, the road he went over, is one hell of a road; and now, he said, that we have a provincial Conservative candidate nominated, perhaps we can do something about it.

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I point out to the hon. Minister that you had a provincial Conservative candidate nominated and today in this book, this large binder, I see that we have 5.7 miles of a binder coarse only from

Southampton easterly, as far as the next vote is concerned.

The reason that I bring it up under this vote, Mr. Chairman, is as follows. Not only is the road the hon. Minister travelled on attending that big convention in—I have forgotten where it was, Southampton or some place—not only is that a terrible road, but we have other terrible roads in Bruce county and some of them, Mr. Chairman, are provincial highways that come under the direct jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Highways who is giving his estimates to us tonight.

Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. Minister can say that the road going from Paisley to Southampton is one hell of a road, then I can tell you that the road, the provincial highway, the King's highway, from eight miles south of Wiarton is one hell of a road, too.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Watch your language.

Mr. Whicher: I am quoting the hon. Minister!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I only said it once.

Mr. Whicher: But I have to say it several times in order to get a little action.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I was listening to the hon. Minister and he said that he was very flexible, that he and his associates in his department would be quite willing to review certain situations and I hope he will review the situation as far as No. 6 Highway from Wiarton south is concerned.

Under this vote 802, maintenance of King's highways and other roads, I look at this, at all the headings there. For example, patrol costs; we certainly have them, Mr. Chairman. Gravel crushing; I would say we certainly need some gravel on that, because about half the pavement is left, so there has got to be some gravel. Dust laying; we will need something to look after the dust on that particular road. Surface treatment; most assuredly you are going to need it because, Mr. Chairman, I tell you that the road that the hon. Minister of Highways travelled on in order to go to that certain Conservative convention really was, and is, no worse than the road I am talking about right now.

Surface treatment; of course we will have to have surface treatment. Hot mixed patching. I do not know whether this will be hot mixed patching or cold mixed patching, but one thing is sure, if you do not want to have

a few accidents there, there is going to have to be some patching. Mulching, of course there is going to have to be mulching by your patrol units in that area.

Operation of ferries; well now, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure about operation of ferries, but let me tell you this: one year ago right now there was a foot and a half of water over that King's highway of which you are the hon. Minister. I hope that there will not be that much there this year. We have not had as much snow, but of course we may have to have ferries. Painting, bridge painting and repairs; well now there is the odd small bridge that the water keeps going up over; a bridge will have to be built too.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Better get the vote passed so the work can go on.

Mr. Whicher: Provision for flood and storm damage—I do not know about that, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that practically under every item of vote 802, maintenance of the King's highways and other roads, that this particular number of miles of road from Wiarton to Hepworth comes under that category.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is this. At what stage of the game do you leave the maintenance field and get to the capital field where you say as in vote 803, construction and other capital projects; when will this road be constructed properly?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is just about as good an answer as I can think of, Mr. Chairman. Surely the priority for that section of road will come up.

Mr. Whicher: Well, when?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is a good question. I would have to examine our list of priorities, Mr. Chairman, and I will do it as sure as I am sitting here but I cannot tell you off the cuff when that priority number will come up.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I have been here too long to accept that sort of answer. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister told the Tory convention in Bruce county—oh, everything was smooth that particular night; they had a big crowd there, half of them were Grits as a matter of fact, but they were there to listen to what the hon. Minister had to say and were disappointed—but nevertheless he said on that particular night, "Now we will be able to do something about it." Well, does that mean that just because I am here he is not going to do anything about it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, a vote will come up here shortly under development roads. Maybe if the hon. member—

Mr. Whicher: What about this one? This is the King's highway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have told the hon. member about the King's highway.

Mr. Whicher: What did the hon. Minister say?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is on vote 803. I told the hon. member that the priority would come up.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, then I must—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do you want me to finish—

Mr. Whicher: No, I am not finished.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Neither am I. I am not finished. I simply make the suggestion that you might ask a question relating to development roads, which is the road I was really talking about when I was at Port Elgin. I was talking about—well, I will say it once—the hell of a road I was talking about, of course, was that road up to Paisley and on to Southampton, you see.

Mr. Whicher: You should have gone on your own road.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not have to go far that night. I just make the suggestion that if the hon. member wants to ask about the development roads later on, please feel free to do so.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, at this time, in order to protect myself, and I am sure that the hon. members would want me to do so, I must read an editorial dated Monday, September 30, this is four or five days after the provincial election, from the Owen Sound *Sun Times*, which is the largest newspaper in our particular area. It is headlined: "Queen's Park Neglect of Bruce Peninsula." I am going to read the first paragraph only:

For some time now it has appeared that the provincial government has neglected the Bruce peninsula largely because its sitting member has been a member of the Opposition. Perhaps the fact that Ross Whicher at times has been an outspoken critic of the Progressive-Conservative government has made those who control such matters reluctant to give more than token aid to what is one of the province's finest summer resort areas. It has been said that at least one of those who must pass—

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be the hon. Minister of Highways who would be suggested here. I continue:

It has been said that at least one of those who must pass on such matters has established himself as a watchdog lest Mr. Whicher should receive credit for provincial expenditures in that area.

This is what was said in the largest newspaper in our area. It is not even in my riding, I might tell you, but the fact is—let me tell you this.

The road I am talking about, from Wiarton south, is worse than the road the hon. Minister described as being very poor. If we are getting results in other areas, which we are, and if we must take for granted—because all we have to do is look at the map—that Bruce county is one of the largest ridings in the province of Ontario, and if you think you are doing a job by giving us 5.7 miles of a binder coarse only in that particular area, when you yourself have said that "This is one hell of a road," then I say that you are being negligent in your duty.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on vote 802, I think this would be the vote under which the suburban roads commission would come. The hon. Minister, earlier this evening, mentioned the fact that they were studying the idea of the suburban roads commission, with something in mind as to changing the formula, and so forth. This would probably satisfy the objections we have in our own community, where there has been recent readjustment or reassessment. The point now, that I want to talk about, rather than suburban roads, is the idea of putting roadside water spots along our highways. When we travel throughout the state of Ohio we find places where an individual can turn off, and simply rest and get a drink of water, not one of these—

Mr. Sopha: You have given them a new idea so it causes tremendous consternation.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not refer to a plaza type of stop, because this is a commercial affair. A family driving along 401 does not always feel inclined to drive into a plaza because they are obligated to spend money when they do get in there. They would like some place along the highway where they can pull off, rest, get a drink of water, could find washroom facilities; this is very common in the United States. If you take Interstate 94 going from Detroit to Chicago you will find them at probably every 50 to 75 miles; it is a very handy thing. You

find exactly the same thing in the state of Ohio—just a place where a person can pull off the highway and get a drink of water, not necessarily coffee or tea.

For the sake of those who would like water, Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister consider this?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment under vote 802. It has been rumoured that The Department of Highways has thought about, or is going to move in the direction of, asking all farm people to remove gateway signs. I would ask the hon. Minister if this is so? I want him to comment on this.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would answer the hon. member by simply saying that any sign on the farmer's property will remain there undisturbed. Signs which are located on the right of way of The Department of Highways, on a King's highway or a secondary road, may, under certain circumstances, be required to move. But, certainly, a sign on a farmer's gateway, which is usually located on his own property, can stay there as far as the department is concerned.

Vote 802 agreed to.

On vote 803:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, on this vote I find that—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General) moves that the committee of supply rise, report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members on the opposite side of the House would agree, I would like to revert to order 29 in order that I may have, for the legal and municipal bills committee, sufficient work for a committee meeting.

THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I might say that we will continue tomorrow with the estimates of The Department of Highways and perhaps move to those of Economics and Development and also turn to the order paper.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, Energy Resources.

Hon. Mr. Cass: All right. Mr. Speaker, I was taking the advice of a senior member who conveyed it to me and he must have made an error—Energy and Resources Development, and perhaps the order paper, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Cass moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.20 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATA

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Page	Column	Line	Change to read:
1561	1	36	detention centres. We certainly expounded
1572	1	23	Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about Canada?
1572	1	25	Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about Canada?



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 17, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

First report, standing committee on government commissions, Mr. Harris	1683
Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	1683
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, first reading	1683
Milk Industry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	1686
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	1686
Farm Products Grades and Sales Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	1687
Vaccination Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Dymond, second reading	1687
Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	1687
Marriage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading	1687
Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading	1687
Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading	1687
Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1687
Recess, 6 o'clock	1722

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Central Technical School, Hamilton; and in the west gallery, students from St. Patrick's Separate School and Our Lady of Sorrows Separate School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. Harris, from the standing committee on government commissions, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 47, The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Bill No. 48, The Energy Act, 1964.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE PHARMACY ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): **Mr. Speaker,** these amendments are to permit graduates in pharmacy, pending registration, to practise in a limited way by dispensing in some pharmacies under supervision; to permit hospital pharmacists to elect a special member to the council of the College of Pharmacy to represent hospital pharmacists; and to authorize regulations to be made prescribing standards of maintenance and operation of pharmacies and require that pharmacies be operated in accordance with these standards.

THE ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy Resources) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy Resources): **Mr. Speaker,** this bill gives the northland commission authority to acquire a seal to affix on their legal documents.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: **Mr. Speaker,** before the orders of the day, I believe it is necessary to correct certain errors in a report which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of this morning.

In this report, I am quoted as "promising nurses that the government would not oppose compulsory arbitration if the nurses really wanted it". I must deny this statement most emphatically.

When the two nurses told me the chairman of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission was reported to have said the "commission would oppose compulsory arbitration", I said I believed Dr. Neilson had been misreported; that matters such as compulsory arbitration would be policy, and only government would determine policy. Then any decision would be for the commission to implement.

The two nurses spoke to me about "collective negotiation", and I did state that if nurses really wanted this, government would not oppose it.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Minister would answer the question asked by the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) yesterday, before the orders of the day?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, **Mr. Speaker.** I thought perhaps the hon. member would be posing the question again.

The question, **Mr. Speaker,** as you will recall, was: Has the government any further

statement to make on the hospital bed shortage, in view of the emergency meeting of Metro doctors with a representative of the OHSC on Friday evening? Further, what answer has the government given to the convalescent homes of the Metro area in their offer, more than a week ago, to make 1,000 beds available?

There was no emergency meeting of Metro doctors with a representative of the OHSC on Friday evening last. This was a meeting of the executive of district No. 11 of the Ontario Medical Association. Some time ago, I met two members of the executive and discussed with them bed shortages, as well as other matters. They asked, at that time, if someone from the commission would meet with their executive for more full discussion of hospital matters. I undertook to arrange for this, and this was the meeting held last Friday evening.

In answer to the second half of the question, I would say that all the facts, statistics, and all other matters pertinent to the entire problem of Metro hospitals, are now being gathered together in orderly fashion. Certain important discussions and negotiations are at present in progress. I am therefore not in a position to give a more specific answer to this part of the question until these discussions and negotiations are completed. I can say, however, that all the resources of The Department of Health, including the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, are at the disposal of Metropolitan hospital boards and other interested authorities to assist them in dealing with their problems. I am quite confident that sound and workable solutions will be found; and, as I stated, when our negotiations are concluded, a full statement will be presented to this House.

It had been my intention, and shortly after the opening of this session I had arranged that all these matters, and any other points of interest or concern about hospitals, would be fully presented as in former sessions before the committee on health. However, in view of what has more recently transpired, I will put these things before the House at the earliest possible time.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, it is three years since an Irish affair has been before this House. I actually missed that one so it is four years since I had the honour of drawing, to the attention of the House, the fact that this is the seventeenth of Ireland, and I do so with great pleasure today.

Of course I have, on many previous occasions, had occasion to do this. I think it is

pretty well recognized by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and many others, perhaps by all, except a few of the new hon. members, that I am the only living political representative of St. Patrick in the world.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There have been a few would-be successors, but so far they have been frustrated. I would like to convey, sir, my thanks to three groups: first, to my Progressive-Conservative Association in St. Patrick riding which has sent me this very fine pot of shamrocks with its good wishes; secondly, to this rather unique utensil of shamrocks sent to me by my office staff; and thirdly, to the presence here today of a number of students from St. Patrick Separate School, a school in the riding of St. Patrick.

The Irish, sir, are a curious people. The Parliament of Ireland never meets on the seventeenth of March. On the other hand, we have the premier of Northern Ireland here celebrating in Toronto today. The art of conversation is respected in Ireland. A Dubliner once said if one could get the English to talk and the Irish to listen, society in London would be quite civilized. As for the Irish women, God bless them. Irish eloquence once said about an Irish woman: "a woman who would coax the birds from the branch with her talk." While the Ontario Attorney General (Mr. Cass) may think he is being plagued at the moment with petitions by women to be compelled to sit on juries, over in Ireland a woman has to petition even to get her name on a panel for jury service.

I visited the Irish Parliament in 1962 and I looked at the order papers and I saw 100 questions on the order paper of the day. I met Mr. De Valera, who in his old age is still a fine, strong figure of a man, but his eyesight has failed very much. He did say to me, however, that he hoped Irish literature could get a little better circulation over here in Canada. On that occasion I also met a number of Canadian engineers and mining people who were engaged in assisting in trying to develop some of the mineral resources that have lain idle for so many years in western Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great day for the Irish. I have two or three other weapons from Ireland here, but this particular gavel is the most historic. Four years ago, sir, when I last spoke on this subject in the House, this gavel was presented to the Speaker of the day for use on that particular occasion. You, sir, were chairman of the committee of

the whole House and during the afternoon you so wore out your arm as chairman, that you had to call upon the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. W. E. Johnston) to assist you. Between the two of you, you and the people in the House at the time, you almost destroyed the gavel.

You have, sir, very graciously agreed to accept the gavel again today for one day's use.

I am still hopeful that it will come back to me reasonably intact but I hope that the business of the House will not be subdued on that account. I have pleasure, sir, through the page boy, in handing you this gavel for recognition in that way.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I shall endeavour to use it more lightly today. Thank you.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak also on St. Patrick's Day and I have also been blessed with the beautiful scented shamrock. I would say, sir, that I do not feel this is an appropriate time to take issue with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

After all, it is St. Patrick's Day. If he, sir, wishes to claim for himself the distinction of being the secular representative—and I want to emphasize, the secular representative—of St. Patrick I am sure no one will object.

I would say, sir, that I remember the occasion on which he spoke before, perhaps that is why I do not want to take issue, I unfortunately was not present in the House. I understand that he was overcome with such emotion at my absence that he suggested that perhaps I had been celebrating a little too much the night before—or it might have been at a wake, my wake, that was being attended. Someone did tell me that genuine tears rolled down his face at the thought of this and because of that I feel particularly warm to him. But I have no issue to take with him, sir, because I would say this: never have I heard him speak truer words than he spoke just now and I say that with deep conviction.

I thought I would take issue with someone, sir, and therefore I thought I would take it with Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson, as you know, is alleged to have said, "We hold the truth to be self-evident that all men are created equal." I would say that today there is not a man or a woman in this House who does not yearn to have been born in Ireland, or in some way, to have a loose association with someone who was born there.

Let me quickly hurry on to my mother. My mother was born in Dublin, and my father was born in Belfast, and I am alleged to have been born near the border and I think that is politically a happy position.

I understand, sir, why there is this yearning on the part of people to want to be Irish. I thought of going to some authority to find out what qualities the Irish have that all humanity wants to aspire to be like them. I was disappointed that I went to Bernard Shaw, who suggested that the Irish had potatoes in their heads and did not have much else to say about them, so I disclaim him as an authority.

But I went to a more authoritative source, sir. It is *Hansard*, page 2249 on March 17, 1961. Just by coincidence the authority is myself. I say this in a discerning but certainly a modest way. I pointed out that the virtues of the Irish are all the larger virtues. I suggested that it was a country of warriors and saints and poets and playwrights, a land where conversation sings in the streets. Perhaps, sir, we all welcome Ireland and St. Patrick's Day because in a way it is an imaginary land that we aspire toward. Perhaps we welcome it because, including the Irish, we do not take narrow nationalism too seriously. I think today in the world that this is the kind of virtue that should be welcomed.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I know I should yield the floor to my hon. friend from Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) but I do have the distinction of coming from the township of Erin. Erin is my home. It has been the home of my ancestors since 1825; in my riding I have the two municipalities, Erin township and Erin village—both good Irish names. I know the Irish members in this House are feeling rather sentimental today and when I think of Erin I feel a bit sentimental, although it just happens that the first settler in Erin township was not an Irishman, but a Pennsylvania Dutchman or German. In fact, one finds in studying the history of Ontario that Pennsylvania Dutch or Germans were pioneers in many areas.

But Erin—as it developed and the forest was cleared away—developed into a rich farming country with beautiful scenery and rolling hills. I would suggest to people who are of Irish descent that they really have never lived until they go about 50 or 60 miles northwest of Toronto into the rolling hills of Erin and there stand on a high hill and look out over the countryside, see the evergreens in swamps, and the cattle on the hillsides. A few years ago they would have

seen many fields of Irish cobbler potatoes. The people are friendly. They, like St. Patrick, had a strong religious background and in the early history of the township they dotted the countryside with churches and schools that are still there.

I am going to suggest to hon. members that some day they take a trip up to Erin. If they want to approach the village, they come in on Highway 24, and as you approach the village you see a large shamrock sign, "Where Irish Eyes Are Smiling." Now if you want to hit the highlight of Erin, I would suggest that on Thanksgiving Day you come up to the Erin Fall Fair—a preview of the Royal. That day there will be literally thousands, perhaps 20,000 or 25,000 people, will come back to Erin to see the fair and renew old acquaintance and to reminisce on the incidents that took place in the development of the township and the village. Mr. Speaker, I wish you the very best on this St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) has just told me that he thought it was a sorry day for the Irish when the Reillys had to give way to the Roots. Perhaps I belong to this number of which the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) just spoke, this loose association, because the name Reilly ordinarily would associate me with an Irishman, but I was not born in Ireland.

However, my mother was very fond of children. You see, there were 13, 14—15 altogether, plus one that was adopted, making a family of 16; and I was number 13. I am not superstitious and I never considered it unlucky with the number 13.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I am in the same category as the chap who said, "Are you related to Bill?" And I said, "Yes, I am remotely related. He was number one in our family and I was number 13."

The three youngest members of the Reilly family were born in Toronto. On my way in this afternoon, one of our parking attendants, Mr. Bob Glen, asked me if I would like to have this shillelagh for the balance of the day. Now if you require an extra one, Mr. Speaker, I am sure this is available to you.

He tells me that over in Ireland the idea was to slip the cord over the wrist, and use the side of the shillelagh to hit an opponent. If the side was not effective, then of course the butt end could be used.

Bob Glen tells me the front and the back of this shillelagh had been designed with

the word Ireland inscribed on it by a chap who worked in the CNR—a fellow by name of Bill Drennan. I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to join with the only living representative of St. Patrick, with the hon. member for Dovercourt and the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton), to say to all the people who are Irish and to everybody who loves the Irish, it is a great day for Ireland.

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): I will be only a moment, Mr. Speaker.

Of all those who have spoken in connection with St. Patrick's Day, there are two who were born in Ireland and those are the hon. member for Dovercourt and myself. I was born in Dublin. Now I am very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in that I can celebrate St. Patrick's Day because I was born in Dublin, and I can celebrate St. Andrew's Day because my father was Scottish and is buried in Scotland, and my mother was English so I can celebrate St. George's Day. So that it is a pleasure to be here.

I have not had the opportunity to say anything and in just these few words I thought I would remind the hon. members that I was born in Ireland like the hon. Minister from St. Patrick. I have met De Valera, I have met his son, Major De Valera, Mr. Costello and a number of the influential Irish people when I was in Ireland and in Dublin in 1950.

In conclusion, I might just say, if Mr. Speaker were not of Irish descent, begorrah, he would not have allowed so many Irish speakers before the orders of the day.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE MILK INDUSTRY ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Milk Industry Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want

to call this because there is a meeting of the agricultural committee. I doubt if this bill will be in your book—perhaps it just came up today—but if I can call it now, it can get to the committee this week.

THE FARM PRODUCTS GRADES AND SALES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE VACCINATION ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health), moves second reading of Bill No. 67, An Act to repeal The Vaccination Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) moves second reading of Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 49th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

On vote 803:

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned last evening, I had just proceeded to make some comments on a subject relative to the estimates covered in 803, capital disbursements, construction and other capital projects.

I am sure the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is well aware of the traffic problem that the city of Hamilton is facing today because of the continual increase in population, industrial expansion and subsequently the great increase in traffic flow in and around the city of Hamilton. The hon. Minister is also aware of the extensive traffic survey that was taken, I believe at a cost of some \$400,000, and subsequently the results brought about a projected programme over a period of years of some \$200 million.

I understand that some time in December, I think it was about December 3, a delegation met with the hon. Minister and presented a request for increased subsidies in regard to this project. I believe that as reasons for an increase in subsidies above the then known 33.3 per cent, as it was for the city of Toronto on projects of a similar nature, they referred to the city of Kitchener and also to the Lakehead which have similar projects. They felt they did receive a good hearing by the hon. Minister. I would just quote from the *Hamilton Spectator* of December 3, the day of the meeting, what took place, and ask the hon. Minister to comment in this regard:

A new cost-sharing formula which could see Queen's Park pay 75 per cent of the cost of Hamilton's proposed freeway system is being considered by the province. The hon. Charles MacNaughton, Minister of Highways, today told a Hamilton delegation, seeking extra help in implementing the city's \$200 million traffic programme, that he was very cognizant of Hamilton's traffic problem and would have a decision on a new rate structure very soon.

I would ask the hon. Minister if he would inform the House as to whether or not there is a new formula, and whether or not there is a chance of Hamilton being treated in a fashion similar to the city of Toronto?

It seems to me that we are getting into the position that when we talk, in general terms about the province of Ontario, we are talking about Metro Toronto. And vice versa, when we talk about Metro Toronto we seem to be

talking about the province of Ontario. I think it is about time that these major problems which arise in other cities should be given the same kind of attention as Metro Toronto. I would hope that the other hon. members from the Hamilton area will make some comment in regard to this subject, so that we can jointly bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the needs of the city of Hamilton in regard to this real problem, the problem of traffic flow.

I noticed that the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) made some comments last night. He, too, feels that there should be a new formula for the development of much needed highways in the different sections of the province.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is, of course, quite correct when he states that a traffic study has just been completed costing the sum of \$400,000. I feel it is only fair to point out to the House that the cost of this was subsidized by The Department of Highways, to the extent of 75 per cent. But it is quite true, also, that we have had a series of meetings with the mayor and representatives of the council of the city of Hamilton, with respect to matters emanating from this traffic study.

It was a comprehensive traffic study. It dealt very adequately, we feel, with the transportation problems in the city of Hamilton projected over a period of 20 years. As I understand it, and as I recall it, it is divided into several stages. We discussed with the mayor and representatives, the last time they were here, matters associated with stage one. This stage contemplates an urban expressway, or a crosstown expressway, through the core area of the city, as the hon. member and all others from the city of Hamilton will be well aware. We indicated, at that time, to the mayor and his associates, that we felt that a section of that urban expressway, the section proposed in stage one, was eligible for the type of assistance we discussed last night.

I might point out to the hon. member that, if nothing official has been said beyond that to the city of Hamilton, it was delayed until the appropriate legislation was introduced in this assembly. That has now been done, which enables me to negotiate an agreement with the city. I can assure the hon. member, and those from the Hamilton area who are interested, that we are quite prepared now to undertake negotiations to this extent.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the hon. Minister on his

well-prepared and equally well-delivered report given yesterday. There is no doubt we have a network of highways second to none on the continent.

Being cognizant of the excellency of our highway system, and having heard the fine report of the hon. Minister, I would that I could, as a Progressive-Conservative member, settle back and relax, secure in my belief that all was well—and leave criticisms, general and specific, to the Opposition members.

However, I made a promise to my constituents and, what is equally important, I made a promise to myself, that I would do everything within my power to attempt to alleviate the hardships encountered and suffered by those homeowners adjacent to Highway 401 as widened. Such being the case, I have no alternative but to use every proper means to champion their cause and endeavour to advance their interests on every occasion possible.

Much scorn and derision has been directed at the promises of politicians, but I would like to go on record in this House—and may I say that, from my observation of the hon. members in this House, I am no exception—as one who fully intends to honour his promises, notwithstanding any personal embarrassment or opposition I may suffer in so doing. To do otherwise would render me unfit to hold this high office, and to do otherwise would indeed render me unworthy to be a Progressive-Conservative member. To do otherwise than our conscience dictates, to sit back for personal reasons and not try to right a wrong, an admitted wrong, is not in my opinion a desirable trait in anyone, least of all in a man or woman holding elected office.

I do not subscribe to the theory of one of the great British leaders that, on being elected, one ceases to think constituency-wise and, in effect, abandons the local outlook in favour of the broader issues concerning the province as a whole.

I sincerely believe that our duty lies in both directions, that we must concern ourselves with local problems as they arise, while at the same time having regard to those all-embracing issues relating to the entire province. Indeed, one finds that there is overlapping. When one analyzes and diagnoses local problems they are, in many instances, attributable to matters inherent in province-wide government policies and administrative practices.

Therefore, lest the hon. members of this House recline and rationalize that this is purely a local, narrow, parochial problem, I hasten to assure them that such is not the

case. On the contrary, this is a problem brought about by the administrative policies and practices of The Department of Highways which affect, in varying degrees, the riding of every hon. member in this House.

I did not enjoy making my maiden speech in this House, because I found it necessary to attack a department of this government. And, being a newly elected member and a very unimportant one, one could imagine that I did so with the greatest reluctance. I enjoy making this address even less; for, if anything, I am even more determined to try to focus the attention of this honourable House on what I consider to be a most flagrant violation of the rights of those citizens bordering Highway 401 in Armourdale and neighbouring ridings.

I am reminded, sir, of the story of a farmer going away on a trip of two weeks' duration, who entrusted the care of his mule to his best friend, with the earnest plea that it should be treated with the utmost kindness. His friend assured him that such would be the case and assumed this duty, solemnly pledged to devote the kindest care to this special charge. However, he found that no matter how hard he tried he could not even get the poor animal to eat. He pleaded, cajoled and exhorted the critter to partake of its sustenance to no avail, and day by day the mule lost weight and grew weaker, much to the great concern of the farmer.

Happy he was, therefore, when his friend returned after two weeks. The farmer explained his inability, no matter how kind he had been, to get the mule to eat. The owner of the mule reached over, picked up a sledge hammer and clouted the animal three times as hard as he could right on the head. The farmer was shocked and asked his friend how he could treat the mule so cruelly, when he had asked the farmer to treat it with the greatest kindness. The friend replied, that before treating the animal with kindness, it was essential first of all to get his attention.

That is exactly what I have been trying to do, sir, to get the attention of the hon. Minister and his department.

Incidentally, sir, lest the Opposition members take any other meaning from my story, I do not want any inferences drawn or innuendoes made that the hon. Minister or anyone in his department are mules, or any other popular connotation. On the contrary, the hon. Minister is the height of graciousness, the epitome of understanding in every respect, a dedicated man, very capable of carrying out his heavy burden in a manner that brings high honour to his office.

I have suspected on the odd occasion that he recognizes that I am right, but for some reason or another his hands are tied, or he believes them to be tied. He has my kindest wishes and personal respect. I am aware that he carries onerous burdens, and is in fact a victim of circumstances in that he occupies his high post at a very trying and difficult time.

I thank the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) for the honour he did me in an address reported on page 551 of *Hansard*, in remarking that he took for granted that because I had now entered the Highway 401 problem it was some indication from the government benches that something would be done. Quite the contrary, sir. Personally, I had entered the fight long before the homeowners themselves had organized, and in fact had urged them to band together in their common interest. Secondly, if I had or have the ear of the government, most assuredly it is a deaf one, or it at least appears to be so to date.

It is rather appropriate that my problem concerns highways because I seem to be off on an excursion of my own. I had requested an interview with the hon. Minister in September, prior to the election, resulting in a meeting with him in January. I think a fair statement of this meeting would be to say that I did not come out or emerge with any optimistic outlook. I predicate this feeling on a statement made at the outset that any thoughts as to financial relief should be dispelled but any other suggestions to alleviate the problem, such as landscaping, noise barriers, and so on, would be discussed.

If no solution can be found to adequately remunerate by expropriation or any other means, then I submit any other red herrings are a feeble attempt to solve the conscience of the highways department, in fact they are an insult to the intelligence of the people, and as I said in my maiden speech, are comparable to throwing a doughnut to a drowning man as a lifesaver.

Two weeks subsequent to my meeting with the hon. Minister in January, a brief was presented to the hon. Minister and his department by a group called The 401 Ratepayers Association. This is an association of dedicated people, living adjacent to the highway as widened, who refuse to bow to the dictates of the highways department, and who as yet have not become reconciled to accepting the oppressive hand of this department without putting up a fight. They are fighting, sir, only to save their lifetime savings, which are invested in their homes.

Almost without exception, the decrease in

value, the devaluation of the property, succeeds in wiping out the entire equity of the homeowner, once again leaving the mortgage companies with no loss at all and the homeowner without a cent. I brought this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister in my maiden speech some six weeks ago and to date have absolutely no assurance whatsoever that even one homeowner more will have his property expropriated or receive any compensation whatsoever.

I am, quite frankly, very disappointed, not because of the apparent lack of action, but because slowly, inescapably and surely, the message is filtering through. My intuition tells me, and perhaps I am wrong and I hope and pray I am, that nothing further is going to be done, that a firm decision was made long before I entered the picture, probably long before the hon. Minister himself became an incumbent of this post, and that this decision will be strictly adhered to, this policy will be carried out adamantly, this practice will be railroaded through, regardless of personal loss to a small group of citizens.

I said, sir, and I reiterate, that I hope and pray that I am wrong, because if The Department of Highways can ride roughshod as it has over a segment of our decent law-abiding citizenry, I suggest there is no limitation on the powers of government, that through our administrative policies, not through our legislation, we make a mockery of all that is good and decent and fair and equitable. This being the case, sir, it behooves each and every one of us sitting in this House to examine and re-examine not our legislation, which we so ardently debate, but the manner in which our legislation is implemented. Whatever is done by a department of this government is a reflection on each and every one of us in this House. Therefore, it is imperative that our citizens, our decent, law-abiding citizens, be treated in a fair and equitable manner. To do otherwise is to negate the entire democratic processes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to spell out to the hon. members one thing and one thing only, for this is the trap I found, a clever trap, mind you. That is, that we do not need any new legislation. We are not creating precedents. We are not jeopardizing our highway construction programme. There is nothing, absolutely nothing standing in the way of helping these unfortunate people, except The Department of Highways.

My first approach is to the department, where I met with apparent sympathy and understanding and seeming concern that

nothing could be done. This was due, it was blandly pointed out to me, to inadequate legislation, respecting injurious damage. I fell hook, line and sinker for this plausible explanation and wasted hundreds of hours writing to every jurisdiction on the continent and studying highway expropriation statutes till I was blue in the face. Oh, yes, I was led nicely down the garden path strewn with legislative flowers.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How do you like them apples?

Mr. Carton: Fortunately, I came to the realization that this was not a legislative problem at all, but rather the whole problem centred around The Department of Highways and its willingness to expropriate property necessary for the highway construction.

When Highway 401 was originally built, we were told that this was going to be a thing of beauty, with appropriate landscaping and safety features. Accordingly, The Department of Highways expropriated sufficient property to render this possible. Not one person queried the width of the land acquired. It was used for highway purposes and this ended it. We had, in fact, a safety and a green belt area, and I emphasize the word safety. I am certain that there are designated criteria pertaining to adequate roadways. For example, a municipal road is 66 feet wide, a county road is 88 feet, an urban four-lane road is 200 feet and a rural four-lane road is 300 feet. Surely for safety reasons, if for no other, this 12-, 14-, 16-, 17-lane speedway should be commensurate in width.

Several years later, I submit, The Department of Highways finds that it must create additional highway facilities expeditiously and economically and seizes upon the idea of widening Highway 401 to become a super-colossal speedway. However, this time it utilized the land it formerly held to be necessary for a safety and a green belt area and expropriated only those houses sitting right on the highway. It put this hideous, and I mean hideous, and gargantuan, monster immediately adjacent to front and back yards as the case may be, and in some cases, within 20, 30 or 40 feet of the house itself.

For the benefit of the rural members, I suggest that if this came within 20, 30 or 40 feet of a barnyard in their riding, the farmer would probably want and succeed in getting his whole farm expropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to have some photographs of the areas concerned. I had two copies made, one for each side of the

House. I would appreciate hon. members having a look at these and may I state from the outset that these are not the worst cases. These are just typical cases of what is happening in the area.

I would like to read, if I may, from the—just very briefly, because I do not believe in reading excerpts from various things—but I would like to read one or two items from the brief presented by the Highway 401 rate-payers. I will read one short paragraph:

Members of the association who have placed their homes on the market have been frankly told by their respective real estate brokers—

I will prove this later by genuine letters:

—that the sale of their properties at what should be a fair and equitable price is hopeless, simply because of what is now, or will be in the near future, the proximity of the property in question to the expanded 401 highway.

In this particular brief, there is appended a letter. I will read one paragraph, and if any hon. member wishes to see these he is perfectly at liberty to do so. One paragraph:

At least eight different real estate people have suggested that we just walk off and leave the house for the mortgages owing.

Now may I state this: These people have \$5,000 equity in their house and, at least eight different real estate people have suggested that they just walk off and leave the mortgages.

That is one example. This is another example, addressed to a home owner at 65 Belgrave Avenue:

Replying to your inquiry of today's date I wish to say that I visited your home at 65 Belgrave Avenue, for sale in 1962, and for a period of about five months followed the usual procedures in an effort to dispose of the property. Although we had many calls from our advertisements and some from the sign on the property, and although we introduced the home to many others looking for this kind of home, we were unable to secure even the lowest possible offer.

Proximity to 401 highway, and the fact that this traffic artery was being widened to twelve lanes, reduced prospective buyer interest to zero.

It is our opinion that the prospects for a sale have not, and will not, improve for years.

This is a letter, Mr. Chairman, addressed to the claims adjuster of The Department of

Highways from another homeowner on Belgrave Avenue:

We are informed by our real estate agent that our property is totally unsaleable. There is concrete evidence of damage done to the structure, this being checking and cracking of plaster in every room in the house. The concrete floor in the garage is cracking and the brickwork at the rear of the house was repaired last fall.

Another letter from a real estate agent addressed to the people at 69 Belgrave Avenue:

I appreciate your calling me to list your house for sale, and I also fully realize the effect this location is having on the health of—

I will not name the lady.

However, the price of \$26,900, being what you paid, is completely unrealistic. The highway has depreciated your value by several thousand dollars, between \$6,000 and \$7,000 in my opinion.

I also noted considerable damage caused by the highway—

And it goes on to explain how he feels that they should go about getting compensation.

I have some pitiful letters, sir. Here is a letter from a widow:

I lost my husband in the fall of 1961, and have a daughter who has been very ill for over three years, and unable to work but for a few months of this period and who has, to this date, by no means recuperated. I have only one salary, that of my oldest daughter, coming in steadily and a very small widow's allowance.

We were in such a position, financially, that in June 1963 we were forced to take a second mortgage on our home so that we would not lose it. The equity that I had in the home has now depreciated to nothing.

That is from a widow, sir.

Mr. Chairman, *ad infinitum*, I could go on. There are many, many letters. I do not propose to bore this honourable House at length with various excerpts. I would prefer to get on with the point I am trying to make. I have not dwelt purposely on these specific cases because the evidence is there to see.

Any hon. member who is interested can drive, I suggest, along Wilson Avenue from Avenue Road to Bathurst Street where there is a three-block-long bridge of ascending height, a not-so-miniature Burlington Skyway, constructed of drab, grey concrete, wending its way across front and back yards, almost

into the very bedrooms of some homes. The hon. Minister himself, and his department officials, have stated on various occasions that they are in sympathy with the people affected. Therefore, sir, it is really unnecessary to establish the fact that these people have suffered, are suffering, and perhaps will suffer the rest of their lives through heavy financial loss.

This is the first basic. Grievous damage has been done. The second basic is pinpointing responsibility and, sir, this is no problem. It lies entirely and completely with The Department of Highways, an arm of this government; therefore, in the final analysis with the hon. members of this House. No matter how some of us may shift uneasily in our seat sometimes, we all know that under a democratic system, regardless of what may be done by or through any department, we are the ones who are responsible—you and I.

The estimates show almost \$82 million for maintenance, \$213 million for capital expenditures, and I am talking in infinitesimal proportions of these amounts. I repeat what I said in my maiden speech: That properly done, and I reiterate properly done, the cost would be almost negligible.

I am suggesting that a reasonable safety and green belt, uniform in width, be established in the residential area. I know I have a great deal of support from many hon. members, moral support from hon. members on all sides of this House. For this I thank them, because I repeat what I stated at the outset: I regret, sincerely regret, being so strong in my convictions, but this is my last opportunity to right an admitted wrong.

Many of my friends and personal supporters—and indeed, many of the homeowners affected by this problem—called me as late as last night, trying to dissuade me from making this second address, advising me that I had done all that I could for them and that I was only inviting personal political suicide within my own party.

My reply was twofold. If one is going to commit personal political suicide—and, incidentally, this I doubt—but if one is going to do this, it is better to do it honourably and openly and knowledgeably in the House for a good and worthwhile cause on behalf of one's constituents. This, perhaps, is my political naïveté, but I believe it to be my duty. Secondly, sir, as only one member of this great Conservative Party, I am expendable. The dynamic Conservative Party in this province, led by the finest leader in Canada today at any political level, is not. Therefore, if I sincerely and earnestly believe that wrong is

being done, that the rights of our citizens are being violated, and if all other attempts have failed, it is my duty to bring it to the attention of this House and to the attention of my hon. fellow members.

No government can afford to ignore the rightful pleas of its citizens, to wantonly, shamelessly, recklessly, knowingly deprive and, yes, rob its citizens of their life savings. Power misused can become a cancer, a self-destructive cancer, continually gnawing and eating away until, in time, the very core and the very heart of the victim is destroyed.

I conclude, sir, by stating the assault on—yes, the rape of Armourdale—is now completed, and other victims lie in the path. I ask only that a re-examination of the damage be made and that justice be done. I urge the hon. Minister and his department to approach the problem anew, to use a positive approach not a negative one, to show a sense of fairness and justice. Anything less is unworthy of our government; anything less should not be tolerated.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Yorkview has the floor, unless he wants to yield it.

Mr. Singer: Probably on the same subject.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, the speech which we have just heard is a very refreshing one. If it is recalled, in my participation in the Speech from the Throne, I mentioned that there was enough dynamite in this younger crew to blow many members right off the Treasury benches. Now the fuse is sputtering and the explosions are starting. I also, at that time, advised the hon. members to keep their idealism; and if the hon. members across the floor do not update their thinking, then they should bump them clear of those Treasury benches.

Mr. Sopha: I prefer to hear from the hon. Minister.

Mr. Young: I think that we will give the hon. Minister an opportunity in a moment, because I want to raise another problem here just to add to this. The fact remains that this is the kind of idealism which I think this House appreciates and the kind of courage which is refreshing. I am not going to take too much time, because the case has already been presented, and presented in a very forceful and a very good way.

But I do want to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House the

situation on Lorne Bruce Drive in my riding, where the people have bought homes with picture windows facing Highway 401. At the present time there is open space with a gentle slope up to the old 401 in front of the homes. In the estimates for this year, on page 43, the Toronto by-pass estimates, provision is made for reconstruction from Keele Street to Jane Street and reconstruction involves an 18-foot wall which will come right to the edge of the street in front of these picture windows and these people then will look out upon a towering mass of concrete. Already they have dubbed this wall "The Berlin Wall", and this is what they will call it when it comes.

In the estimates we were told that a basket weave structure is to go on top of that wall; an interchange so that traffic can flow from a main thoroughfare out to the collector roads at the sides. So that what these people are now going to see through their picture windows is the Berlin Wall topped with a basket weave structure, and they are not happy about it.

Right along the whole section of this highway, Mr. Chairman, people are going to suffer very serious depreciation of their homes, as we have heard. This kind of depreciation should not have to be borne by the few people on the side of that highway. This is a highway being built for the good of the whole province and so the depreciation should be a charge upon all the people of the province.

On Lorne Bruce Drive—as well as in other places—The Department of Highways can certainly work out some financial arrangement, perhaps by taking an option on these houses and offering them then at public tender. It may be some of the present owners will tender themselves at lower prices, I do not know. But first of all, the price should be established as of the time previous to the reconstruction of the highway and then the public tenders will determine what the value is after the construction has gone forward.

So I urge, Mr. Chairman, upon the hon. Minister of Highways, that this matter be taken under serious advisement and that these people who are suffering this great loss of equity in their homes should have very serious consideration in these estimates.

Mr. Singer: Along with the hon. members for Armourdale and Yorkview and at least two other hon. members in this House—

Mr. Sopha: Who are the silent ones?

Mr. Singer: To be quite fair, most of the hon. members are affected—and there are six

of us who have spoken in some form or other in connection with this matter. The hon. member for Armourdale described it as the rape of his riding. I would suggest it is really the rape of the whole of north Metro, because this problem is common to at least six provincial ridings; the ridings of York Mills, Armourdale, Downsview, Yorkview, Etobicoke and perhaps some others. I do not hesitate at all, Mr. Chairman, to pay to the hon. member for Armourdale the highest compliment. Had a speech such as he has given come from the benches of the official Opposition, I am certain that we would have been faced with all sorts of barracking and all sorts of suggestions about how foolish we were to put forward these ideas, the ideas nevertheless would have come forward. But it was an act of intense courage on the part of the hon. member to express himself, and express himself so forcefully.

I know how hard he has worked in studying this problem, how many meetings he has attended, and I have seen some of his files and have some idea as to how much effort he has put into trying to find a solution. But with him, I come to the end of the road in this problem. The answer lies on the government benches. The answer lies in the decision to be made by the hon. Minister of Highways.

And the question is a very simple one to which the hon. Minister, I hope later this afternoon, is going to provide an answer.

The question is: are a small group of citizens of Ontario, perhaps 300 in number, going to be forced to sacrifice themselves and their property, their assets that they worked so hard to amass, for the benefit of all of the people of Ontario, with the feeble excuse, with the ridiculous excuse, with the careless excuse, that we can do nothing?

This government can, if it wants, do something. When you see the pictures that the hon. member sent around the House; when you go out onto the ground and examine the chaos that has been created to these homes; when you talk to real estate agents; when you look at office buildings which previously were substantial assets to the people who bought them that are now completely unrentable; when you realize the havoc that has been caused by the action of The Department of Highways to these few people who are being called upon to pay for all of the people of Ontario—then if we must accept, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that can be done, we must accept the fact that this is a heartless government.

This is the only answer, Mr. Chairman. If this government is not prepared to put a

few more dollars into the \$12 million expenditure it talks about in its book, to compensate these people who are going to be so grievously hurt and who are so grievously hurt, then this is a heartless government.

I do not think anything more than I can add is going to present the case better than that presented by the hon. member for Armourdale, the hon. member for Yorkview and the other people who have spoken, or the remarks made previously by several hon. members of this House.

As my hon. friend from Yorkview said, it is not just a question of giving it careful consideration. There have been months of time in which anybody in this House and particularly the hon. Minister, has had time to consider it. All the hon. Minister has to do is talk to any one of his departmental officials who have come into the various meetings that have been held to listen to the rate-payers. One after another—and the department for reasons best known to itself always sent a different team—one after another, various officials got up and said, "We extend you our deepest sympathy".

Surely the government of Ontario can do something more than express sympathy when it itself has done a wrong.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills): Mr. Chairman, when Highway 401 was first begun, a green, or landscaping strip, was provided on either side of Highway 401 pavement. I do not believe it was put there merely as a precaution for future widening, but rather, I believe, it was put there for a purpose, a safety factor—a precaution for those adjoining the highway. It seems to me that if the hon. Minister and the department will accept that principle, which was apparently previously adopted by the department and adhere to it, particularly in these built-up areas, that they will solve much of this problem.

In my particular area—and I will not speak only for them—there is the fear of the unknown, because the widening of the highway has not reached this area as yet but it shall within the next year or two. Already it is having an adverse effect in that they do not know how close the actual pavement, the driving areas, will come to their own properties. If throughout this section, and other Metropolitan areas in this province where 401 must cut through existing areas, if we can have such a policy established—I am sure that the hon. Minister is giving consideration to this, for he has told me, and I believe he has told the hon. member for Armourdale and others, that he is giving

consideration to this—but if we can have a policy so there will be a space between the actual driving portion of this highway and adjoining properties, a clear and definable and irrevocable set-back, then we will help these people and help them immeasurably.

For indeed they do need to be helped and they deserve this consideration. I am sure that the hon. Minister is considering this and I am waiting to hear his decision.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to add my words of tribute to the courageous speech that was made by the hon. member for Armourdale. He has said, on more than one occasion, all that has to be said with reference to this problem. I am not going to go into any details as far as the riding of Etobicoke is concerned, except that the problem, as we have it, is a very minor one compared to Yorkview, Armourdale and Downsview.

I know that all hon. members of the House will join with me when I ask the hon. Minister if he will not tell us when some concrete action will be taken. If no action is going to be taken, I think it behooves the hon. Minister to stand up and say he is not going to take any action. I do not think it is fair for the people concerned to be kept on a string worrying as to what is going to happen.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, also representing a riding through which Highway 401 runs and where it is anticipated it will be widened, I would like to reiterate some of the sentiments made by the hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Armourdale and the hon. member for York Mills. I think, Mr. Chairman, the biggest problem in the riding of Scarborough North is the fear of the unknown. We do not know just how it is going to affect the area, although I am thankful, as the hon. member for Etobicoke is, Mr. Chairman, that because our riding is still largely undeveloped along 401 except for commercial development, the problem will not be nearly as great as it has been in some of the other areas. But I do think that there are areas that will be affected and that the principle of a green strip, as has been certainly established in the past, is one worthy of consideration. I hope that the hon. Minister will consider this, that where the highway pavement comes right to the edge of someone's property, it will be considered that a green strip, at least equal to what was in effect before the highway was widened, will be considered and instituted.

I think another problem that is faced, particularly in my riding and in those where the actual work has not yet begun, is this fear of what is going to happen. I hope the department will consider a public relations programme and institute meetings with residents who are in close proximity to the highway and explain to them exactly what is going to happen. I hope that when these meetings are held The Department of Highways will be able, in a concrete way, to tell them that they are going to establish some form of green strip and that this widening will not be a problem that will seriously affect them or their properties.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think at the outset that I should say to the hon. member for Armourdale and, of course, the hon. members who spoke, that no one needs to apologize for his convictions along these lines.

Addressing my remarks principally to the hon. member for Armourdale, because I think he made the case generally and those who spoke after him simply attempted to amplify what had already been said, I shall say to the hon. member that his concern and the concern of those for whom he speaks, is quite understandable.

Mr. Sopha: Then why did the hon. Minister not give him an appointment between September and January and why did he have to wait? Tell us the answer to that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you, sir, that if this hon. member will be patient for a few moments, I shall do my best to discuss what is a matter of serious concern to a lot of people without these frivolities.

Mr. Sopha: Frivolities. On a point of order, I take exception to that. I take great exception to that. It is not a frivolity at all, it is a very good question. Why, he had to wait from September to January.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I regard it as frivolous under the circumstances. The hon. member can have any opinion he likes about that.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister is losing his temper.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am not, I am quite serious about this, and I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to say to the hon. member for Armourdale, and I want to say to every hon. member of this House that I am not insensitive to these

problems that have been discussed here today.

I would refer the hon. member to a meeting in January, held, I believe, on January 30, at which time I was pleased to receive himself and representatives of the Highway 401 Ratepayers Association. I would also suggest to the hon. member that I had a meeting previous to that with him in my office and certain other people who are interested in this problem.

At the meeting on January 30, those whom the hon. member represents in the persons of the Highway 401 Ratepayers Association did present to me a brief. I felt, and I feel now, that every proposal that was submitted in that brief was worthy of very careful and very understanding consideration, and if I am not mistaken I believe the hon. member will attest to the fact that I directed on that occasion that every proposal that was made be thoroughly investigated. I further indicated to those who were in attendance that I did not see how we could possibly have anything to report to them for a period of less than two months. I believe that the hon. member will substantiate that.

While I have said in unequivocal terms that I am not insensitive to these problems, I also suggest to you, sir, and I suggest to the House, that when the reference is made to positive action, does this mean pursuing a situation in a unilateral manner, or should the Minister with any sense of responsibility, certainly, carefully and exhaustively investigate all sides of a difficult situation? Assuredly, Mr. Chairman, there are two sides to this situation. Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I am not in any sense of the word suggesting that a preconceived idea or a preconceived decision exists. I do not think it ever has on the part of my staff, it certainly never has on my part. However, I would like to suggest that I have no intention at this moment of minimizing the problem that confronts these people, because it is a very serious problem, as each and every one of us knows and only has to ask himself whether if he were confronted with the same problem, would he feel identically the same as they do.

On the other hand, I say this, and I want to repeat as positively as I can, that while we are going to examine the other side of the problem, it does not mean to infer that this preconceived decision has been reached. The other side of the problem is simply this—and nobody knows it better than the hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Chairman, because he at one time, headed a municipal government

—that the effects of the decision, whatever it may be when it is made, can have a similar effect on every similar jurisdiction in the province, with like problems.

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. members, that in line with what I regard as my responsibility, I propose to investigate that side of the problem as well.

I submit then, sir, that until both sides of this problem have been thoroughly investigated, and all pertinent matters relating to the problems have been thoroughly investigated, I will not, I cannot, in line with my responsibilities, make any decision. It will be made when these thorough investigations—and I assure you, sir, they will be thorough; every related matter will be weighed and carefully considered—have been completed. There are no preconceived decisions or ideas in existence at the moment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I listened with very great interest to the remarks of the hon. Minister. I found out just one little bit of information that I was not aware of until he spoke, that was that when the brief was presented by the Highway 401 Ratepayers Association, the hon. member for Armourdale was there.

I am delighted that at least one hon. member who had spoken in this House upon this matter, before the meeting took place, was allowed to attend. I would have thought it would have only been courtesy to have invited all hon. members who were concerned with this problem, no matter whether they were Liberal members, NDP members or Conservative members. But that was not done.

However, I again congratulate the hon. member for Armourdale for the fight he has been carrying on; and perhaps he has got an easier entrée into the hon. Minister's office than some of the rest of us.

But let me draw to the hon. Minister's attention these facts: He became aware of this problem long before January 30. Or, if he did not, then a whole series of his departmental staff are not doing their job, because this matter came to the forefront early in September of 1963, and many reported speeches were carried in the newspapers. There were many public meetings and, as I said before, Mr. Chairman, to each of those meetings the hon. Minister's office was requested to send officials, and they did send officials. I met, during the course of four or five meetings I attended, I would think, at least 15 different departmental officials. This went on through the fall.

Unless those people did not go back to the department and report to the hon. Minister, which I find very hard to believe, then the hon. Minister knew of this long before January 30. The hon. Minister must have known about it, good politician that he is. He must have known about it, being the Minister of Highways, the first time it hit the newspapers, and that was early in September. So we have September, October, November, December, January and February, to March 17. The hon. Minister says there are two sides. I agree with the hon. Minister. There are always two sides to any problem.

What is being suggested here, by all the hon. members who have spoken, is that the government add X dollars—and no one can identify that figure at the moment—to the cost of the highway.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one further point. These X dollars which are asked, to be devoted to the care and attention of the people who have been done this grievous wrong, are asked to be given only to do equity to a tiny group of people who are being penalized in the name of all of the people of Ontario. And, after September, October, November, December, January, February, March, one would have thought that, when his estimates came forward on March 17, we would have had the answer for better or for worse, so that the answer could have been debated on the floor of this House, Mr. Chairman, not just a promise of further investigation.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, might I swing the minds and thoughts and voices of some of these jaundiced members in the Toronto area up to the great fresh breezes of northwestern Ontario.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): We dealt with your area yesterday and you were not here.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have listened to you, and a little while later I will be talking to the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) about some things he said yesterday, but I will not right now. This will be in a Budget speech, if I have a chance to give one.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the highways department in this province has done more to open up the great northwestern part of this province than any other department of government and the north was never opened up until a Conservative government came in in 1943. Before that time, one great road opening I attended in the town of Geraldton was to do honour to a piece of road the great

Liberal government had built, running six miles from Geraldton to Creelman Creek. That was the type of highway building done in those days, under the Liberal administration. My friend, the hon. leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver), who is a great friend of mine, will remember those days well.

The only road we had each year, in Port Arthur and Fort William, was from the cities down to the Pigeon River bridge. That was a yearly contract for about six or seven miles, and was paved with a pavement probably half an inch thick. It was a yearly contract, and that road, for years, was so bad that it took two days to go to Duluth—our only outlet.

Then my mind goes back to the trans-Canada highway, when it was started by the Bennett government around the shore of Lake Superior. The Liberal government came in in the federal House, then all those contracts were stopped; every camp was closed down; every contractor went into bankruptcy; but we, in the north, still had our railways, thank God. That was the Liberal record on roads in northern Ontario, which is on record for you to read.

Let us see what has happened since that time, under Conservative governments. Any of you, who have the privilege to come up to my area, will see the great trans-Canada highway. I will give credit to the Liberal government in Ottawa for putting up part of the money, for a scenic road of benefit to transport companies and the public, there is no more beautiful highway in the world. One mile of that road—the hon. Minister knows the mile of which I am speaking—cost almost \$2 million, through rock-cuts 70 or 85 feet high along the Lake Superior shore. It is something which is not only of benefit to industry, but of great benefit for its scenic value—a marvellous piece of road construction.

Then we have Highway 11. Let me tell you of some of these roads; they are a part of our northwestern Ontario development.

Final contracts were awarded last year for the completion of the Atikokan-Fort Frances section of Highway 11, with expectations that this major road artery will be ready for traffic late in 1964, or early 1965, including the Rainy Lake causeway. You know something about that, Mr. Chairman, because we are going to try to have it called after you. It is a great piece of construction, exceeding \$17 million in cost, to bring in a tourist area which will bring thousands and thousands of American tourists. And those from the eastern part of Ontario, from Metro Toronto—who

will be grieving so much about the land appropriated for roads and that they have not been paid enough for the land. Eastern Ontario citizens will want to come up to the north and see something beautiful in the great northwest—including our great highways.

Opened in the past three years was the Spruce River resources road, to the heart of the Thunder Bay pulp forests. Then the Manitouwadge-Caramat industrial highway—a new resource road which this government built with the help of Marathon Paper Co. This was the first road built under the policy of the roads to resources, to see that our great mineral and forest wealth was opened up for the benefit of the people of this great province.

The Ignace-Savant Lake link of the roadway to Pickle Lake, beyond the Albany River to the great Pickle Crow gold mine, to open up that area there. That is the road this government has built, in spite of the discrimination and the objection of the Opposition in this very Legislature where I am speaking today.

The new international bridge at Pigeon River, and new sections of Highway 61, eliminating the former highway route of steep grades and sharp curves. Reconstruction of the trans-Canada highway between the Lakehead and Manitoba continued, and paving of the Red Lake highway also made progress.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Do they pay the hon. Minister for overtime?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: For some of the things the hon. member has said recently, he is not going to be paid overtime; but when the next election comes along the people of every area will probably take their toll—which he will regret.

Mr. Sopha: Do not rub it in.

An hon. member: That goes for you, too, Elmer.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Of significance, Mr. Chairman, to the northwest, was the opening of the international bridge at Sault Ste. Marie, as my friend, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart) will remember.

Mr. Sopha: Get up and take a bow.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: A great \$24 million project, eliminating a bottleneck ferry service and enabling easier access to the Lake Superior section of the great trans-Canada highway for our American friends. Acutely needed rebuilt and paved highway links for

Sioux Lookout and Manitowadge to the trans-Canada—that great mineral producer which would not have been able to get its product to the markets of the world had it not been for this government putting in that branch from Highway 17.

Mr. Sopha: Is that why the hon. Minister goes in by helicopter?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: No, it is just because my time is taken up sitting here in this House listening to the hon. member, when I could be out doing better things.

Mr. Sopha: Very useful employee.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): What are we doing now?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: These important northwestern communities, for far too long under a Liberal government, had been served by obsolete and dangerous roads. Urgent also is road access to the nickel mining and smelting community at Werner Lake in the Kenora area and improvement of the Fort Frances-Kenora highway cannot be delayed. With that we agree; the hon. Minister agrees. These matters will be attended to.

Mr. Whicher: How does the hon. Minister know?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: The only reason we do not do more of this is because the hon. members object to the money we are spending now for these necessities.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the hon. Minister reading from?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: This is the last report of the Ontario Development Association, and I am reading to be polite to the hon. member. If I gave my own thoughts they would be more ambitious than this, because I have seen every foot of every one of these roads I am speaking about.

Mr. Sopha: You are destroying my faith.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: To eliminate hazards at rail crossings, overpasses were completed or are under way on the trans-Canada highway near the Lakehead and near English River—tremendous big overpasses are being built that really do cost something to build and will last for years. Another is at Dryden, and an improved subway is projected at Sioux Lookout. Secondary road extensions were authorized, planned and built to Northern Light Lake near the eastern border of Quetico Park. In the Red Lake and Sioux

Lookout areas initial work was planned on a new road from Pickle Lake to the Manitoba border. Another resource road is the great road going from Pickle Crow Mines over to West Lingman Lake, which has already unearthed many mineral treasures up in that far northern area.

Mr. Sopha: Where?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, our Lakehead by-pass is now past the planning stage and will be commenced, I imagine, some time this year. It is a great by-pass, or ring road, to go on the outside of both those cities at a cost of millions of dollars and we are undertaking other projects too numerous to mention. I am telling you that The Department of Highways has done a great job for the north as it has right here in Metropolitan Toronto. When we criticize and talk about the things that have not been done, money is the only thing that has prevented this great department from doing a better job than it has already done.

Mr. Sopha: Two government members and two Opposition members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: All right, if you in the Opposition benches would stop once in a while carping and criticizing, we would be privileged to get on much faster with this great work. I have no hesitation in saying that there is not one of you men over there who can tell me that any time you have gone to see our Department of Highways that you were not treated with courtesy and consideration. I would like anybody to get up and deny that in this House. I know it is not a fact.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): I will get up and deny that right now.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: I cannot even get an appointment.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I cannot accept that remark. Only if the money was not available would the highways department refuse a good request. That is the only reason the hon. member would be refused.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot even get an—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: And then the hon. member would come in the House and vote against the money to do it with, and then kick when it was not done although the hon. member well knew the reason why.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay a tribute to the hon. Minister and the men in The Department of Highways. I believe that our hon. Minister—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): What about the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts)?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Well, the hon. Prime Minister—we do not have to praise him in this House. Every person in the province of Ontario is doing that every day outside, so it does not matter whether we do it here or not. I just want to say that this hon. Minister, in my opinion, sir, is one of the hardest-working Ministers that this province has ever had. I have been in this House many years. I do not know whether there is one man over there who has been in this House longer than I have.

Mr. Thompson: Why do you have to praise him?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: All right, say so if you have. Ah, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and he is one of the men who criticizes the least. He has seen what this department has done. All of the hon. members over there know the way they are treated by the present Minister of Highways, with courtesy and kindness and consideration. There is never anything he turns down that is asked for, provided he has the funds to do it with and thinks it is necessary.

Mr. Sopha: He will not answer his mail; is that courtesy?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: He does not answer until he gets the answer himself to give you. Some of the hon. members, if they get a letter, just say, "Oh, yes, I will do it so and so—" and then forget all about it. But he does not do that.

Mr. Sopha: George, you are destroying my faith in Parliament.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I am very sorry if I have done that. I think so highly of the hon. member and the great riding up at Sudbury that I certainly would not like to say anything derogatory about the hon. member.

I also want to say a word, Mr. Chairman, about the staff of The Department of Highways. Right from the top down—and I have known many of them—when they were far below the positions they occupy today—and all through those years my association with them has been kindly—they have been considerate and they have done everything they

possibly could do to assist me and the great area which I represent.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say these things because I believe them in my heart. I wanted to say them publicly so that these men would realize that the opinions of other members of this Legislature—and they are often critical—certainly do not apply to all of us here. I say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister and his staff, to carry on in the way they are doing and this province will be noted throughout the world for the beautiful highways and the multiplicity of highways that we have. It will grow in the years to come and this will be one of the places where tourists can get to the farthest part of our province through good roads. There will be facilities on these highways to look after the public, because these facilities cannot be built until the roads are built. I think The Department of Highways staff in this province has done a good job and I want to compliment it sincerely for it.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I was pleased last night to hear the news of the hon. Minister when he announced that tenders would be called for the completion of the two south lanes of Highway 401 between Tempo and Tilbury in southwestern Ontario. Also a few weeks ago I was pleased to hear the hon. Minister announce that the interchanges, underpasses and overpasses in that area will be built this year or contracts will be called, also that contracts will be called for four service centres in that area and maybe completed this year.

But I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister that these two north lanes have been a hazard to the travelling public in southwestern Ontario since they were officially opened last October. There have been too many accidents, too many deaths on that two-lane strip between Tilbury and Tempo. I know the hon. Minister came through that area last year and said, "Why the delay?" and "There is not sufficient money to complete Highway 401, the south two lanes."

However, this afternoon, I tried to find out, or since last week I have tried to find out, how many accidents there were between October and the present time on that two-lane highway strip. Of course, we have been given the runaround from one department to another, Mr. Chairman, and it finally winds up that this information is not available to the hon. members of this House or to the official Opposition.

They referred us to regulation number 143, section 5, which information is only available

to the courts. This seems to be unusual and it is a great surprise to me that this information is not available to the members of the Opposition in this House.

Another matter I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister, too, before he answers these remarks of mine, is that we see in different papers where new cloverleaf designs require more land. In two county roads in southwestern Ontario, the interchanges were surveyed and fenced, and outside this interchange a businessman applied for a permit to build a place of business. This past summer he built a place of business and this winter along came the officials of The Department of Highways and informed him that the land will be needed for a new-design cloverleaf.

It states in this paper that this may take place at every cloverleaf across the province of Ontario, which means a change in 102 cloverleafs from one end of Highway 401 at Windsor to the other at Quebec, which means a staggering amount of money. I might say that it is estimated that two of these interchanges—with the new buildings which will have to be paid for and the Department of Highways needs land—it is estimated that it will run into \$100,000 at these two county roads.

Now with the increase in the gasoline tax it is staggering that these reports come out in the paper. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the hon. Minister's comments on these things.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, with respect to this matter of accidents on the north lane section of 401, I would say that if we do not provide you with this information as accurately as we can within the next few days, the hon. member should feel free to rise in the House and ask it over again because this information is available. We do sometimes have to assemble it, Mr. Chairman, from The Department of the Attorney General, the Ontario Provincial Police and The Department of Transport, but it can be obtained and hon. members can have a record of these accidents and where they took place.

In certain situations I think you will understand that we are not able to comment on the causes and the nature of and the responsibility of those who may have been associated in these accidents, because they may be under investigation by the courts. But we will certainly give the hon. member a record of where they took place to the extent I mentioned.

With respect to this property matter associated with the interchanges on the section of Highway 401 between Tempo and Tilbury, I am prepared to say to you that in the circumstances you describe, there were some problems. But I am also prepared to say, and I know you will be relieved to know, that they have been all resolved. We have been down to see these people; we have redesigned some of the quadrants of the interchanges to the point where their property is not going to be affected or required.

In each and every circumstance, I can say to you, Mr. Chairman, the problems to which the hon. member makes reference have been satisfactorily resolved and we have taken steps to ensure that those problems cannot recur.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the hon. Minister that we are concerned, too, that when the tourist season comes along, the traffic will increase greatly in that portion of 401 and in that area. I ask the hon. Minister to accelerate this work as much as possible. I think if he does it will help prevent accidents and maybe save lives.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I will not speak on Highway 401, I will speak on 200½, because that is all we happen to have in southwestern Ontario, the north two lanes. When we get the other two lanes then we will call it 401.

The hon. Minister mentioned yesterday that he was going to proceed with the requesting of tenders for the paving of the other two lanes. I would like the hon. Minister to assure us that 401 will be completed in 1964 as, I understand, he said yesterday; because in reading from the Windsor *Daily Star* of yesterday, we understand that 401 will not be completed until 1965. Mr. Chairman, if it is 1965, it is the old story over again.

We come in one year and we are told it will be completed in the following year. One year the weather interferes; the next year there is something else that will interfere. We would like assurance from the hon. Minister that 401 will be completed in 1964, because he has already assured the municipality of Windsor by letter at one time that they were going to accelerate the paving of the other two lanes of 401. Surely if they were going to accelerate it, it would not be difficult to pave—I think it is 68 more miles, approximately 68 miles, of ready graded road, all except for the concrete ribbon.

He knows the importance of this to the community at the extreme southwest of the province. We would not request this be

done were we not in the position that we have been in ever since the Ford Motor Company decided to concentrate their manufacturing in the Toronto area. We have approximately 7,000 still unemployed and it is of vital importance to us to get the complete concrete four-lane ribbon from the Windsor area right through to Toronto.

We need it now for the sake of tourism, for the sake of industry and agriculture. The longer this government procrastinates and holds off, the more difficult it is going to be for the people in the Windsor area to attempt to overcome the deficiencies that they are confronted with as a result of being an extremity in this province.

Can the hon. Minister at this time assure us that 401 will be completed in 1964?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was in his seat yesterday. He must have heard me say that all contracts would be called in a matter of weeks for the completion of the south lane of 401. He would also have heard me say that if we got a few breaks from the weather and the other associated breaks that we need in terms of construction problems, and we have them, then he would also have, I think, sensed, or heard the acknowledgement made by his seat-mate, the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough), when reference was made to a weather situation a few years ago when road building equipment was idle for a period of 30 days and quite visibly so; then he would know that I made no promise that it would be completed in 1964 because as yet, Mr. Chairman, I have found no way to control the weather.

However, I repeat, and I hope it is for the last time, that this section of Highway 401 will be completed if we get the breaks we need, weather and otherwise.

Now last year I recall the hon. member played to me, or sang to me, the first version of the Newman refrain and—

Mr. Sopha: Pretty nasty today, are you not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am not. I am just being a little positive for a change.

Mr. Sopha: Do not get nasty with me.

Mr. Bryden: A good thing he sang the refrain.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very well, but if he will recall the remarks that were made a year ago, it was simply suggested that we would have the north lanes paved and

finished. When we were questioned about that I think I recall myself saying that I will promise nothing else but that we would proceed upon the completion of the north lanes with contracts to complete the south lanes. I make the same statement here today, but, of course, Mr. Chairman, for me to promise something that may well be impossible would be nonsense. I simply tell you that we are going to award these contracts and if we get the breaks we need the road will be finished. If we do not, it is because it is humanly impossible to do it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I strongly object to the hon. Minister's remarks stating if I were here! May I inform the House that I was in my seat in this House yesterday as long, if not longer, than was the hon. Minister, and I make it a point to be here practically all of the time.

Mr. Chairman, with two hon. members from Windsor not feeling too well, I see to it that I am here all the time.

An hon. member: Three!

Mr. Newman: Well, possibly three. The hon. Minister mentioned the Newman refrain. He will hear the Newman refrain as long as the people from Windsor send me to this House. Were we not to have problems in the Windsor area, I would be here patting the hon. Minister on the back. But because we have problems and because the good people in Windsor recognize ability, they send me here.

And I like me too! Mr. Chairman, they threw in the best opponent they could have in the last election and my majority went up substantially.

Mr. Chairman, in last year's *Hansard* the hon. Minister says:

However, let me assure you that paving operations will continue without interruption until four lanes are completed over the entire length of Highway 401.

We heard this story last year. So you will hear that Newman refrain up until the time you have 401 completed, four lanes. Up until that time it will be only 200½ and not 401 to us.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think it is noteworthy that under the estimates of every single department the hon. Minister of Mines stands up and heaps fulsome praise on the hon. Ministers and departments concerned. And yet when the estimates of The Department of Mines were before this House, not one hon. Minister opposite got up to say

even one nice thing about the hon. Minister of Mines. It was so obvious at the time, Mr. Chairman, that I felt impelled to step into the breach myself; but, unfortunately, try as I could, I could not think of a single thing to say and I judge that the hon. Minister's colleagues suffered from the same disability.

Mr. Chairman, last night when we were dealing with vote 801, I tried to raise the matter of the fair wage policy of The Department of Highways. At the time you called to my attention that that question could more properly be discussed under vote 803, and I would like to deal with it briefly at this time. Before you ruled me out of order last night, I had called to the attention of the hon. Minister the fact that this government, in relation to fair wage policies, is at least 40 years behind the federal government.

We continue, in this province, to do no more on construction contracts than to insert a minimum wage in the contract. The minimum wage is now \$1.30 an hour. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that it is most unlikely that any contractor could get anybody to work on construction work for less than \$1.30 an hour, so that the minimum he has inserted there is really quite meaningless. It is a gesture in the direction of a fair wage policy without any of the substance of such a policy.

I also expressed surprise last night that we had made no further progress than that in the direction of fair wage policies, because it had certainly been my impression that the government had announced last year that it intended to implement a genuine fair wage policy. This, I suppose, was one of many pieces of window-dressing prior to the election which have now gone down the drain. But I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that this is an important issue. It is one on which he should, no doubt, seek the assistance and advice of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree); but fundamentally, I think, since it relates to contracts let by his department, it is his responsibility.

The federal programme, which has been in effect for at least 40 years, is that whenever a construction contract is let, one of the schedules attached to it is a schedule of minimum wages, specifying that wages below the figure set forth may not be paid for the different categories of labour specified. Those wages are drawn up by the federal Department of Labour on the basis of going wages in the localities concerned, and the federal Department of Labour is responsible to make sure that the wages are actually paid.

It seems to me that this government, with

the kind of contracts they are entering into, should also adopt such a policy. They would undoubtedly need the assistance of The Department of Labour, but the implementation of such a policy, in my opinion, would not impose an undue burden on the staff of The Department of Labour. It would be necessary to draw up schedules for different localities and to revise them from time to time. But the federal government is doing that all the time, and I am quite certain that the federal Department of Labour would be quite prepared to let the provincial government have access to its work in that field.

They collect a lot of their information now through the national employment offices and it is public information, anybody can have it. I am sure a co-operative arrangement could be worked out with the federal government, whereby wage schedules could be drawn up for the different categories of labour involved on highway construction, with very little additional work on the part of the civil service of this province.

Once again, I regret to say, it is necessary to make this plea; but I am once again making a plea to the hon. Minister that this is the kind of policy that should be adopted—it is the only adequate policy. The hon. Minister mentioned last night that an increasing number of the people working for contractors on construction work are becoming organized and are now working under union contracts. That is a welcome development, and will no doubt ensure that a large percentage of the employees on these contracts get fair and reasonable wages. But I think the fact that many of the employees are now organized makes it all the more necessary to have fair wage schedules in the contracts. It now becomes, or may become, possible for a contractor whose work force is not organized, and who may be paying very much lower wages to get an unfair advantage over those paying good wages, in bidding on contracts offered by the department.

I think the fact that some of the employees are organized makes it desirable that standards of wages should be set for all those who wish to bid on government contracts, so that there will be no possibility that a contractor will gain a competitive advantage on the basis of low wages. I would think anyone in this House would agree that that is an undesirable form of competition. The whole purpose, or one of the main purposes, of a fair wage policy is to prevent that sort of competition.

Another purpose, of course, and I think a most important purpose, is that governments

should set an example in the treatment of labour. They should not let contracts to anyone unless they are quite certain that the people who earn their living by working for the contractors to fulfil the contract will be decently paid, and will have decent conditions of labour. It is too bad that we have to bring this up year after year but, as far as I am concerned, I am going to bring it up every year until the government is prepared to state that it has adopted an adequate fair wage policy.

I must say I missed the opportunity to raise this matter under the estimates of The Department of Public Works. As I say, I have been under the impression that a more adequate policy had been adopted. I do not know if it has been in Public Works, but apparently from what the hon. Minister told us yesterday it has not been adopted in The Department of Highways. As for his minimum wage of \$1.30 an hour, I would suggest to him that in, what the gentlemen opposite always like to refer to as the banner province of Ontario—and I believe it is the banner province of Ontario—a minimum wage of \$1.30 an hour on government contracts is an absolute disgrace.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask one question of the hon. Minister? I notice on page—

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get some information from the hon. Minister. I will be sorry for the hon. Minister of Mines if it does not turn into a criticism, because far be it from me to walk away from anything that might be construed as criticism of the government. As the hon. member for York South said yesterday, it is our responsibility to criticize when the opportunity presents itself. It is most difficult, of course, for the Opposition to find things into which we can really get our teeth into and get information which will help us correct the way we have trod in the past.

I want to ask the hon. Minister some questions relating to Highway 401, principally through the city of Toronto. This will be, I presume, an auxiliary contract to the main contracts which are being let. It is contract No. 63318, and it has to do with tree planting. It says from Avenue Road to Hogg's Hollow—that will be the area in which the trees are to be planted.

I have in my hand a list of the verified bids for this tree-planting project. A further

examination reveals that this call was for 400 trees, and they are to be white spruce, which is quite an ordinary tree for Ontario, and Austrian pine. As I will relate in a moment or so, I am presuming, on the evidence that I have, that Austrian pine and white spruce are similar in value, because the latter part of the contract reads that the contractor may provide 200 white spruce or Austrian pine. So presumably, from a cost level, they are on precisely the same basis.

These 400 trees were to be planted. I have not any idea whether they are planted at the moment or not, but certainly the contract is let. Two hundred of these were to be brought in from Kipling—no, Liverpool sideroad—and if you ask how far that is they will tell you it is 24 miles, or in the vicinity of 20 to 24 miles. Apparently 200 of these trees were growing on highway property at the Liverpool sideroad, and it was considered to be wise on the part of The Department of Highways to bring 200 of these trees in and replant them in the area that I have noted—the Avenue Road-Hogg's Hollow area. The other 200 trees were to be provided by the contractor, secured, I imagine, from a nursery.

The contract was let for \$55,600 for 400 trees. That works out, if my arithmetic is any good at all, to about \$140 a tree. I hope they look good when they get them planted in Hogg's Hollow and in that area, because \$140 a tree is a lot of money. It would seem to me to be an indication that The Department of Highways is not husbanding its resources very properly, when it pays \$140 a tree to have 400 trees planted.

If it wanted 200 white spruce trees, surely it could have secured these from The Department of Lands and Forests. Surely there is enough co-operation between departments that they have not got to go out and buy these trees at these prices and have them planted to the extent that the total contract comes to \$55,600. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, is this a fair cost to attach to the planting of trees on the highways of this province? Is that about your average cost, about \$140 per tree? Is it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It would appear to work out to about that, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I think I should say it involves more than the cost of the actual tree. I may require to get more information on this for the hon. leader of the Opposition but I think he would go along with me when I say that there is more than the cost of the tree involved. There is the transportation, there is the cost of keeping them alive, I guess,

and there is the cost of planting them. I must confess I do not know what this should properly cost, but I will be more than happy to find out and get this information, possibly this afternoon by phone. If that will—

Mr. Oliver: I just cannot for the life of me see the justification for digging up 200 trees out at Liverpool sideroad, or wherever it is, transporting them over 20 miles into Hogg's Hollow and planting them there at the terrific cost entailed in this contract. I think it is a waste of public money.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, at the moment, until I have more information, I am obliged to say that it looks like a lot of money to me. We will see if I can offer some more information to the hon. leader of the Opposition very shortly.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. Minister is looking into it, I wonder if he could ascertain too—not just a little p.s. to my hon. leader's remarks—what happened to the trees that were there before the department started widening, because there were a number of trees that were growing there and they just seem to have vanished.

Mr. Bryden: The bulldozer got them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member, if those trees are not there now I think he can safely assume that they had to be removed.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am sure they did but why could they not be replanted instead of the hundred-and-forty-dollar trees?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There again, I am informed that everything that was salvageable and could be replanted from those trees was handled in that manner. I am not a tree expert, I must tell you. We will have to get some more information.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough North has the floor.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to say that even though we may have some problems, I am sure that all hon. members of this House would agree that we have one of the finest Ministers of Highways that we have ever had. Certainly, while we may have a few problems, we all feel this way toward him.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wells: I would like to again just say a few words about Highway 401, but on another aspect of this highway and one I

think which will find favour with most hon. members of this House.

I am sure that we are all heartened with the hon. Minister's words when he says that the highway is nearing completion, and we know that it will be completed very shortly. In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the naming of this highway is wrong. Four-o-one may have been all right when this was just little strips of unconnected highway across the province, but now when we have highways designated 402, 403, 406, and so forth, I feel that some consideration should be given to renaming Highway 401.

When we look around North America, particularly down in the United States, we find that there is the New York State Thruway, the Pennsylvania Turnpike, the Garden State Parkway, the John F. Kennedy Expressway, and even here the Frederick G. Gardiner Expressway.

Here in Ontario we have a beautiful functional highway, a black ribbon of progress that spreads right across this great province of opportunity from the Quebec border to the city of Windsor. I think that it is the road that we could say is Main Street, Ontario, and I think it should have a name fitting of the position of distinction which it holds. I would like to suggest two alternatives to the hon. Minister for his consideration.

As we approach the centennial year in 1967, perhaps it might be an idea to institute a contest in all the schools in the counties through which this road runs, and have the students submit names which they think would be applicable to this great highway. Or, Mr. Chairman, if this is not thought feasible, I would suggest for the consideration of the hon. Minister that the highway be named the Leslie M. Frost Thruway.

Mr. Whicher: How about the Lester Pearson Highway?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make some observations now to the hon. member who has just spoken, and I do this at the risk of incurring the displeasure of certain senior members of my staff.

I concur with the hon. member, I think there is nothing less romantic about a highway than a number. I personally believe that the point is well taken. I would also associate certain problems with that. I am sure the hon. members will bear me out, that from the administrative point of view, there are problems associated with names versus numbers. Nevertheless, I simply say to the hon. member that he finds the Minister very sympathetic to his proposal. It is going

to be considered and I would find myself quite happy if somehow we could accomplish just what has been suggested here today.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview has the floor.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister regarding an item which is outlined on page 54, referring to the highway east of Gananoque. I notice that 401 at that point does not use Highway No. 2. I can understand that. It would have to be rebuilt *in toto*, but it also seems to be ignoring the partial highway which was built some years ago, with the dual bridges and which was just reconstructed in part some years ago. The route outlined on the map seems to be midway between the two present routes. It may be because of the type of granite along there, or the fact that the bridges may be too narrow, I do not know what the reason is. But there must be some good reason and I would direct the question to the hon. Minister as to what the reason is, why the old route is abandoned along the lake and the new route is being placed midway between these two roads.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member that we feel that a new alignment for the controlled-access facility is required. The section of highway he refers to, firstly almost prohibits appropriate control of access. It is not built to adequate standards associated with the standards we use for the construction of these controlled-access freeways. Second, we think we would be well advised to retain this road that you refer to in its present state, because it is one of the best scenic drives in the province.

This is, Mr. Chairman, what has prompted us to move the alignment for the four-lane controlled-access section of 401. There are a number of other associated problems, but frankly, we have all too few of these scenic drives throughout the province and we think it is folly to destroy them all. So these essentially are the reasons why it is being done.

Mr. Young: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth East has the floor.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning when I picked up my book that had been presented to us by the hon. Minister regarding the capital construction programme, there was also attached a letter asking the hon. members to regard the contents as confidential until we had begun at least to deal with his estimates.

Before I got the book and had even opened it, I opened the *Globe and Mail* and I saw an article which was an announcement by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) that the Ontario government was going to spend \$500,000 for an 18-mile stretch of highway between highway 576 and Timmins.

I wonder if the hon. Minister had disregarded the confidence. It is a picayune thing. So I looked through the book and I cannot see any reference to this project as contemplated in this programme between now and 1965. I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us whether this is going to come about, or why it is not in the programme if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs can take the opportunity on a Sunday to make this announcement?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What was the designation again?

Mr. Gisborn: The 18-mile stretch between Highway 576 to Kamiskotia Lake.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that is a mining and access road and as such it will not appear in your programme, it is done under another programme. It is not our own highway department's capital construction programme. It is the mining and access roads programme.

In that light, I would simply say the hon. Minister was not disclosing any information, because the tender call had already been advertised. So he was simply commenting on a tender that had been called.

Mr. Gisborn: Thank you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I noticed in the programme, we are told No. 8 Highway is going to be regraded and the drainage problem looked after. I am very pleased about this, because it really needs it. It is a highway that has become in bad repair and I am glad we are going to get this looked after.

I also am pleased that we have now, in the past year, had Highway 20 completed. There was a very good job done on that portion. But there is a portion of highway in my riding, the Queen Elizabeth from Hamilton to the Lincoln county line, about which I am highly concerned. This concerns the development of that stretch into a controlled access highway.

I am under the impression that property has been expropriated in preparation for service roads. I have watched the programme as indicated in the past, and the further programme laid out for the next year on the development of controlled access roads and structures from

the Lincoln county line to the Homer bridge—now the Garden City skyway bridge. I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain the delay of developing the Queen Elizabeth in this area to a controlled-access road.

There are three or four stop lights there and crossroads. We have had our share of serious accidents and fatalities in that area. We have now developed the Garden City skyway bridge, the Burlington skyway bridge, to take care of the traffic flow. In between the two, we have developed a bottleneck with stop lights and open access roads. I would hope that we could get on with the job of really putting in the controlled-access roads in this section of the highway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would presume you are speaking about the Queen Elizabeth Way between Hamilton and well, Niagara Falls, if you like? Is that what you are talking about? St. Catharines?

Mr. Gisborn: Between Hamilton and the Lincoln county line. You are doing quite a job in developing controlled access from there on. Why not the portion that is in Saltfleet township?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would, I think, simply say to that, that we cannot do everything at once, Mr. Chairman. We do our best to develop a programme within the keeping of our ability to do so and the funds that are made available for that purpose. At least we are starting to control the access on the Queen Elizabeth Way and it will be controlled in its entirety when this programme is finished. But we cannot do it all at once, it is as simple as that.

Mr. Gisborn: I think the hon. Minister—through you, Mr. Chairman—I think the hon. Minister's argument, when he stated that money is a problem, that it might have to wait, bears some merit—it seems to me that we are putting the cart before the horse in this whole development in that area.

We have developed the skyway to ease the bottleneck of traffic flow from the east and we went ahead with the skyway over the Welland Canal to do the same thing. But we are leaving a piece in the middle that really will cause a bottleneck.

The flow of traffic just gets terrific there and it causes a terrific hazard. I am sure the department is aware of the amount of accidents in that stretch, because of stop lights in between two areas of fast flowing traffic. We have stop lights and crossroads on a main double lane highway. I would plead that a real look be taken at this and

some priority given in the development of controlled access in the Saltfleet area.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would say that the hon. member is quite right. We are now building in terms of priority. The contracts have been called and are underway for the slip-offs, or service roads if you like, that will eventually connect with an interchange at the Vineland sideroad.

Now some locations are more accident prone than others. The area that I refer to I would say, Mr. Chairman, is well known to the hon. member, but the contract is underway now at that point. It will be followed by a contract for an interchange and we are of the opinion then that the number one accident-prone location will be taken care of. This will proceed until the entire length of the Queen Elizabeth Way is taken care of, as the hon. member suggests.

But only so much can be done at a time and we are trying to deal with the worst situations first.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I have three questions to ask the hon. Minister on this particular vote. The first one deals with the reconstruction of highways. I would like to know at what stage highway maintenance becomes too expensive and reconstruction of that particular highway takes place.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabour this point at all, because I went into it last night, but of course I am referring to the reconstruction of eight miles of highway immediately due south of Warton.

The hon. Minister has said, during his remarks yesterday and it has been mentioned by several hon. members today, that we have a fine set of highways in the province of Ontario. As a matter of fact I think the hon. Minister said it was the finest in North America, and maybe even in the whole world. Just supposing that he might be right, might I say then, that certainly this particular eight miles of road that I am discussing at the moment is the worst in the province of Ontario.

It has been surveyed dozens and dozens of times. The residents of the area get sick and tired of seeing provincial highway surveyors going down the road every summer—every single summer, I might say—and then nothing else takes place. Obviously this is a most expensive piece of highway to maintain and, some time in the future, it is going to have to be reconstructed.

I think the hon. Minister suggested that I ask him the question under these estimates,

capital projects: When will this particular piece of highway be reconstructed? If he can give me that answer I will appreciate it. Before I sit down, I will ask another couple of questions; but I would like to point out that he emphasized yesterday that the highways in the province of Ontario did much to decentralize industry. He said that Highway 401, for example, going through these various cities and towns throughout the province, did much to bring industry from the larger centres into the smaller ones. With this I would most certainly agree. As a matter of fact, I have said it on numerous occasions in this House in years gone by, but we must not forget that there are other roads in the province besides Highway 401.

There are the highways which go into the various little towns and villages in this large province of ours; we would like a little bit of decentralization of industry up in areas such as Huron county, Grey county or Bruce county. I have no fear of the roads not going into Huron county, I assure you, but at this particular minute I am really interested in this eight miles of road immediately south of Wiarton.

I have an expert witness, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. Prime Minister himself travelled on that road in the contest of last September. I do not know how fast he was going but if he was going at all fast he would appreciate the fact that it is not in the best of condition. I would hope that the hon. Minister will be able to give me an immediate date when this road may be reconstructed.

I was impressed with what he said yesterday, that his department is most flexible. I asked him for a small amount of highway, only eight miles—that they become flexible and commence reconstruction this year. When the hon. Minister is talking about the millions and millions of dollars spent on highways such as 401—which, of course, is most necessary—then those of us in rural Ontario have a tendency to be a bit jealous.

We in Bruce and Grey counties are most jealous about this fantastic amount of money being spent, which we agree is necessary in the larger centres, and we want our share too. We want only a little bit this year, Mr. Chairman, and we would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would have a meeting with his senior advisers and become flexible on this one particular point.

The second thing I want to bring up, Mr. Chairman, deals with development roads, which come under this vote. In Bruce county, of course, we have to give credit where credit is due; and this year we are going to get a

considerable part of the total amount of money which is being spent in the province in the county of Bruce. The reason it is going there? There are two reasons. The first one is that the roads there are so terrible that something has to be done. The second one is that the hon. Minister happened—and thank heavens that he did—to attend the political convention of the government's supporters in my area. He travelled over this particular road, and it was so poor that he had to promise them that his department would fix it; for this I am most grateful, I assure him.

However, I am a little bit worried about when the road is going to be reconstructed. I believe that the impression has been given by the department that it will be done immediately, almost immediately. I think the hon. Minister said, at that particular nomination, that now we could do something about it. I do not want to belabour that point, but certainly the Conservative people in Bruce county are giving everybody the impression that this road is about to be reconstructed immediately.

However, from a little town that is vitally concerned with this road—Paisley, Ontario—I want to read an editorial dated January 16, 1964, from the *Paisley Advocate*. I quote as follows:

A few weeks ago, reporting a brief conversation with the hon. C. S. MacNaughton, Minister of Highways, we said that the Minister had sidestepped making any forecast as to the date for a start on reconstruction of the Elora road north, but that he had pointed out that when pre-engineering is completed, construction will follow as a foregone conclusion.

If any of our readers assume that this meant they might be gliding over a new roadway next year, they are due for disillusionment. It is probable the road will not be finished until 1966 and conceivable that it will not be completed until the following year.

This conclusion is based on information provided by an official of The Ontario Department of Highways in the following letter, which I will read too. It is addressed to the editor of the *Paisley Advocate*, Paisley, Ontario, with reference to the development road, Paisley, county of Bruce:

The Minister asked me to write to you about the status of the above development road. The county of Bruce has retained a permanent consulting engineer to design the project and prepare estimates and contract documents. The design is expected to be completed about May of 1964.

A large stretch over the Saugeen River is involved. Our development road programme provides for a contract to be called for its replacement during the coming construction season. The grading, granular base, and hard surfacing will be the subject of two or three contracts called in subsequent years.

Our programme is contingent upon the county of Bruce acquiring such property as is necessary.

If you should be interested in following the progress of this project I recommend that you maintain close contact with Mr. E. B. Eyundt, the county engineer, who will be able to furnish you with the information you seek.

Yours very truly,

J. P. Howard,
Municipal Engineer per
P. D. Patterson,
Director of Expenditures Engineer

This is what the Paisley *Advocate* finishes up with:

Figure it out for yourself. Replacement of Shantz Bridge in 1964; grading, 1965; granular base, 1966; and hard surfacing, 1967—which, by coincidence, is just about in time for the next provincial election.

Mr. Chairman, I would be most unhappy if the hon. Minister does not go ahead and reconstruct this road as soon as possible.

I would hope that he would make some comments on it this afternoon, because it has been a political football for years and years and I am getting tired of kicking the same old ball around. Incidentally, my good Conservative friends in Bruce county are tired of the game, too. We would like to have the road reconstructed to start on a new ball game.

The next thing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, because it comes under this vote, is: How much money is being given as a grant by the department for the construction of the Toronto subway this year? I would like the hon. Minister to comment on these questions, please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Highway 6, I will assure the hon. member that I will discuss this matter with senior advisers in line with his request. This was the request made, that I discuss this with senior people in the department; and this I will do.

With respect to this development road, the hon. member is aware, I believe, that I accompanied the hon. member for Muskoka

(Mr. Boyer), who is the vice-chairman of Ontario Hydro, to Douglas Point a few weeks ago, among a fair-sized entourage of weekly newspaper editors, and we had a very pleasant day. While I was there, the editor of the Paisley *Advocate*—is it?—approached me about this development road. He seemed to be in considerable doubt about whether we were going to build a road at all. I did, as the hon. member points out, assure him that it was designated as a development road for pre-engineering purposes and, upon completion of the pre-engineering which involves acquisition of land and associated engineering matters, it would in fact become a development road; and, of course, that is true.

He still felt rather doubtful that it really meant anything, so I suggested at that time, and the hon. member has referred to it, probably a letter from the department setting forth the plans of the department would be of interest to him and so requested the development road people to write to the editor of the paper. Of course, the hon. member has read what he decided to print about it.

I would first of all suggest that the Bruce county Paisley-to-Southampton road will cost an estimated \$1.2 million, 100 per cent of which will be paid for, of course, by The Department of Highways. It would appear that the pre-engineering is largely finished and we contemplate an expenditure on the order of \$150,000 this year. The pre-engineering should be finished shortly, so we have set up that much in the way of funds for the current year. It will allow us to get started with the work associated with the bridge to which the hon. member made reference.

Our estimates of the completion year is worked out in association with the county officials, because while the department pays 100 per cent of the cost in terms of direct assistance, this is the way, of course, that we provide direct assistance to counties. The work from that point, including the engineering and eventual design and construction, all becomes the responsibility of the county. I am not trying to shirk responsibility here, or to duck it, but these construction schedules are worked out jointly with the county authorities so that we can allocate the funds required over a forward period, and they have been allocated, of course, upon consultation with the county people.

I would suggest to the hon. member that if the county can accelerate its side of the programme, I am quite confident we may be able to find the—I do not believe the hon. member is interested in what I am saying.

Mr. MacDonald: He has lost it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But it will be on the record anyway and the hon. member can read it. So I submit, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would like to consult with the county engineer, I think he would welcome that. As I have already stated, and I will repeat it for the benefit of the hon. member, if the county authorities feel they can accelerate this programme then I am quite prepared to say we will review the financial aspect of it. I think, with some degree of assurance, I can say we will make the funds available for an accelerated programme. But this is the way it stands today, and it is entirely within the jurisdiction of the county at this moment, other than that we will provide the funds.

I might say, while I am on the subject of development roads in Bruce county, that the road from Hanover to Chesley, a matter involving an estimated total cost of \$618,000, will be completed in this construction year. We have expended to date \$277,000 and we contemplate the expenditure of another \$331,000 in the current construction year, which will bring that road to completion.

The other question was the matter of the amount of subsidy that would be paid to Metropolitan Toronto as our share of the cost of the subway. The amount involved there is \$6 million.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are two points that I want to raise, one with reference to item two in vote 803, property purchases. I understand that out in the tobacco communities, in the process of acquiring land for construction or reconstruction of a highway, the department has bought, in order to get what it requires, whole farms. Some of the farms it has bought are farms on which there are tobacco quotas, and the department itself is engaged in selling the tobacco quotas to other growers. In view of the fact that this is a very controversial issue, which, in the mind of a considerable number of people, is contributing to the surplus tobacco production, I am wondering if this is the case. Would the hon. Minister comment on it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, that information should be available in just a few moments if you will allow me to come back to it. If the hon. leader of the Opposition were in the House I would try to comment on the matter of trees, as he referred

to. However, will you allow me to come back to that question because we are getting the information for you now?

Mr. MacDonald: Trees and tobacco quotas will be an appropriate—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, we will come back to this.

Mr. MacDonald: The second point then that I wanted to raise—and this is coming back to the topic I raised yesterday, or the underlying principles of it—is that the more I reflected on the reply of the hon. Minister to my queries as to procedures and policy underlying what might be described as the Omichinski quarry, the more I was puzzled. For example, how general is the practice of the government having its own quarries and in effect designating in the call for tenders and in all the tender documents that the material must be obtained from that quarry? I ask that question because in this particular case—and I am curious to know how general it is—as the hon. Minister related, what the department did in designating this quarry. I think it must be said, without any argument, it was done with very little investigation.

The reply of the hon. Minister was that the other bidders were aware of what the situation was in this quarry. Presumably they may have been local people. Whether they went in and did further boring themselves I do not know, but the comment of the hon. Minister was that Omichinski had not done this. What puzzles me is, if the department designates a quarry, in the call for tenders, and in the tender document, and insists that this is where the contractor must get his material, does the department play this sort of cat-and-mouse game of not assuring itself that the rock is available in sufficient quantities, and available without the kind of painful succession of problems that the contractor had, so that the cost will be less—the cost to the taxpayer in the final result?

The comment of the hon. Minister was that this bid of Omichinski was lower, so much lower that the department came to the conclusion that he was not aware of the difficulty he was going to run into. The hon. Minister almost suggested—and perhaps I am being unfair—that he anticipated the difficulties were going to arise, at least that Omichinski had seriously underbid. The hon. Minister knew it was going to cost more. If the other contracts had been taken it was going to cost more anyway.

Indeed, I come back to a point which I think the hon. member for Downsview asked

yesterday. I think it would be rather interesting to know the difference between the Omichinski bid and the others, because the procedures are the ones that interest me at the moment and he certainly lost \$173,000 by audited account of his own books—I presume audited by the department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, frankly I am not in a position to go too much further than I did last night. I must say I feel that I made all the appropriate comments that needed to be made, although I did promise to get some more detailed information to the hon. member.

With respect to the contractor Omichinski that the hon. member has named, it is now well established that he underbid the job. There is not much mystery about that, because of course if he had not, he would not have been in trouble. But this matter of quarries: As far as the department is concerned, he could have gone into any part of that area. We simply told this contractor, as well as all the other bidders, that there was suitable material in the area. This we had proved by the methods that are employed by the department. The material then was suitable for the purpose for which it was required.

It is difficult for me to accept that the fact that he chose to try to get it out by a method that was not efficient or with less equipment than was required, is part of the department's responsibility. We do not quarrel with him as to how he took it out as long as he took it out and prepared it in a fashion that was acceptable to us for the paving contract for which it was required. So that the relationship to his bid and other bids, while there was quite a disparity, seems to me to have no bearing on the case.

Mr. MacDonald: Considering the difficulties they had to face and he did not, it does have some bearing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would put it, then, in terms of providing the hon. member with more of the detailed information he has requested, that in round figures the next low bidder was \$70,000 higher than the successful bidder; Omichinski in this case. I would point out, without naming this contractor—this can be done, it is public information, if the hon. member insists on it—is a contractor with a broad knowledge in this field from one end of Canada to the other, so that he bid realistically.

Mr. MacDonald: Why then did the department offer only \$16,000?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why did we offer only \$16,000?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, to settle the contract.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I explained that to the hon. member last night.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, with respect, the hon. Minister is arguing that this was a realistic bid, \$70,000 more. Then surely his offer to pay \$16,000 is an unrealistic offer to settle the contract. I mean, you cannot have it both ways. I am only trying to reconcile what appear to be irreconcilable things in this.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I hear a comment that I must say is absolutely correct; the contractor cannot have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. If this contractor elected to bid as low as he did, with full knowledge, or the ability to acquaint himself with full knowledge, of what he was about to engage himself in, then I frankly fail to see where the interest of the province would be well served by now making up to him the difference between himself and the next low bidder.

Frankly, I regard this as a preposterous situation and suggestion. I can do nothing else.

As I explained to the hon. member last night, the amount of \$16,000 proposed by the claims committee after reviewing the facts was simply a matter of awarding a sum to remunerate the contractor for those matters involved in the contract over which he had no control. That is as far as we can ever hope to go with the matter of claim settlement.

I do believe, Mr. Chairman, and I think most hon. members would concur with me, that if we went any further and if we pursued the course that he suggests here, then the Minister would rightfully be subjected to much more criticism than has been the case up to this point.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: Just one moment. I want to rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I beg your indulgence to make these representations to you, these submissions. I have not discussed these with my hon. colleagues, but when the submissions are made, perhaps I may make them with the assurance that they are also the views of my hon. colleagues.

My respectful and courteous submission to you, Mr. Chairman, is that the system that you have adopted whereby you write down,

apparently, the names of the hon. members in the order that they shall speak, does in my respectful submission, not permit of the orderly development of the debate and the argument. If I may cite an example to you of recent occurrence, that is yesterday.

Yesterday the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) rose and he made some remarks about a certain bridge in the riding of my hon. friend, the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator). After he had made his observations and before the hon. Minister of Highways could reply and before my hon. colleague from Niagara Falls could reply, the hon. member for Oshawa arose and he addressed certain remarks on an entirely different subject. Then, subsequent to that, another hon. member rose and introduced a third subject. I think it was fully five or six speakers until the hon. member for Niagara Falls had an opportunity to return to the subject of the bridge.

Therefore, it is my respectful submission, sir, that rather than have a list of the members in the order that they shall speak, if you would permit the exhaustion of a subject before going on to another one. In this case, Mr. Chairman, it may be that the hon. member for Grey North is rising to speak on the very subject that has been discussed and my friend, the hon. member for Etobicoke, may have another subject. So rather than being straitjacketed into a list, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request you to permit the debate to flow along in terms of the subject matter.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I have already done that today in connection with Highway 401.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed, I observed that today. Every hon. member that wanted to say something about 401 had the floor.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question through you to the hon. Minister. This is in relation to the cloverleaves, the exits from the highways in the general Metropolitan area.

It has always seemed rather strange to me that when you come off any one of the highways onto the cloverleaves going 50 or 60 miles an hour suddenly you see a sign that says 25 miles an hour or 15 miles an hour. I speak in particular about the exit from the Gardiner Expressway north onto Bay and York Streets.

The curves and the angles that one has to turn to come off these highways have always seemed to me to be very dangerous. I am wondering whether this is something that

has been brought to the attention of the planners in the department? It is a most dangerous situation as far as I am concerned.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would say that—I am not going to quarrel with the hon. member about the dangerous aspects of this—it is a matter that is completely outside the jurisdiction of The Department of Highways, I would say, Mr. Chairman. It is a Metropolitan Toronto responsibility entirely.

Mr. Braithwaite: I refer also to the exits off Highway 401 leading into Metropolitan Toronto in the northern part of Metro. They are in the area of your department's jurisdiction, are they not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If they are associated with 401, yes. Well, our interchanges provide for 1,500 feet of transition—if you understand what I mean—from the time you leave one rate of speed until you have to assume the ramp speed, or whatever we like to call it, the deceleration speed. We are reasonably sure that 1,500 feet is sufficient to provide for adequate safety requirements. I do not know what the Metropolitan jurisdiction uses, whether their transition distance is less than that or not, I cannot say.

Mr. Braithwaite: I would like to carry this a step further. I am thinking in particular of the exit off 401 for Islington Avenue and the other for Weston Road. In both cases, particularly if it is raining, it seems to me that the degree of curve is much too great. I have heard more than one person complain about the fact that there is too much change too quickly in the direction that one has to make on the ramp.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: —I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question on 803. Being completely fair, I realize this is the largest spending department in our business, but there is an item of \$1,557,000 there for travelling expenses and in 801 an item of \$266,000 for travelling expenses. Realizing that these figures are based on actual experience, possibly in 1963, I am asking as to the matter of policy. I have done some research on this estimate for the 1964-65 fiscal year and in the overall Budget it is shocking to realize that you ask us to budget for the coming year amounts totalling \$6,850,000 for travelling expenses. Now being from a small town,

this is a shocking thing to me that we are spending \$6 million for travelling expenses.

Further, I am wondering what control there is in this regard. Secondly, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, about the item of \$1,540,000 for consultant fees, if the government has thought of hiring its own consultants on a permanent basis? That is the first thing I would like to hear from the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, while the information with respect to travelling expenses is being obtained, I would say through you to the hon. member that the consultants' fees are largely the result of an attempt to accelerate certain of our programmes, and I would point out to you, sir, largely associated with 401.

About a year ago, when we were examining the matter of the rate at which we could undertake the fastest possible completion of certain sections of 401, we realized at that time it was going to place a rather substantial burden beyond the ability of existing staff to perform and get the engineering and required design matters completed. At that time—I would suggest that this goes back, approximately, a year—it was decided that if we were going to accelerate this programme we would have to get some outside help. To that extent then we did engage a number of consultants, and we have employed them. That is, I think, with reasonable accuracy, the reason why this vote is higher than it would normally have been.

Mr. Sargent: I ask the hon. Minister: What is the rate paid to consultants? What percentage of the contract?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is based on a sliding scale, I believe, related to the value of the contract. I can get that detail for the hon. member. It starts off with a percentage for the first, shall we say, several hundred thousand dollars; for the next \$100,000 it is a little bit less, but I do believe it is graduated.

I am given to understand that, if it is just for design, it would be one rate but if the contract, the undertaking with the consultant, involves design and supervision of the work itself, it would require more. The percentage would increase if they had to supervise the work.

Mr. Sargent: What would it be for a \$1 million contract; what would be the fee?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You want the figure related to design, design and supervision, or supervision? You want both?

Mr. Sargent: Of both, for overall construction.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Design and supervision—we will have the information in a minute.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, I have a question regarding tenders. I have a tender here for the bridge-painting of the Burlington Bay skyway bridge. I have a letter here from the president of a large paint company, who feels that it is not in a position to bid on this tender because of the tender call. I would like to ask the hon. Minister: On one section of the contract it calls for the necessary rating of \$75,000 and a substantial deposit; then another rating of \$30,000, with a substantial deposit. This paint company cannot bid on the contract because it feels that, in effect, there is no opening for the small painter to handle the deal because of the financing needed to bid on the contract. I am wondering if there is any thought in the mind of the hon. Minister to make these contract costs a bit smaller so that contractors can bid on them.

The penalty here is terrific for a small businessman. It would seem that only the larger firms—and, as outlined in the contract, the painting shall be supervised by the contractor and applied only by experienced tradesmen.

I imagine the hon. Minister is correct there, in the public interest, to get qualified people; but the specifications, I think, are loaded, as my hon. colleague says, in the interest of the bigger contractor. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there is any hope that they could look toward the smaller man in this regard in these contracts?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the point the hon. member referred to is, of course, related to the extent of the pre-qualifications the department sets up for painting contractors.

He will be interested, I am sure, to learn that we are now about to embark on a trial basis, and are removing the prequalification requirements. We are going to call for tenders for painting without the necessity of prequalifications, and see how it works.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask the hon. Minister: Is the financial rating still necessary in those large amounts?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No. The financial rating is associated with what I have referred to as prequalification.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the intelligence, or lack of it, in policy in so far as boundary roads are concerned. When we have two municipalities, and one is forced into building a bridge on a boundary road, one municipality receives an 80 per cent subsidy and the other municipality receives a one-third subsidy. I think, in the interests of equity, that this policy should be realigned and assessed on a fair basis. Does the hon. Minister see any hope? In Owen Sound we have had to close down a major hill because we cannot afford to spend \$100,000 to fix the hill. We closed down this major artery, but were forced into a boundary road agreement where we have to spend \$50,000 to build a bridge that is not being used. The township gets an 80 per cent subsidy, and we only get one-third subsidy. This does not seem fair, when we were forced into the deal. What hope is there for equity in this regard for the municipality?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would think that this is probably a matter which requires to be looked at by me. I am not familiar enough with the circumstances. I recall the situation where a bridge spanned a boundary river in a town, but the basis of subsidy there, again, is at variance with the basic rate of subsidy in a city. I will have to ask the hon. member to let me get some information; we will provide it for him.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, apropos of what I said earlier, I want to take the opportunity, not being one who uses the time of the estimates to any great extent, to ask questions. I have a private brief that if I want to ask questions of the hon. Minister, I can call him in the morning, or the deputy, and solicit the information.

But I want to go away back, in the hope that those who read *Hansard* in the province will tenaciously, and with fortitude and dedication, thumb through the pages from the remarks made by the hon. member for Scarborough North until this point, some score of pages later, where I make my own observations about naming a highway after a living Conservative. Indeed, I should go beyond the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough North and, this time, emit my accolade to the man from Armourdale. I felt proud to be a lawyer this afternoon when he made his remarks—that is a practising lawyer, as he is, not like the six in the front bench

over there who are a long way from the practise of law, who have lost contact.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): They are doing a good job.

Mr. Sopha: Knowing the jury the hon. member spoke to, as I know them, I am afraid the hon. member pressed the case a little bit too strongly to get results; but still, I admire the tenacity and the fortitude with which he pressed it. I noticed how the hon. Minister got a bit sensitive to the criticism too. He got an opportunity to calm down when we had the diversion of the hon. Minister of Mines, the master of diversion in the House.

Dealing with the advocacy of the hon. member for Scarborough North that we name Highway 401 after Leslie M. Frost, the Frost Freeway or Thruway or whatever it is, I want to say that I have always had, as a result of my research into Canadian history, the well-founded impression that one of the things that differs a Liberal from a Conservative is that a Conservative is a person who likes those artificial trappings of title and honour that come from doing something with or to his name. That belief was founded in the roots of Canadian history.

I want to deplore any tendency on the part of this government to name that highway after Leslie Frost. To go back to the roots of Canadian history, we see that in the last century, when this nation was founded, when the Queen was instructed by her advisers, be they British or Canadian, to give baronetcies, on the one hand it was the Conservative politicians who accepted them; Cartier, MacDonald, Howe, Tupper, Galt and the rest; and it was the Liberals who refused them: Brown, Blake, McKenzie. They only caught Laurier because he went to the coronation in 1897, the 60th anniversary, and the Queen announced that he was Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

So it is today. You go about this province, and I have gone about and I have seen buildings inscribed with names of living people. Without exception, I asked somebody to give me an example, otherwise the name ascribed to an edifice or structure or building; is that of a Tory.

An hon. member: They are the builders.

Mr. Sopha: He is a Tory, he is not a Liberal at all. Because Liberals put aside that artificiality, Liberals have not got the arrogance that attends it.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): What about the bridge in Ottawa?

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Sopha: What is your point of order?

Mr. Cowling: I will give the Chairman my point of order, if the hon. member does not mind, and when I get real good and ready to give it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my point of order is this: I do not think any discussion on politicians of the past on either side of the House is really relevant to the estimates of The Department of Highways. Another thing, Mr. Chairman, I would point this out on my point of order, the hon. member who is in the midst of speaking now is constantly taking liberties along these lines on the estimates. I have sat and listened and participated to a degree in the work of the House as it has gone on these last several weeks; but I must say, Mr. Chairman, to my point of order, that the hon. member now speaking has overstepped the mark on many occasions. I think that on this particular one, when he is talking about some of the great forefathers of the past, that you, sir, should rule that he stay with the item with which we are dealing on the highways estimate. That is my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 803; the member for Kent East.

Mr. Sopha: I did not finish. I take it you are not going to rule me out of order because the hon. member for High Park obviously was not in his seat when the hon. member for Scarborough North spoke.

Mr. Chairman: Reverting to vote 803—

Mr. Cowling: I heard it, I was sitting in my seat.

Mr. Sargent: In support of my hon. colleague, on naming highways after prominent Conservatives, as it were. It is maddening to pick up copies of civic administration magazines, municipal magazines we all read—

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on my point of order, sir.

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking to vote 803, I am speaking to \$150,000 in this budget for road publicity.

Mr. Sopha: But I have not finished.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Kent East asked for the floor and I have it down here, and you intervened.

Mr. Sopha: I just want to make the final statement that I also deplore, it was not a fortnight ago, that a school board in this province rejected the name of Sir John A. Macdonald as the name of a school.

Mr. Cowling: It was in the riding of Scarborough North.

Mr. Sopha: After history has put its judgment on the epitaph of a man, then let his name be inscribed. But wait until history and judgment, not while he is alive, is my point.

Mr. Chairman, now I want to take the opportunity to refer to the remarks made by my hon. colleague from Bruce, and if I may—and he always grants me his indulgence—in a kindly attitude say to him, that I sympathize with his problem in asking for some roads in Bruce, but I thought I would take this time to give him a little advice. I am in the happy position that my hon. friend from Bruce is not. It is as if we were two Caesars swimming the Rubicon and I ahead of him have gone across the current and have reached the safety of the shore while he is still struggling manfully with the current. Because 11 speeches ago, Mr. Chairman, I say to my hon. friend from Bruce, I began to ask for the Sudbury-Timmins road; and after 11 speeches over five years in this House it is a reality. Now I am in a happy and fortunate position as it were, having crossed the Rubicon, that I have nothing more to ask for.

An hon. member: So why ask for it?

Mr. Sopha: So as I look in the book and see how they are coming with the Sudbury-Timmins road and I see they are always going to work in 43 miles of this total 115 or something this year—

Mr. Whicher: Not over that Rubicon yet?

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, I am in the position that all I need do is to urge upon my hon. colleague from Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers), through whose riding it goes into the riding of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs—and I shall in the privacy of the corridors, the cloak room, the Black Knight, or somewhere else—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Invite us.

Mr. Sopha: —urge them to approach the hon. Minister of Highways in order to get it built as fast as possible. I am not even going to ask him for fear of the disappointment that might attend the citizens of Sud-

bury, at 43 miles this year, how long it is going to take him. I am content that if it is finished in Confederation year that will be time enough in the transitoriness of human things with which we have to contend.

So I say to the hon. member for Bruce, in friendship and in companionship and comradeship, keep up the fight. If you have to make 11 speeches to get through to the hon. Minister of Highways, then make them. Grains of wisdom eventually permeate the deafest and dumbest of ears, until they will give you some assistance and some of the roads to which the great county of Bruce is entitled.

Now one final subject, and I bear in mind that the hon. Minister is especially sensitive this afternoon, or at least he was. I hope he is not now.

It is now some time ago—and I feel obliged to say this—that my colleague, the hon. member for Nickel Belt and I drew to the hon. Minister's attention a most distressing situation that exists on Highway 17 to the west of Sudbury. That is the presence of fog that occurs there in a very phenomenal and very unusual way. This fog phenomenon will arise and disappear within a period of about 15 minutes oftentimes. Now that situation and that atmospheric condition has caused several very serious, yes, and I am sorry to report, even fatal accidents. Not many fatal accidents but several accidents that have indeed been serious, and at times as many as 13 cars have been involved. Some time ago, I think it was in January, or perhaps before the first of the year, I have not my file with me, my hon. colleague from Nickel Belt and I jointly addressed the hon. Minister and the officials of his department about this situation. He undertook, as he has done on several occasions this afternoon, to make an investigation and to do everything that is reasonable in his power to alleviate this situation.

Regrettably, one of the experts that he does not appear to be able to afford within the \$299 million that he wants, needs and uses, is a meteorologist, who I suggested to him and his officials was the only person now alive with the scientific and technological know-how to determine just what would be the underlying causes of this fog situation. I have not heard from the hon. Minister that he has employed a meteorologist in order to make the special investigation that that person could make. However—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, I think if the hon. member will recall the statement before the orders of the day,

I assured him of just what he is requesting now, that we had engaged meteorological people and I think I put on the record remarks related to their findings. I think probably if he will read back in *Hansard*, he will recall that that statement was made.

Mr. Sopha: I recall the statement being made about one being hired. I do not recall having received any report. I might just mention at this point that in the negotiations between my hon. friend from Nickel Belt and myself and the hon. Minister, the communication up to now has been direct between us and not through the pages of *Hansard*. I hope that has not broken down.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This was in response to the hon. member's question before the orders of the day.

Mr. Sopha: In response to the question from the hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, correct.

Mr. Sopha: Well, he is in his seat and he can speak for himself.

However, there is one other thing that I am not quite sure about. I have the feeling that one of the officials of his own department, that is, the hon. Minister's own department, advocated that a precautionary and preventive measure that could be introduced and erected in relation to the happening of these accidents would be separation of the four lanes of the highway by a structural median. I do not know that my words are terms of art. This would prevent the happening of a type of accident that has happened in this fog situation. That is: Not only have cars going in the same direction run into each other—as many as 16 of them have piled up—but during the foggy situation vehicles coming in opposite directions have unwisely, imprudently and even dangerously crossed over the line that separates the north half from the south half of the road. There have been collisions with oncoming traffic, so to speak.

The erection of that median—and this was quite widely publicized in Sudbury and met no objection from any person or groups as far as I know—would prevent the happening, at least, of that type of accident. It would be interesting if the department would look into the total number of accidents. One of the difficulties there is, of course, that quite a number of police forces are involved, in order to ascertain whether accidents involving traffic coming from opposite directions are

more frequent than those involving traffic all going in one direction.

However, in an endeavour to make known to the citizens and constituents of Sudbury and the surrounding area, I address my remarks at this time in the hope that I might stimulate the hon. Minister to bring us up to date to some extent on what the activities of the department are in regard to the terrible situation.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the hon. member that this situation—and it is an unfortunate one and a matter of concern to the department—is under continuous investigation. As I stated in a statement before the orders of the day, we have engaged the federal Department of Transport, which department operates the meteorological branch. We are continuing to work with it and I am informed that the federal meteorological people are still actively working on the situation.

The proposal the hon. member suggests with respect to a structural median is certainly worthy of investigation and I would not be too sure that this is not under consideration. We are considering everything that can conceivably be done to relieve what is certainly a dangerous and very undesirable situation.

I think I am in a position to answer some of the other questions that have been posed here this afternoon. I would say to the hon. member for Grey North that at the moment the matter of the rates of subsidy, cities versus counties, is a matter of legislation. In other words, they are statutory. At the moment the Minister has no authority to change these rates of subsidy, township or county versus cities. They are statutory situations. I am quite confident that is not the explanation the hon. member would wish to hear, but nevertheless it is the situation with which the Minister of the day is confronted, so I simply say that I am powerless to change these rates of subsidy because it is a statutory requirement.

I have some more information here for the hon. member relating to the matter of consultants' fees. I would point out that these are rates that are set by the Association of Professional Engineers; they are not rates that are assessed or imposed by the department. The Association of Professional Engineers set them. The percentage rate for design is in the range of \$500,000 to \$1 million. The hon. member suggested \$1 million. The rate for \$500,000 up to \$1 million, and the percentage for design is 3.5 per cent. For \$1 million to \$2 million, it

drops down to 3.43 per cent. Similarly, where design and supervision of construction are involved—a \$500,000 contract or a \$1 million contract—the comparable rate would be five per cent plus 150 per cent of the salary of staff directly associated with the supervision of the contract.

In other words, the firm of engineers makes 50 per cent on the salaries it pays to the people who are in its employ. This is its profit on its work against the overhead and everything associated with it. So then, within those limits it gets five per cent plus 150 per cent of the salaries of the men—the engineers it assigns to the supervisory aspect of the job.

When we reach \$1 million, and in the next range, \$1 million to \$2 million, the percentage rate declines from five per cent to 4.9 per cent with still the same percentage of the cost of salaries of those staff people associated with supervisory work.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask the hon. Minister as a matter of policy what thoughts has he about this matter? For \$1.5 million it would seem to me you could get a lot of engineering done. Why would you not retain your own consultants?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I just pointed out these are consultants retained by the department.

Mr. Sargent: Why would the hon. Minister not have them on staff?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Sir, I have already explained to you that within the limits of our existing staff a year ago, to accelerate some of these programmes that we are being pressed for by some of your colleagues, as a matter of fact, and associated with our own desire to get these jobs done, we felt it was as expedient for this temporary situation involving extra work, to employ consultants. When we get that situation behind us we will revert back to the point where our normal complement of engineers is adequate to do the work.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask the hon. Minister: This has been a constant picture the last ten or 15 years and it will not grow less—does it figure that you would continue to retain consultants on this basis for the next ten years, or would you not be farther ahead to get a permanent staff of consultants?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would hope maybe that this would dispose of the matter. It is the opinion of the department that it is as efficient, and

probably as economical, to employ outside consultants in this matter as it is to try to carry a staff of engineers at the department level to take care of peak requirements.

In other words, if we attempt to keep the numbers of staff required to take care of peak loads, specific situations, we think we are going to be involved in a greater expense than assigning this work to consultants—for specific situations and sometimes for brief periods.

I could only assume, Mr. Chairman, that this has been pretty carefully analyzed by the people who advise the Minister, and that it is not only as efficient, it is probably as economical or more so than the course the hon. member proposes.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, one more point, if the hon. Minister will bear with me.

In road publicity, there is an item of \$150,000. I realize this has been passed in 801.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, it is. This—

Mr. Sargent: But I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, it is another vote, I would point out.

Mr. Sargent: I would ask the hon. Minister to answer me a question on this.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I would say you would have to ask the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 803.

Mr. Sargent: I realize that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: If the Minister wishes to answer you, it is all right with me.

Mr. Sargent: The point is: When you pick up trade publications in the municipal field you see advertisements placed by The Department of Highways telling the people of Ontario what good fellows the hon. Minister of Highways and the hon. Prime Minister are to give us all these roads. We do not mind you telling them that, but I hate paying for it. I think, as a policy, it is an insult to the people to spend our money to tell the people of Ontario about your progressive road programme and what great fellows the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister are. I take exception. I have been in the advertising business. This is nothing but a mild form of corruption. I think it is wrong.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! The member for Lambton West.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Chairman, in rising to make a few remarks on this vote, I will preface my remarks by saying that the reference that the hon. member for Sudbury made, about having to make 11 speeches in order to gain his point, rather appalls me; but he did at the same time speak with great relish about this, as though it were some very great feat. Perhaps this may be, because the hon. member appears to me to be so enamoured of the sound of his own voice that often the point he rose to make is never made. But I suppose the music is sweet in his own ears.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I usually say nice things about you, but now I will stop.

Mr. Knox: At other times he is so wrapped up in some silly verbiage, like that we heard just recently, that everyone else misses the point entirely, even if he did not.

Mr. Sopha: This means war, of course.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): That is enough from the hon. member for Sudbury on March 17.

Mr. Sopha: You are the one who said: "Thank God for my leader".

Mr. Knox: Thank you, for repeating that for me. I am still of the same opinion as I was before.

I wanted to say, with reference to the highways in my area—and this is where I want to get into something about the highways—that it appears to me that in 11 speeches, something has gone wrong there. The road we are presently working on in our area is the by-pass road for the city of Sarnia, for which we say "thanks", and we of the city of Sarnia did a lot of the early planning—took six years altogether.

I was on the council at the time and promoted this road. We had a little bit of it done by suburban roads to make it a little more interesting to The Department of Highways; and when we were all ready to present this to The Department of Highways, we felt that we had this at a point where it would be so obvious that this road was necessary, that only one speech would be required.

Well, we came to The Department of Highways and one speech was made with respect to this particular by-pass—I made it, and that is all the speech that it took. So if you do your planning and your homework properly, and you make your presentation properly, it really will only take one speech—one effective speech.

I think we should, after all we have heard this afternoon, say something good about this department, and about the present hon. Minister.

We have some other plans in our area, of which I just want to remind the hon. Minister. We were speaking about a scenic route this afternoon—in our area we have a section, from Sarnia to Wallaceburg, which gets into the riding of my friend, the hon. member for Kent West. We have plans for making this the most scenic route in the province of Ontario. I have heard another area designated as having that already today.

But this will require, first, a north-south highway—a more direct route. We expect, in time, to get this. In the meantime, through our suburban roads efforts, we have about half of this road ready now. And with a little more effort on our part, I think we probably, when the proper time comes, will be able to make a presentation to the hon. Minister of Highways just once; and it will be so obvious that we require this road that it will be accepted.

We are not ready yet. There is only so much money available, I may say, for the placing of highways. We, in our riding, are willing to acknowledge this and to wait, with all the patience we can, till it is ready.

Somebody says we get more than our share of it now; and yet somebody else mentioned this afternoon that they were very tired of listening to talk about Highway 401. I have not been too tired of listening to Highway 401, but I will agree that perhaps it is time, for a change, to let us talk about Highway 402.

Highway 402 is one with which a great many may not be familiar. At the present time, it leads from Perch Creek Bridge—which is the junction of Highway 7, Highway 22 and Highway 40A—to the Bluewater Bridge. I think it is about three or three-and-a-half miles long. Over this little highway, feeding out into the other parts of the province, come these tourists who make the other ridings so rich. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a great many of them go to the riding of my friend, the hon. member for Bruce, who has made such a sad tale for his riding during these last few hours. As nearly as I can make out from what he said, it must be a delightfully rustic area which impresses me as though it may be relatively unchanged from its natural state.

But I will say that this is what appeals to tourists, and perhaps a lot of them go there and Bruce gets rich because of that. All this starts back at Highway 402, which is leading

from the Bluewater Bridge, and it is up to that that I want to lead.

You will be aware, Mr. Chairman, and I know you are aware, that a great new highway in the United States has been built, or is being presently finished, leading from Seattle to Detroit and Port Huron. Port Huron is our sister city across the river, in which the eastern end of the Bluewater Bridge resides. This highway is going to have a tremendous effect on the traffic pattern in our riding. It is said that this Highway 402 will have to accommodate, in the next few years, close to four million people. Now Highway 402, in its short length, is a four-lane divided highway; but, as I said, it then leads to the junction of Highways 7, 22 and 40A. There it becomes a three-lane highway and as it passes along about another 14 miles it gets into the riding of my hon. friend and colleague, the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Henderson). After passing through there for a short distance, it becomes a two-lane highway.

The point I want to make is that planning will have to be accelerated in order to take care of the tremendous amount of traffic that is going to pour over the Bluewater Bridge with the completion of this huge, non-stop highway all the way from Seattle through to Port Huron. There is not a stop on it, so you can be sure that tourists are going to take this highway.

We in our riding are concerned with the ability of the highways that we have to handle this traffic. In the planning for new highways, which the hon. Minister is doing—and I may confess at this point he knows about this, he is planning for this—he is going to have to spend money in the near future, more money in our riding. I want to acquaint the House with this so that when the time comes and we make that one speech, not 11, the rest of you will be sympathetic with what he is going to have to do and will support his endeavour.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might rise at this point to provide the information on some of the questions that were asked earlier, if the hon. member will permit me to do that.

In answer to the question put by the hon. member for York South regarding The Department of Highways being in the tobacco business, I would simply say that when land is purchased in the tobacco area the tobacco rights are purchased with the land at the appraised value. When the department has

surplus land from severance, the surplus land and the rights are sold by public auction. We take our land requirements out—and in some circumstances it is more equitable to buy the entire property—we take our requirements out and sell back the surplus. This is the way it is handled. We are not in the tobacco business.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, then, they switched the quota.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Whatever it is, we are not in the tobacco business.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear that the hon. leader of the Opposition is not coming back, or is undertaking to listen on his public address system or whatever it may be, but nevertheless he asked me some questions related to a contract associated with trees some time ago—

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps the hon. Minister might defer it to this evening. He had a medical appointment that he had to keep and perhaps the hon. Minister might defer it to this evening if you have to go that far to make those answers. He will be here this evening.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would you prefer that we do it that way, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: If it meets with your approval.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very well, I simply thought we might put it on the record so he could read it if he was not coming back. I will keep that information.

I might say, while it is out of order, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that the hon. member for Grey North was allowed to ask a question on vote 801 with respect to roads publicity, I think maybe I should reply.

The situation to which he refers concerns advertisements in certain trade publications or municipal magazines. Now, the best information that is available to me is simply that in the year that is just concluding this month the amount of advertising spent in this field was nil. The Department of Highways spent not one copper on advertisements in the periodicals referred to by the hon. member. I would point out to him that the amount allocated for roads publicity covers such items as these and I doubt if any hon. member will dispute the—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, point of order. The February issue of *Civic Administration* carried a full-page advertisement over the

signature of The Department of Highways. I do not know who is paying for it. They do not run them for free, I do not think. I will produce the advertisement tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would still state that no matter what appears on the advertisement it was not paid out of vote 801 for roads publicity.

Mr. Sargent: My apologies, but I imagine—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I respect your statement, but my statement still stands. This is a fact.

However, I would like to state for the record that the sum of \$150,000 for roads publicity is made this way: Displays in county fairs, \$15,000; a display at the Canadian National Exhibition, \$10,000; a display at the Ottawa Fall Fair, \$2,000; and at the Western Fair in London, \$2,000.

We also expend under this vote, for our photography section, money for motion pictures, still pictures, supplies for the photographic section and miscellaneous items, a total of \$20,000.

We do have a photography section. We take pictures of all contracts in progress. We take pictures of the opening of roads and bridges; we think this is a reasonable thing to do. These pictures are made available to the press in the area and any other media that requires them.

We have set aside the sum of \$2,000 to bear the expenses of providing assistance for road openings. We do this for municipalities. Our district offices are equipped with public address systems and things like that and we make these available for that purpose, \$2,000.

We spend \$1,000 a year on subscriptions and memberships of various kinds which are associated with the work of the department.

The Department of Highways publication, or *DHO News* as it is called, is a departmental organ that is circulated among the staff and this costs \$24,000. We publish road bulletins for the information of the general public, this costs \$5,000.

The northern Ontario road map introduced last year cost \$38,000; roads to recreation map was \$20,000.

This makes up the total of \$150,000 for roads publicity. We think it is pretty good publicity, we do not think we are being too unreasonable with the taxpayers' money for the purposes I have described.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, were the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr.

Belanger) here he would have asked the hon. Minister concerning the status of the Turkey Creek bridge. I think the hon. Minister mentioned something earlier in the year.

Mr. Yakabuski: Quit whining!

Mr. Newman: What is the matter, if you are tired, go ahead and go out and have supper but let us discuss the estimates here.

The matter of the Turkey Creek bridge, which is an extension of Highway 18 in La Salle.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, now, I am going to be quite frank and state that a year ago when the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich, your hon. colleague, raised this matter, I described to him at that time the reasons why it was deleted from the programme. I did give him my assurance that, if at all possible, we would have it on this construction programme. I simply have to say to you now that certain matters associated with property acquisition, certain matters associated with design, I could obtain more detail, have simply meant that we are not ready to do this construction job yet.

So I think, and I am not trying to be facetious, Mr. Chairman, that you might inform the hon. member and your hon. colleague, that maybe somebody's up Turkey Creek at the moment. I do not know whether it is he, or whether it is me, or both of us; but this is where we stand.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, there are three other questions I would like to ask of the hon. Minister and we are all through with Turkey Creek now.

Mr. Yakabuski: Thank goodness, we will not have to worry about Turkey Creek.

Mr. Whicher: Yakabuski is yakking.

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes, he has a reputation for yakking, but he has a point.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, just because we bring up problems that we have in our own municipality, that is not whining. We simply would like to see consideration given to problems that we think are just and need attention. Apparently all the hon. members on that side of the House have all the roads they need in their area, so let us build them in the Opposition members' ridings and then you will not be asked these questions later on. The easier way to satisfy us is to come along and do what we suggest here.

Mr. Yakabuski: Do not put it in a whining tone.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister the status of Highway No. 3. One year ago I asked about the straightening out of the road so that the tourists coming in from Detroit, and likewise the residents of my own area, would have easy access to both the provincial park and also to the Pelee National Park. Highway No. 3 is a winding road and it certainly could stand a considerable amount of straightening out. Last year the hon. Minister mentioned that some work had been undertaken and that he planned on doing some extensive work this year, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make a comment. There has been a lot of talk here this afternoon—

Mr. Newman: I would like an answer to my question, sir, and I have two others.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Will you allow me a moment?

Mr. Newman: Yes, on Highway No. 3, sir.

Mr. Root: Some hon. members have said that this government does not do any work in Opposition members' ridings. I am looking at the map of the Stratford division and I see a plan for work in Wellington county. It is a continuation in Wellington South of what was carried on in my own riding. And Wellington South is an Opposition member's (Mr. Worton's) riding.

Mr. Whicher: You will have to get a new set of glasses.

Mr. Root: I look over into the Owen Sound division and I see work going on in the riding of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I would suggest that perhaps some of the hon. members in the Opposition could take a lesson from the hon. member for Wellington South and the hon. leader of the Opposition and once in a while say "thank you" and be constructive and they might find it will bear fruit.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago I commended the hon. Minister of Highways for acceding to a request that had been made to work on roads in the area that I have the honour to represent, and I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say that the people of the entire area appreciated what was done. I hope that my friend, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) might comment because I think the road from Shelbourne to Harrison gave an outlet to the north to the people in his riding, and they, in their own way,

showed their appreciation. It may be because he is a very fine type of person that they did not go quite far enough. I think the people of that riding did indicate that they appreciated the effect that these roads had on this whole area. It is the boundary between my riding and that of the hon. leader of the Opposition. Another piece of highway attended to is from Acton up to Highway 24 at Ospringle and I know the people of Halton, the north end of Halton, appreciated it. The people in my own riding appreciated what was done and I think that I would be remiss if I did not say that the people of Ontario do appreciate what The Department of Highways is doing. I know they showed appreciation right across the board in the area I have mentioned. The department is not narrow in building roads. In the riding of the hon. member for Wellington South, they are building roads, and in the riding of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

I think the hon. members opposite should take a lesson from these two members who have been here for some time.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, when I talk about a highway I ask for nothing for myself. There is no highway through my riding at all so I am only asking for the hon. member for Kent West when I speak of Highway 401.

Mr. Yakabuski: Let him speak for himself.

Mr. Newman: He has not taken the opportunity to speak in the House, that is why we—

An hon. member: Why do you not let somebody speak for you?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would still like from the hon. Minister, the comments concerning Highway No. 3, before we are given that wonderful piece of advice from the hon. member who preceded me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask the indulgence of the hon. member. You are correct, there is nothing on the current programme but I will try to find out the status of programming on the remaining sections of Highway No. 3. I cannot give it to you now; we will get the information for you.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 803 agreed to?

Mr. Newman: No, Mr. Chairman; I still have two other questions, and one is concerning the 401 overpass at the Maidstone township line. Is that for completion this

year? I noticed a listing on page 7, under the Chatham district: "Proposed new work, structures and approaches 130-64 Maidstone township line interchange." That is on for this year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If it is shown in the programme as proposed new work, it simply means a tender call will be advertised in this current construction season.

Mr. Newman: I am very pleased to hear of that from the hon. Minister, because on January 17 he had mentioned the fact in a press interview that it was going to be scheduled for February 16, 1965, so he has pushed it up one year. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

One other problem or question: The hon. member for Lambton West mentioned the Bluewater highway. Is there any planning in the department for the extension of that highway south following the Lake St. Clair shore going up into Bell River and then into the city of Windsor itself, so that you would have a Bluewater route starting at the Windsor gateway, going up into Sarnia and then from Sarnia extending up into Lake Huron? There is no planning for that yet, is there?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would have to say to the hon. member that there is nothing of that nature contemplated at the moment.

I am now in a position, I believe, to answer the hon. member with respect to the information he wanted associated with Highway No. 3 in the Windsor area. Our present programme calls for Essex West to Maidstone 3.3 miles in the 1966 construction season; westerly again from Maidstone 5.1 miles in a succeeding construction season—I cannot project it that far ahead—and the last section will take it to Windsor. Beyond 1966, frankly, I am not in a position to say with any accuracy just when the work will be done but it is programmed and scheduled.

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister is scheduling things so that within possibly four or five years it will be all straightened out.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right.

Mr. Knox: Mr. Chairman, might I mention to the hon. Minister that I did not mention the Bluewater highway in my remarks?

Mr. Newman: I stand corrected in this.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word, too, to the hon. Minister. A

few days ago, my good friend, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), was giving credit to the government for building a provincial highway to the reservation that is in his riding. I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister that I have in my riding a fine Indian reservation, the Moravian reservation, and there is not one foot of pavement on that reservation. These people are first Canadians, they pay gasoline tax and they pay licences, so I would hope the hon. Minister would jot this down in his minute book or in his book, and not forget pavement for this Indian reservation that is in the riding of Kent East.

Another matter that I would like to ask the hon. Minister is with regard to these service centres. I understand that so much ground rental is received from these companies who build these service centres, and also I understand there is a percentage of the gross of business. If I remember correctly, there are about eight of these service centres in operation this past year; could the hon. Minister inform us how much revenue was derived from these service centres? Also, has the hon. Minister any control over the prices charged at these service centres across the province of Ontario? For instance, is

there any control over the charge for meals to keep the meals to an average in the surrounding area?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would say, in respect to service centres—first, with regard to the Moravian-town Indian reserve we will, of course, make a note and look into it.

With regard to these service centres, the hon. member is quite correct. They pay a ground rental, then they pay a percentage of the gross, and this is based on a matter of tender. In other words, we call tenders and the person who offers the highest percentage of gross is awarded the tender. We do exercise control to the extent that these are inspected and supervised; and we do our best to ensure that the prices charged are not unreasonable, contrasted with the type of service and the quality of food being offered to the driving public. I think it is generally accepted that the prices are not unreasonable, and it is generally accepted that the service has been quite satisfactory. So, if this answers the hon. member's question, these are the related facts.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 17, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, concluded	1725
Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	1739
Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	1746
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1751

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

(continued)

On vote 803:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether anyone was cut off in the midst of a question or not. There are one or two things I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton).

In driving from Hamilton to Toronto on the Queen Elizabeth Way and watching, over the past year or 18 months, as it has become a fully controlled-access highway in that area, I have noticed the service stations being boarded up and abandoned in this process. I have no association whatsoever with the people concerned, but I would be interested to know what sort of deal is necessary between the department and these people. Is it necessary for the department to buy out the whole establishment in order that they be closed up under those circumstances?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): I would say to the hon. member that the situation was simply this: When those people went in there to operate the service stations, it was with the full knowledge that eventually, some day—now, if you like—that, related to the requirements of the department, they would be obliged to go. They went in there with the full knowledge of this and they have now, in the process of widening that is taking place and so on, simply moved out as was understood at the time.

Mr. Nixon: Does the department own the premises which have been abandoned?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Probably not. We do not know what they have done, or why. They have done this in the line of what I have already indicated to you.

Mr. Nixon: There are two service stations just west of the Highway 27 cloverleaf, which

now have a monopoly of the business there and really are in much the same category as the service centres on 401. Because of this, do they pay a premium for this special position, in the same way as they would along 401?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Probably the hon. member should be a little more specific. Is he making reference, for instance, to the Supertest station just west of 27?

Mr. Nixon: That is one of them; and I believe there is one across the road from it, too.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is an Imperial station, I believe. No, there is no premium arrangement there. They simply enjoy a good location and the benefits which accrue to a good location. It has accrued to them over a period of years and, eventually, either by negotiation or otherwise, arrangements will be made if the property they occupy is required for the interchange facility to be built in the widening processes which will be undertaken. I know of no special arrangement with them.

Mr. Nixon: I would suggest that it might be a profitable enterprise if the hon. Minister had his people negotiate with the owners and operators of these two stations, since the fencing off of the rest of the stations in the distance between Toronto and Hamilton has given them a very preferred position—very similar, I would submit, to the positions of the service centres on 401.

I would also like to ask the hon. Minister about the designations of the various roads. The hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton), this afternoon was referring to a number of designations—and I think particularly of Highway 97 which runs westward from the city of Galt. I am not sure what its designation is, but I would wonder how long The Department of Highways intends to leave it at such a low standard?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I see it the hon. member has posed two questions here. The two service stations referred to, I believe, are the Supertest on

the one hand and the Imperial, not too far away, on the other.

We have, for some time, owned the property on which the Imperial station operates, so they are quite well aware of the fact that some day we will have to say, "Remove yourselves," you see. With respect to the Supertest station, we have been engaged in negotiations for quite some time. They, too, are aware that they will be obliged to move, and these negotiations have been underway and are still underway.

With respect to Highway 97, I wonder—

Mr. Nixon: I could be more specific in that connection. I do not know whether you are familiar with this stretch of road, Mr. Minister, or not, but I see that it is in the proposed new work in the book we have before us, and it is going to undergo grading, drainage and granular base. This has been a King's highway for many years, and most of Highway 97 has been brought up to very high standards, indeed. There is one short section which has never been brought up to this standard, and it is a considerable hardship for the people who have access to that road. The dust conditions, the hills, the potholes, lack of good service, are quite a hazard; and I must say they will be pleased to see they are in line for grading, drainage and granular base, and will be most interested to know when they could expect to drive on a paved surface. It is a King's highway and has been so designated for a long time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I think I would simply say, in reply to that, Mr. Chairman, that the first form of work engaged in the improvement or reconstruction of any highway is the grading, drainage and granular base. We do not usually leave highways of this description unpaved for any prolonged length of time, so that if the grading, drainage and granular base is under way this year, I think it is only reasonable to assume that paving will follow when the road base is put in condition for paving purposes.

Mr. Nixon: Driving through the province, we are always interested to see the signs which contain information about a project under way. I think these signs are very well prepared, with the symbolic trillium and the names of the hon. Minister, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and the deputy Minister, as well as the number of the contract and other information. I would suggest, however, to the hon. Minister, that his advisers might do well to look into the use of the word "another". There is something pretty commercial about the use of this on every one

of these signs. I may be more sensitive than some of the hon. members opposite about this, but it appears to me you are in the process of selling something other than what the sign is there for. I would heartily recommend that it might add to the dignity a bit if this word were removed and we were not confronted with the fact that this is "another" project. We should leave something to the imagination of the citizens when we give this information.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is what you call political advertising.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member will expect me not to concur with the sentiments he has just expressed, because every project of our department is another project; and every project, I may say, Mr. Chairman, no matter how small it is, is another contribution to the highway system of the province and the good of the people of this province.

Mr. Nixon: I would not dream of questioning that at all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well then, if I may say so, I would expect the hon. member to comment as he did. I do not think he will concur with my sentiments and I might add, sir, that I do not concur with his sentiments. So there you are.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister one question. In the Hamilton area we have a very good grid work of highways now coming into Hamilton. We have one bottleneck, that is Highway 6 from Hamilton to Guelph. It is quite a winding road, and narrow. I am wondering when the hon. Minister feels he will be able to start making that a four-lane highway? Has there been any decision made on that as yet?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would say that no specific decision has been made on this particular situation. I think I would be inclined to say to the hon. member that we do have a forward programme with respect to every highway in the province.

At the moment I am not in a position to tell you with any degree of accuracy when the improvement of the section to which the hon. member refers will reach its priority stage for improvement. But certainly it will not be a long period. It is a matter of programming. As I have said before in the course of debating these estimates, we have to assign priorities, and I think you can safely assume, Mr. Chairman, that if this is not on

the programme this year then certainly we have assigned higher priorities to other roads in the province. But this does not mean that this thing will be abandoned any longer than might reasonably be expected. It will come up in the due course of events.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, having answered the question, now that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) is in his seat, if I might talk to him about those trees in which he professed some interest, and rightly so. I was not aware that he was returning this evening. I proposed to do it before we adjourned at six o'clock, for the sake of the record, so that if he was not here to hear the proposition he could at least read it in the record later. Now he is here.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): I am usually here, unless there is an awfully good reason.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, exactly.

Mr. Oliver: I was not afraid of the hon. Minister's answer, either.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no reason to be, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): This could go on all night.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The contract to which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred, before we adjourned, related to the cost of the planting of a number of trees—400 in all, I believe. Now this contract involved tree-planting on Highway 401, as he properly described, in the area of Avenue Road. Trees required are large trees; big ones.

Mr. Oliver: Large trees?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Big ones.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will describe the size of them to the hon. leader of the Opposition. Trees required for this contract were from 10 to 20 feet in height. The reason of course was that the department wished to restore the situation to what it was before, rather than plant saplings and take ten years to do it. These trees are also required to form a sound barrier in that area.

Mr. Oliver: Sound barrier?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Sound barrier; and they do a very effective job, I might say, Mr. Chairman, in terms of providing a sound

barrier. Trees of a certain height and a certain description do a very effective job.

The contract also requires the contractor not only to remove these trees, transport them and plant them, but to maintain all of them for a period of one year. In other words he has to dig, move them, plant them and maintain them for a period of a year. We felt this was a somewhat difficult job. The location is difficult for the planting project that is associated with it and consequently, while it certainly appears to be a lot of money—it did to me, my first impression when the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned it was that it was a great deal of money—but when you examine the facts it is not too much.

Four bids were received, the lowest, as mentioned, was \$55,600. Now one would wonder why The Department of Lands and Forests were not able to supply trees for this purpose. The Department of Lands and Forests usually do not allow trees to reach this size before they make them available for distribution for departmental and other use. This may not be an answer that satisfies the hon. leader of the Opposition, but these are the facts associated with it, Mr. Chairman. Having waited for him to return I certainly wanted to tell the hon. leader of the Opposition these related facts.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if any of these trees will be replaced if they die?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that, of course, was associated with my previous comments. If they die in the period of 12 months they are replaced at no charge to the department.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned for the dinner hour, I asked a question in regard to the service centres along the route of 401 to the effect that I thought there were eight in operation during this past year. I asked the hon. Minister what was the revenue received from those eight service centres in operation during 1963.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member, he will understand, of course, that these service centres have not as yet been in operation for a full year so that to project a full year's revenue is impossible. The estimated annual revenues from these service centres, the eight centres on highway 401 is \$400,000 and the estimated revenue for the two centres on Highway 400 is \$40,000. A total of \$440,000 is the estimated revenue from these service centres.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask three brief questions. First I would like to adopt the suggestions, sir, of the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) and thank the government for the work that is being contemplated in my area, namely, eight-tenths of a mile of construction. For this we are very thankful. I know it is a very ticklish engineering problem and will be solved.

The questions are: could the hon. Minister determine as to when Highway 77 from Staples to Comber will be reconstructed?

The second question: in view of a letter I received from the deputy Minister on October 8 suggesting Highway 18 between Kingsville and Harrow was going to be completed this spring and—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am afraid I did not catch that.

Mr. Paterson: Highway 18 between Kingsville and Harrow—it was indicated in the letter to me that this would be done either this winter or early this spring and I do not see this in the estimates.

A further question with regard to development roads, I notice that the Chatham area has been appropriated slightly over three-quarters of a million dollars to be spent on development roads and it has been drawn to my attention, whether true or not, that Essex county has never received one development road in the past. I would like to know whether this is true or not, and if it is true are there any other counties in this province that have never had a development road?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On the matter of Highway 77 from Leamington to Comber, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is aware that this section of road was only assumed within less than the last 12-month period as a King's highway. We are aware of the fact there are sections of this road that are not in as good shape as we like a King's highway to be, but certain sections of this highway are in quite acceptable shape, I think, as far as King's highways standards are concerned. Having only assumed this a year or so ago and with the assumption, it will be recognized, of course, that we added heavily to our maintenance costs, I think we sensibly and reasonably felt that this might be deferred to a future programme.

I would say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, that he is quite correct: There is nothing programmed for this year, but we propose to have our district forces keep close watch on the substandard sections

and when suitable maintenance will not keep them in an adequate state of repair then in fairness I think we can suggest that we will think about improvement, reconstruction, resurfacing or something.

On the matter of Highway 18, Kingsville to Harrow, I would respectfully request the hon. member to allow me time to get the facts. If we do not convey them to him this evening, we will do as we did last year when we addressed a letter to every member who asked a question on which we did not have the facts at our fingertips. We wrote and provided complete information. If we cannot get that information tonight, I assure the hon. member we will make this information available to him.

So far as development roads are concerned, I would simply say the hon. member is not quite correct when he said there have been no development roads in Essex county. This may be correct in a sense of the word, but the town line between Wheatley and Tilbury is a development road and as the town line and the boundary it is related 50 per cent to the county of Kent and 50 per cent to the county of Essex. It is quite a substantial undertaking and I think both counties are benefiting here very substantially.

I would point out to the hon. member that in the ordinary sense of things and on the basis of the warrants that we use for direct assistance, this was a rather generous move on the part of the department, because neither the county of Essex nor the county of Kent, in all honesty, unless there is a specific situation arises, conform to the warrants that are required for direct assistance. So here you see we have a rather costly stretch of road down the town line and there are quite substantial benefits accrue to the county of Essex as a result.

An hon. member: Flexible!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very flexible indeed!

Mr. Paterson: Could the hon. Minister tell me when that road was determined a development road?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It was designated as a development road at the outset, it has never been designated as anything else. The departmental people were down and discussed this matter with the counties involved and at that time it was so designated.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): I am aware of the magnitude of the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Highways and the scope of

his department, but what I am going to relate now I think there is a principle at stake.

We heard today from the hon. member for Armourdale, Mr. Chairman, that it took about six months and he could still not get a decision from the hon. Minister or the department on a matter of importance. We have been over four years trying to get a decision for officials in Owen Sound and of our suburban areas commission, as far as the take-over of a highway. It is a case of a suburban area road going northwest from Owen Sound some 12 miles and it carries more traffic than the province of Ontario highway. We are being asked to maintain this road and this has no relation to the city of Owen Sound. Here is a case where a traffic count was taken by the department of the hon. Minister and it showed that they were carrying more traffic than a province of Ontario highways department road; and the city of Owen Sound is asked to maintain it as a suburban area road—12 miles out.

Mr. G. E. Gomme (Lanark): Does the hon. member not get a subsidy on it?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, we do.

Mr. Yakabuski: The traffic is all after dark, is it not?

Mr. Sargent: Every time we bring this matter up with The Department of Highways the hon. Minister is looking out the window. It has been going on for four years. They just cannot get interested in our problem. The traffic count was taken by the department last year from July 18 to July 25. On July 18 it carried 2,364 cars; July 19, 3,851 cars; July 20, 4,444 cars; July 21, 5,642 cars; July 22, 3,149; July 23, 3,339; July 24, 2,200 even; and July 25, 1,934—a total, in one week's time, of 26,932 cars.

Bearing in mind that this road goes northwest from Owen Sound, it funnels all the traffic to Sauble Beach, the finest sand beach in Ontario; it funnels all the traffic through Bruce, up the peninsula, up to Manitoulin Island. All this traffic goes over this suburban area road, which the department defines as something which we should maintain. For four years we have been submitting that this is unfair; it is inequitable. We in Owen Sound cannot afford to fix our own streets, but we have to maintain the department's highways. Every time we come down here we draw a blank.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister, on behalf of the people whom I have the good fortune to represent, for a statement of what

he plans to do about it. It has been going on four years. I think it is only fair that the small parts of Ontario be looked after, because two-thirds of the hon. members of this House are from the small parts and are supplying two-thirds of the money here. I think it is time that we had an equitable look at the smaller parts of Ontario. I would like an answer from the hon. Minister on that tonight.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, singularly enough we rather expected that this question might be proposed tonight, so I shall read, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, the story associated with this. This matter, and the hon. member is almost correct on this, has a history which goes back to February of 1962, and again 1963, when resolutions from the city of Owen Sound were received requesting the department to assume county road No. 2. This request was studied by the planning branch and it was determined that this road should become part of the highway system.

The status of the other highways in Grey county were also studied. And as the development road from Mount Forest easterly to Shelbourne, referred to by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, has recently been assumed as Highway 89—I am afraid that the hon. leader of the Opposition will not be too pleased with the comments I am about to make—I will say that as Highway 4, Durham to Flesherton, does not justify highway status, it was decided to propose to the county that the department assume county road No. 2 as a highway and that Highway 4, from Durham to Flesherton, would be reverted to the county following the completion of the building and the repairs which are necessary.

The regional functional planning engineers held a meeting on June 26, 1963, with members of the county roads committee and the Owen Sound suburban roads committee, and proposed a road transfer, the road transfer arrangement to which I have already referred. The council agreed to the proposal in principle, and it was arranged that the regional engineer will arrange a meeting with prepare the necessary plans, showing the work required on Highway 4, and present these plans to a further meeting. The necessary plans are approaching completion and, following the approval of the design by the planning branch of the department, the regional engineer will arrange a meeting with the county and with the suburban roads committee and I would anticipate this would take place in a matter of about three weeks' time. It is hoped, of course, that full agreement to

the proposed road transfer arrangement will be obtained at this meeting. The work on Highway 4 is presently programmed for 1966.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman! I have sat here all afternoon waiting for an opportunity to speak on one item.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Armourdale made an exceptionally good case of the problem he has in his riding. He made reference to the fact that the highway was built rather close to homes whose property values have deteriorated to the point where they cannot sell their properties. I think possibly that we have an opportunity now to acquire some of the land, in about a 20-mile stretch from the Homer Bridge to the Peace Bridge, for right-of-way on which to develop service roads along the highway where there are no buildings. I think it would be good business to purchase this land, or look into the matter in the very near future.

I was fortunate, and very pleased, to receive a letter from the hon. Minister to the chairman of the street committee in Fort Erie. He was good enough to send me this letter. I think one of the paragraphs in the letter warrants reading. They made certain requests for work in their own town—and I think it is rather lengthy—but one paragraph of the hon. Minister's reply to Mr. Miner is worth putting on the record. The third paragraph:

The department plans to study the control of access to the Queen Elizabeth Way from Niagara Falls to Fort Erie. In this study consideration will be given to the recommendations of your committee. When such report is available, improvement to the Queen Elizabeth Way in your area, will be carried out according to priority.

I think it is an exceptionally interesting paragraph. He is going to make a study, and I believe that while he is in the process of making the study he should try to determine why there are so many accidents along that strip of road.

My own opinion is that when you come out of the city of Toronto to Hamilton you have no level crossings to speak of—none at all I believe to Hamilton—you have your service roads along the highway, and you have your overpasses. And then you come into a stretch, from the circle on this side of Burlington to St. Catharines, where there are many roads which, perhaps, should be protected a little better than they are. But, coming into St. Catharines, you have exceptionally good over-

passes; you are building another one there—and I believe they are all needed. I am not objecting to that, but the travelling public comes through that strip and there are service roads and overpasses and cloverleaves. They come into a stretch of road from that point to the Peace Bridge, travelling at the rate of speed that they are entitled to, which is some 60 miles an hour. They naturally do not look for the traffic that has to cross that highway, and this is where you come across your accidents.

I believe that The Department of Highways should consider purchasing the right of way now along that highway. The land is available, there are no buildings to speak of in that particular stretch and it would be a good time to purchase it cheaply. In your study I hope you come to that conclusion.

Why I say that is because I see mention in the newspaper, the Niagara Falls *Evening Review*—I get it here every morning, the day after it is published—and I would like to read one of the stories, or two paragraphs of it, which I so often read in that paper. This is about the Queen Elizabeth Way, of which I speak. I quote:

BERTIE YOUTH DIES FROM INJURIES IN QUEEN ELIZABETH WAY CRASH

Fort Erie—Eighteen-year-old Geoffrey Raymond of 338 Ridge Road, Ridgeway, died in the Buffalo General Hospital Saturday night as a result of head injuries sustained in the automobile crash on the Queen Elizabeth Way at Pettit Road on Friday evening.

Geoffrey was born in Fort Erie and was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Lee Raymond. Mr. Raymond is a sergeant in the Bertie township police department.

He was a Grade 12 student at Ridgeway Crystal Beach high school where he was active in sports, baseball, track and field.

This young man died at the very young age of 18 years. There are many such accidents along that strip of road. I believe the reason that that happens is because motorists come from an area where they have access cloverleaves and service roads, into an area where they do not have them. They have just a stop-street sign and people come through there.

I know one particular spot that The Department of Highways engineers should look at and I would like very much to take the time to go there with them. That is the Lyon's Creek road where there is a similar road crossing on the Queen Elizabeth Way going into Welland. There is a high rise on

that highway. I would say that if you went up the highway, let us say to the north for want of a better direction, going south to the Peace Bridge you find yourself climbing over a bit of a knoll. I would say at 2,000 feet from that intersection you cannot see cars approaching. I think the people take the chance of starting across, not seeing any traffic. In that particular area alone I do not know how many people have been maimed and many, many have been killed.

I would like to get the record and I think the Ontario Provincial Police department will get it for me, if The Department of Highways does not have those records.

I would like to appeal to the hon. Minister and suggest that this survey be made very quickly. I understand that this is in the process, according to the hon. Minister's letter, and it will be found that life can be saved, as well as property damage avoided, heaven knows how much. Maybe certain types of signs could be put up, stating that from here on in, until otherwise designated, there will not be any cloverleafs or service roads and traffic should watch and be cautious for intersections. I do believe that with the traffic that originates in Buffalo, Fort Erie and that area coming through, better precautions are called for.

In 1950, the hon. member for Welland, who was here a moment ago, and I—when it was my good fortune to be the warden for the county of Welland—got quite a delegation together and we came to the former Minister of Highways. The then Minister of Highways at that time was George Doucette. Then after that time we had, I think, Bill Goodfellow. Then the present hon. Attorney General (Mr. Cass) was the Minister of Highways, sir. We approached him about a similar problem, an overpass at the Mountain road, if you recall.

Apparently the Minister did not hear me, but we had a delegation from Stamford township pertaining to the Mountain road where there is an overpass considered, sir, and the Minister gave us an exceptionally good hearing. George Doucette did a good job of listening to us; Bill Goodfellow did a good job of listening to us. As I say, the present hon. Attorney General treated us exceptionally well. We thought we would come back again, the treatment was so good. The results were nil. This has been going on for many, many years.

Now then, the hon. member for Sudbury said that it took him 11 speeches. He has no record at all because I have approached the government with delegations from the

county of Welland for about 14 years and I can assure hon. members that very little has been done in that particular area pertaining to level crossings.

There was a traffic light put in at the Willoughby-Bertie town line road after accidents and it was brought to the attention of The Department of Highways. The new hon. Minister was good enough to put a flasher or a light at the intersection of the town line at Black Creek. That is a precaution but is not the right type of installation. At least, as a layman I do not believe it is. I think traffic-operated lights should be installed at that particular point.

So from time to time we wind up with accidents, Mr. Chairman, which I think could be avoided if proper installations were put in. But for a cost factor to determine the future of that particular area and to put in the service roads which will eventually be put in, now is the time to acquire the land.

I am sorry to have to draw this to the hon. Minister's attention. About two or three weeks ago I submitted the local paper to you pertaining to the condition of some of that road. We do not mind the bumpy roads; we do not mind some of the guard rail being down. The thing that we are concerned about is losing life on that highway. It can be prevented if proper installations are put in and I hope your survey will support this conclusion and that very soon now overpasses or some type of traffic signals will be put in there to save life, property, and naturally, the anxiety that these people have to go through.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I will comment only briefly on this. Some of it may be related to the comments I made in response to the observations of the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn) this afternoon. Certainly we propose to control the access on the Queen Elizabeth Way from Toronto to Fort Erie.

I would point out to the hon. member that up to this point and waiting for the report on the traffic study that is being made, we have felt inclined, as I suggested to the hon. member this afternoon, to attempt to deal with it on some sort of priority basis.

Certainly when you review the matter relating it to traffic counts, you find from the time you leave Toronto, go over the Burlington Bridge, proceed to Niagara Falls and thence to Fort Erie, that the average daily traffic drops off very sharply. I am not going to go through all of this because it would take too long, but when we start at Highway

2, the Lakeshore road to Highway 27, the figure is 50,000 vehicles per day; Highway 27 to county road 4 at Dixie road, 54,000; when we get to Highway 10, it drops to 40,000. I am going to drop down quite a bit here. When we get to Burlington Street, to Highway 20 at Stoney Creek, the traffic circle the hon. member referred to, we find the traffic is chopped more than in half; it is down to 22,000.

When we get to county road 22 at Vine-lund road, and this is one section we talked about this afternoon, the traffic drops down to 16,000, notwithstanding that it is a very bad and very serious accident-prone location. When we get all the way down here—we will get down closer to home for you—to Highway 8 at Homer—the bridge now is more appropriately called the Garden City Skyway rather than the Homer Bridge—we are down now to the Thorold Stone road, and the traffic is down to 14,500. When we get to county road number 5, to the Fort Erie west limits, the traffic is down to 7,000.

I would suggest to the hon. member then, that while we are proceeding with this and while we are waiting for the traffic study, maybe we are proceeding in a sensible fashion in that we are trying to remedy the situation at these areas where the traffic is the highest.

I do not want the hon. member to get the impression that we are not aware of accidents, because we are. When the hon. member makes reference to accidents and wants details, I suggest that he contact me or the deputy Minister and we will do our best to describe these accidents to him and why they took place.

As far as control of access is concerned, we realize that down in the area referred to there are certain crossings at grade.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, there are.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, there are. Definitely. We do propose to provide for grade separations in all situations that are related to accident-prone areas, related to the demands that the traffic imposes. I think I will simply wind this up, if I may, Mr. Chairman, by saying that when we have the report finished and when we have had a chance to evaluate it, I would hope, as the hon. member does, that we will find the answers to these problems. I do not think there is anything more I can say at the moment, but certainly we hope as you do, that we will find a way to solve these bad situations and the problems associated with them.

Mr. Bukator: Is there a possibility that your people will instruct or request the purchase of at least the land for the service road at this time, because there are no buildings on it and it can be acquired very cheaply, so you will not come into a similar problem that you had here on 401?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On the matter of property requirements I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that they will be altogether associated with what the report of the traffic study reveals. In other words, I do not think it is reasonable to suggest that until we get this report and have had time to properly evaluate it that we can in fairness know what our property requirements are. But once we get this report, and have gone through the evaluation process, and this will not take long, then, I think we will be in a position to move in and acquire the property that is associated with all these requirements.

I think I could maybe safely say this, too, that to move in there now and acquire property might involve the acquisition of more than is required. But certainly the day of property acquisition is not too far off because the report is not too far off, Mr. Chairman. At that point we will move in and acquire our property certainly.

Mr. Bukator: Just to finish up; you have said that I could ask you for a report on accidents. From the Dorchester Circle to Fort Erie, these are the particular roads to which I make reference where they cross, at a level crossing or whatever you call it—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Crossing at grades.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, crossing at grades. I would like the accident report of, let us say, the last 10 years anyhow, because the second lane has not been finished for the last ten years. I believe that people travelling that particular highway believe they are protected from traffic coming in front of them, and then the cars come out in front of them and naturally they have these accidents.

There is one particular area, at Lyon's Creek, where this hump on the road is just like a dog waiting for a rabbit. A car comes across; and the poor soul starting across, that is where they kill him. Many have been killed at that intersection. If nothing more, they could take that down to level.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. member to clarify this. Are you referring to the section of the QEW from the Dorchester traffic circle to Fort Erie?

Mr. Bukator: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right. We will provide as much of this information as we can make accessible to you.

Mr. Bukator: It would be interesting, not so much to myself, but I would like the hon. members of the Legislature to hear it.

Mr. Morningstar: Mr. Chairman, we realize that it takes time to get these things done. I am sure the hon. member for Niagara Falls knows that it takes time to get these things done. After all, we are in the great county of Welland. Some years ago, we were working on this west side road, which is 406 today. You will recall, my good hon. friend, that it was some 10 or 12 years since we were working on that road. Today it looks to be a reality, we are pretty sure it is and we appreciate what our good government has done—the provincial government along with the federal government—in providing this road.

Now they are continuing the extension of this road to the city of St. Catharines where other good friends represent the riding.

An hon. member: Who is that?

Mr. Morningstar: We do hope that the federal government will come in on this scheme and its construction and pay a portion of this extension of the west side road.

Then again the tunnel in the city of Welland, we are working on that. We are very pleased today to see the federal government working along with the provincial government in building this tunnel in the city of Welland which will go a long way in relieving the traffic congestion there. It is something we have wanted for a number of years and I am sure the hon. Minister of Highways in time will get along to the Niagara Falls riding, the same as he has up in the Welland riding.

It takes time to get these things done but today we are seeing results, and I am sure the people in our area do appreciate, Mr. Minister, the work that you are doing in the great county of Welland. Not only in the Welland riding, but in the Niagara Falls riding, too, on Highway No. 3, the Dorchester road. We are very pleased indeed to see that you have these projects under consideration.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I must reply because I did make reference to the fact that the hon. member for Welland and I sat on county council and in 1950 when I was a warden of that county, we were on the committee in Fort Erie looking over the

Queen Elizabeth from the Peace Bridge on through the county, that great county of Welland, to which you make reference.

From 1950 to 1964 is taking a lot of time to get around to that end of the county—at least where the traffic originates on the Peace Bridge, on the Queen Elizabeth Way—so I made reference to the fact that you and I worked together on this west side road of which you speak. It is one of the very few times that the federal government stepped into the road building business. It was maybe because I had friends in Ottawa at that time; because you got 50 per cent from the provincial government and we went to Ottawa and got the other 50 per cent. As a matter of fact, when we built the west side road from Port Colborne to Welland we wound up \$18,000 ahead of the game. Do you recall that?

An hon. member: What did you do with it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: We had more money, as a matter of fact the hon. Minister might want to hire the hon. member for Welland and me to show him how it is done.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): One last question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman. Did the hon. Minister's department hire counsel to prosecute a Mrs. O'Hare and Mr. Swartman and what were their fees?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, this involves the case associated with the municipal roads engineer I believe in the New Liskeard district and a Mrs. O'Hare as part of the contracting firm. I might say that the costs associated with this action have never as yet been submitted because, if the hon. member is not aware of it, it has been stated in the press the case is being retried. The jury in the first instance was a hung jury and reached no decision whatsoever. The case is to be retried and I would presume until the thing is finalized there will be no charges submitted. We have no charges associated with that action submitted to the department as yet.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister did not answer my first question. Did he hire the counsel? Did his department hire them first?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. Attorney General's department engaged the counsel for this.

Mr. Newman: That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, to clarify my request—I am sorry I did not understand the hon. Minister when he was quoting highway numbers—to finalize my request, is the Shallow Lake road to be taken over by The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I submitted the information, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will read this whole thing again.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, I just want an answer to my question, please, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Yakabuski: What do you want anyhow?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have determined, as I pointed out, that this county road No. 2 should be part of the highway system.

Mr. Sargent: We do not know it as that in that section—as No. 2. We know it as Highway No. 27, I think it is.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the reference was to county road No. 2.

Mr. Sargent: The Shallow Lake Road?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, known as the Shallow road.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister: how many miles of provincial highways as presently set out do you intend to try to get back to the counties in the next few months, or in the next year? You have had an evaluation, I understand, and you have arrived at certain conclusions that certain mileage of provincial highways is not adaptable for the provincial highway system and you are going to try to make an agreement with the counties. How many miles are involved throughout the province in this sort of a trading deal that you have in mind?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I will have to get that information for the hon. gentleman. It is not available immediately. I would suppose there are similar situations elsewhere in the province, but I am not aware of these figures tonight. I do not think they are readily accessible. I will make that information available to my hon. friend at the first convenient opportunity.

Mr. Oliver: May I ask my hon. friend a supplementary question? What standard is employed by your department to determine

that a highway presently designated as a provincial highway should not in the future be a provincial highway?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The volume of traffic would be number one. The type of traffic would be another.

Mr. Oliver: The type of traffic?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The type of traffic! I would think it probably would be well established that the traffic over the section that has been referred to is largely local traffic. In other words, it hardly meets the warrants that are associated with a King's highway or a provincial highway. Now I have to assume, and I think fairly assume at the moment, that this has all been closely investigated and that the section of highway that is under discussion at the moment is carrying preponderantly local traffic.

Mr. Oliver: You will be able to persuade me that it is not for political reasons, in any sense of the word?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, perish the thought, is the word, Mr. Chairman, certainly not. I would repeat for the information of my hon. friend that before the county is requested to take it back, it will be restored to proper standards, probably a complete rebuilding job will be undertaken. You will have a better road than ever before.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments at this time. My hon. friend from Wellington-Dufferin referred to me this afternoon and I thought it only appropriate that I should make a few comments about his remarks at this time.

Indeed, I am happy and I appreciate, and I am sure my people do, the fact that the department and the government have built this road to which he referred this afternoon. It has meant a great deal to me and to them, I am sure, and certainly I do not hesitate in thanking the government for it.

The government has also built a bridge in my riding, a bridge on Highway 86, west of Wingham. Once again, we appreciate that and we thank the government for it.

Before I sit down, I would like to mention that there is another bridge we would like in my riding—that is, a connecting link bridge. Certainly I hope, and I am sure, the hon. Minister will give favourable consideration to this proposal.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment on this. The Department of Highways has never at any stage of the game refused the council of the town of Wingham this bridge. However, I would point out to the hon. member that The Highway Improvement Act stipulates that municipalities with a population in excess of 2,500 are entitled to 90 per cent subsidization on connecting links, or structures associated with connecting links. The problem in this instance, I think the hon. member is quite aware of this, is that the council of the town of Wingham, which he represents, simply feels that the rate of subsidy should be 100 per cent. Even if I wanted to subsidize at the rate of 100 per cent, I would have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member, that the statutes will not permit me to do it. And until the town of Wingham is prepared to absorb the modest ten per cent of this cost, I am afraid I have to suggest to the hon. member they will not have a bridge.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 803 carried?

Mr. Gaunt: One final comment, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to say that I realize and I appreciate the hon. Minister's problem. I will say, however, that the bridge—the Zetland bridge to which I referred earlier—I believe cost \$247,000. The Wingham bridge is only roughly half the length of that bridge. Maybe there are other things involved which add to the cost, but I understand that the Wingham bridge, as the plans are set out, would cost roughly \$250,000. My question to you, sir, is: Where does the added cost come in? The Wingham bridge is only roughly half the length of the Zetland bridge, so where does the other cost come in? Of course, this all comes back to the town of Wingham. If the cost of that bridge could be lowered, then their share would be less.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would answer the hon. member's question by saying that, where a connecting link is involved, it is the prerogative and the privilege of the municipality to initiate any project associated with that connecting link if they so choose. If the town of Wingham, then wishes to propose to the department that they wish to build this bridge, under their connecting link agreement and on the basis of the subsidy contribution which the statute permits us to make; and if they, in their wisdom, feel they would like to employ consulting engineers to advise them in this respect; and a bridge, shall we say, which is satisfactory to the town of

Wingham, can be designed and proposed by such consulting engineers, then I see no particular difficulty.

The estimates of The Department of Highways associated with this happened to be \$250,000. This is what our engineers feel is required to build the type of bridge the town should have. It bears no relationship to the Zetland bridge which, I think, is the one to which you are referring on Highway 86. The span itself is not always the factor which determines the cost of the bridge. All other structural aspects have to be taken into consideration.

But I would repeat: If the town of Wingham is satisfied with the basic rate of subsidy the statute permits, and if they can come up with a design which costs less—and it suits them adequately and provides all the features related to safety and structural requirements—then I am quite prepared to say the department will approve 90 per cent of the cost for subsidy purposes.

This matter, you see, of where a connecting link is involved, Mr. Chairman, I would say through you to the hon. member, is entirely the prerogative of the municipality in which the connecting link is situated, and where the agreement between The Department of Highways and the municipality is related. So this is not a matter, I think, which involves the department to quite the extent the hon. member feels it does, because these prerogatives rest entirely with the municipality of the town of Wingham.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister if the department has a plan which envisages the highway needs of this province for the next two decades?

Mr. Yakabuski: The hon. member is going back to the Hepburn days; we do not want that.

Mr. Sopha: I am thinking the hon. member for Renfrew South is the greatest argument I have seen in favour of retroactive birth control.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that a 20-year needs study was undertaken in the year 1959, under the direction of the then Minister of Highways, the present hon. Attorney General of the province. This needs study, sir, is now five years under way, and I think I can substantiate to the hon. member, or safely say, that the department has kept pace with the needs which were projected in this needs study, with 15 years to go.

Not content with this, Mr. Chairman, while we did project this 20-year needs study, we constantly re-evaluate it. We update it from time to time. It was followed by a study on the needs for urban roads and streets. Other studies have been undertaken. Studies have been undertaken relating to subsidies, and many of the increased subsidies introduced over the last 12 months have been related to this study. There have been substantial increases in terms of subsidies, as the hon. member knows, so I can safely say to you that, of course, we have a plan. Two decades is 20 years. We had a 20-year plan in 1959. In five years this plan has progressed, with the updating features I have mentioned. Of course we have a plan. We always have a plan.

Mr. Sopha: You have been talking vague generalities all day. Let me ask the hon. Minister specifically—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member asked a rather general question, may I say.

Mr. Sopha: What is the gross amount of capital which will be required over the next 20 years to meet our highway needs?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the needs study to which I referred, released in 1959, indicated the cost of the road needs of this province for the 20 years subsequent to March 31, 1958 as follows: Roads controlled by the province, King's highways and secondary highways, \$2,438,780,000. At the same time, the projected needs in the municipal sector—municipal roads, county, township and urban—was \$4,714,140,000. The total, then, of these needs costs, forecast five years ago was \$7,152,920,000. The study indicated that expenditures would keep pace with needs if increased annually by \$7.8 million over the \$276 million spent in the year 1957-58. If I am being too general now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member may correct me.

The expenditures were based on 1957-58 costs, and included a five to six per cent allowance for overhead. If the hon. member wishes, I can pursue these figures to show that the provincial government has been keeping abreast of roads. Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member wish me to go all the way with this information?

Mr. Sopha: Let me just ask the hon. Minister this: Are they related as well to the increase in motor vehicle ownership in the province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes.

Mr. Sopha: And are they based upon the premise that with 2.5 million cars now that there will be four million or more in 1970?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: That is the premise?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: These figures were taken into the calculations. Normal growth figures relating to the specific items the hon. member has referred to were all taken into the calculations in the needs study. They would have to be or they would not be of value. This is not a stagnant economy. In those days, of course, we knew the province was going to grow, as we know it is growing and we know it is going to continue to grow. How could you predict a 20-year needs study on a constant basis? Mr. Chairman, I submit this does not even make sense. We must have projected some growth figures or the study would have been useless.

An hon. member: All we did was ask.

Mr. Sopha: It does not make sense at all. I will tell the hon. Minister one thing that has not been growing in this province in your 20 years of power and that is the population. The population has not grown very significantly. We are only six million—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Six and a half million.

Mr. Sopha: Can the hon. Minister tell us where six million of us are going to raise this fabulous amount of capital over the next 20 years to pay for these highways? Tonight, on March 17, 1964, the hon. Minister asks for \$127 million. To meet, over the next 20 years, the requirements in excess of \$7 billion he is going to need, sir, a capital vote of over \$300 million a year. Let me ask the hon. Minister this: In order to meet the projected requirements of \$7 billion, when is he going to start to ask for the \$300 million? Is that next year? Or the year after?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the hon. member that the figures I have stated tonight include not only the contributions that the province makes to the roads of Ontario but also the contributions that are made by the municipalities. These are gross figures.

The hon. member knows very well that when we get away from the departmental capital construction programme, a very great amount of our budget, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact a greater percentage of our budget this year, will be in the form of subsidies to municipalities. Certainly, while

we are spending money the municipalities are spending money too, so I am talking about gross expenditures for road purposes. Naturally, our whole municipal programme outside of our capital construction programme is a joint one, with all the municipalities, urban, rural and otherwise involved, so that the expenditures I refer to are quite accurate and quite sensible.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister this question? He said that it had to increase yearly by seven point something million dollars from the 1958-59 figure of \$276 million, and how much per year does it have to increase?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: \$7.8 million.

Mr. Whicher: \$7.8 million—that would be \$39 million over a five-year period from 1958 to 1964, is that correct? Well, then, according to my arithmetic, the hon. Minister should be spending \$315 million this year on the highways, and he is asking for a budget of \$299,406,000. Would the hon. Minister explain that, please?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I might review these figures with the hon. member, and they show certainly that the programme has been met very well.

Mr. Whicher: Not by your figures, Mr. Minister, because I am using your own. \$276 million in 1958—that is five years ago; and \$7.8 million per year again comes to \$39 million. \$39 million and \$276 million is \$315 million. This is a study the hon. Minister made only five years ago, and we find that the hon. Minister is very close to \$16 million short in this particular year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But the hon. member has not heard the rest of the figures yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Whicher: No, I have not. Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let us go back to the year where reference was made to \$276 million, shall we? We said the total estimated requirements were \$276 million. This is the base year. The subsequent year, the total estimated requirements were \$283.8 million. In 1959-60, the next year, \$291.6 million. In 1961-62, \$307.2 million. In 1962-63, \$315 million.

Mr. Whicher: But surely—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He said the total estimated requirements. These include municipal subsidies, Mr. Chairman, these are capi-

tal costs. Now we can deduct from these municipal expenditures as I go along and show you the net provincial expenditures, but I am dealing with the total to which the needs study related. In 1963-64 the total estimated requirements \$322.8 million, and in the year that we are now talking about estimates for \$330.6 million. This is keeping pace almost to the dollar with the forecast needs.

From this we have to deduct municipal expenditures, and at the outset I made it quite clear, and I refer to my remarks to the hon. member for Sudbury, in talking about the gross needs of the province. So to be related properly, I am talking to the hon. member about the gross needs.

Mr. Whicher: Just one more question. The figures that the hon. Minister has added, along with the provincial expenditures, the initial expenditures are capital projected costs too, or were they for maintenance and capital?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Both, all expenditures! Total! Capital and maintenance!

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question with reference to the need for the massive changes in Highway 401. Were deficiencies discovered as a result of this 1959 survey or was the survey made as a result of suddenly finding the need for a greater amount of lanes on that highway?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would think in answering that question, I would say that the need for this construction to which the hon. member has referred, became manifest at about the same time as the study.

Mr. Braithwaite: One more question, Mr. Chairman. When was it made known to the public that the department planned for the widening of Highway 401 in the Metro area?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This was done about a year ago at a press conference called for that purpose.

Mr. Braithwaite: A further question, Mr. Chairman. Were the five years that elapsed spent in planning for the widening of the highway? What has happened during the five years? The hon. Minister said he found out in 1959.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is that the 1959

needs study indicated the need would arise in the 20-year period. I am quite frank to say that this need came about somewhat faster than we anticipated that it would.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803 agreed to.

This concludes the estimates of The Department of Highways.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1801:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1801, there is a correction that the department has asked to be made on item 9. The reference there is to The Welfare Unit Act, RSO 1960, chapter 428, section 5. That should read: "The District Welfare Administration Boards Act, 1962-63."

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, last night when the House adjourned, the decision was that we were going to have the estimates of The Department of Energy Resources today, following The Department of Highways.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I was not here. There seems to be some confusion, because someone else told me that they expected the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development to follow The Department of Highways. All I am trying to do is accommodate myself to the hon. members in the House.

Perhaps we could have the opening addresses and then we could adjourn if this would be satisfactory. I do not want to crowd hon. members if they are not ready to deal with these estimates. On the other hand, we really were talking about dealing with these estimates last week.

Mr. MacDonald: It is true that we were talking about dealing with them last week, but last night the House leader first indicated it would be The Department of Economics and Development. It was corrected behind the scenes, in full view of us, that it would be The Department of Energy Resources and there was no mention made of Public Welfare.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might make plainer what happened. I announced on the adjournment of the House—and I noticed in *Hansard* today what I had said—that it would be The

Department of Economics and Development. I had not talked to the hon. Prime Minister myself, but that was the information I had. The hon. member for York South advised me then, and in the hallway afterwards, that it was Energy Resources. Having nothing better to go on than that, and there being some agreement over here that that might be it, that was the basis upon which the House adjourned last evening. If there is any misunderstanding I can only take whatever blame or censure there may be for it.

On the other hand, I do know that the hon. member for York South had a schedule which he discussed with me. I do not know where it came from, but it had The Department of Energy Resources on it, I believe.

Mr. MacDonald: The schedule I referred to was the one the hon. Prime Minister gave us on Friday, which was Highways, Energy Resources, and Travel and Publicity, this week.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, we will have to work our way out of this difficulty. I might take it, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member is not prepared to go on with these estimates tonight. I mean, is he raising a point of order or is he not prepared to go on?

Mr. MacDonald: I am speaking on a point of order, in that we were prepared to go on with Energy Resources, but my hon. colleague who is in a position to lead off on Public Welfare is not here.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Chairman, we will go to the order paper, we have lots of work there and we can deal with some second readings. We can go into committee of the whole House and deal with a whole host of bills. Just to keep the record straight, tomorrow afternoon we will go on with The Department of Public Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE COMMISSIONERS FOR TAKING AFFIDAVITS ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to make some remarks with respect to this particular bill.

The appointment of commissioners for taking affidavits has been of concern to me for some time. A commissioner is deemed to be an officer of the Supreme Court of Ontario. He must satisfy himself of the genuineness of the signature of a deponent and must administer the oath in the manner required by law before he signs the jurat. He should refuse to administer an oath for a deponent who he knows is swearing a false statement. Any person who administers an oath is subject to being called upon to testify as to the authenticity of the signature of the affirmant as to the form of administration and as to any other circumstances.

The importance of an affidavit which is sworn before a commissioner must not be overlooked. A person may be committed to a mental hospital on the basis of such affidavit. Some disputes relating to a man's property may be disposed of on the basis of affidavit material. Affidavit evidence may be used in settling important questions relating to the estates of deceased persons. It is thus obvious that serious consideration be given in the conferring of these commissions.

The important function performed by a commissioner for taking affidavits appears to have been lost sight of in the flood of such appointments, numbering now some 4,800. Far too many appointments, I feel, were made which were not required. Many appointments were unrestricted, both as to territory and occupation. Far too many have no conception of the duties or responsibilities involved in the appointment.

I have therefore directed the officials in my department in many instances to refuse requests for new appointments and not to extend many coming up for renewal. Many wide open commissions have on renewal been restricted both as to area and occupation.

The present policy in the department is geared to look after the needs of the public, not the convenience of the individual.

Appointments need not be made in areas where there are already sufficient persons authorized to take affidavits, whether it is solicitors, justices of the peace, commissioners or notaries. In out-of-the-way places appointments of commissioners, or even notaries, are required for the public good.

In dealing with particular groups, a definite number have been appointed with province-wide jurisdiction, thus eliminating the necessity of appointing an individual in each separate unit or area. This has been successfully achieved with regard to credit unions and the Canadian Legion and it is intended to extend this policy to other groups where practicable.

Two main areas are covered in the proposed amendments to The Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act, which is this bill.

In the municipal field it is found that more commissioners are urgently required to transact the public business and therefore the deputy clerk, in addition to the clerk and treasurer, has been designated an *ex-officio* commissioner. Further, in every local municipality with a population of over 100,000 the administrative head, and his deputy, of departments having dealings with the public have also been designated *ex-officio* commissioners for the purposes of the affairs of the municipality. It is appreciated that in certain areas additional appointments may have to be made and this will also apply to areas having a population under 100,000. Such applications will be treated on the merits of the individual cases.

It must also be appreciated that for the proper conduct of business in dealing with the public, certain officials in corporations should hold appointments as commissioners for taking affidavits. Therefore, upon application the bill provides that the secretary and treasurer of a corporation with share capital and co-operative organizations may be appointed commissioners for the affairs of the corporation. Further, provision is made for the appointment of managers in branch offices of such corporations where required. It should be pointed out also, Mr. Speaker, that, to impress all appointees with the duties and responsibilities of their positions in office, a brochure is being prepared. It will be sent out with each appointment.

While I am speaking on commissioners I would like, Mr. Speaker, to go a little further, with a word or two concerning the other two types of commissions which give people authority to administer oaths. First of all there are notaries public, of whom there are some 900, not including members of the legal

profession, in our province. The hon. members will remember The Notaries Act was amended last year, providing for expiration of all previous appointments on June 30, 1964, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, and for all new appointments to be of three years duration. A letter, and a copy of the Act, was sent to all notaries on record in our office, and quite a number of these have been returned marked "unknown," "deceased," "appointment not required," and so on.

The first group of notarial appointments is coming up for renewal on June 30 of this year. These will be carefully screened with a view, where necessary, to further reducing the number. In some cases it will be found that an appointment as a commissioner will be sufficient for the purposes of applicant; and in many cases it will no doubt transpire that the appointment is not required. The need for new appointments will be similarly screened. Here again, in the case of commissioners, the needs of the public rather than the convenience of the individual will be the determining factor.

The third category of persons, entitled to take affidavits and administer oaths, is justice of the peace. At the present time there are approximately 900 justices of the peace in the province of Ontario, usually appointed for the county or district but a number having provincial jurisdiction. Many of these have been appointed for a great number of years and still retain their appointments. My department is notified of these appointments, and of their death and removal, through the magistrates, the police, the local member, the Crown Attorney; and usually, if necessary, a recommendation is made for another appointment to carry on the work. Many appointments also, sir, which were made and required many years ago are now, in view of modern transportation, not required. It is proposed that many of these may be transferred to an inactive list.

What I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members is that there are presently—in addition to those members of the legal profession who are both notaries public and commissioners *ex officio*, and in addition to the clerk and heads of council, and in cities the members of council, and members of this Legislature who are all authorized to take affidavits—4,800 commissioners, 900 notaries, and 900 justices of the peace. It would appear to me, sir, that the checking over of this, the revising of the requirements for the issuance of these commissions, is long overdue. With the assistance of the present Act it is my opinion, sir, that we may be able, first of all, to supply the

needs of the public as well as those of the corporations doing business in Ontario. Also we shall enable them in those areas where they will not be covered by the new Act, to have special appointments made in a manner similar to that done in the past—except with a much better screening and proof of necessity.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): This is a step in the right direction—long overdue. However, in principle I must say, Mr. Speaker, that not much thought went into the preparation of this statute. It is perfectly apparent in section 2 that the statute is, I would say, designed for the interest of finance companies; because under section 2 every finance company branch office in the province of Ontario is going to have, as a matter of right, a commissioner for taking affidavits.

Hon. Mr. Cass: No, no!

Mr. Sopha: That is the way it reads.

Hon. Mr. Cass: It may apply.

Mr. Sopha: That is the way it reads:

Upon application therefor and payment of the prescribed fee, the principal officer in each branch office in Ontario, of a corporation with share capital.

The branch office of every finance company in the province is now, on simple application, going to have a commissioner for taking affidavits for the affairs of the corporation.

Formerly, a few finance company branch offices had commissioners in them. I recall that the Law Association of Sudbury at one time decreed that fact to the inspector of legal offices, if not to the hon. Attorney General himself, and got a very cool and a very evasive reply about it. Let us look at the contrast in principles—the matter of principle. The borrower goes to the finance company and, if the document is required—a document which affects him and his future, his future income and the matter of debt to the finance company—if it is to be executed then a commissioner, right in the office of the finance company presumably, may take the affidavit.

I do not know, it may be that people who work for finance companies are more ethical, and men of greater integrity, than lawyers; but, at least under the rules of court in respect of lawyers, where a lawyer wishes an affidavit sworn or a document executed which is part and parcel of a litigious matter, then the rules of court require the lawyer to go outside his own office to have it sworn.

He has got to go down the hall, if he is fortunate to have another colleague at the bar in close contiguity to him, to have it sworn in order that it may properly be presented in the proceedings in court.

There is a very good reason for it. It erases the feeling of suspicion that the document was not properly sworn. The court, when it has it sworn by someone outside the office, at least on the face of it gives that appearance; but, further, it has a very purgative effect, a very prophylactic effect against the presentation of questionable documents. But apparently in the mind of the hon. Attorney General and his advisors, the same considerations ought not to apply to finance companies. It is perfectly right, under section 2 of this statute, that every branch manager of a finance company office in Ontario may now, on simple application, become a commissioner for taking affidavits.

I think—I say as a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker—that such a provision as encompassed in the four corners of this Act is not therefore designed to protect the interests of the public; and whereas the hon. Attorney General prates about reducing the number of commissioners, if, as I say and is apparent in this statute, every branch office of a finance company is going to have one, he is not at all going to significantly reduce the number of commissioners in the province. I venture to say he is going to increase them. He is going to increase the numbers.

Furthermore, as a matter of a priority reasoning, I cannot see that the secretary and treasurer of each corporation with share capital ought to, as of right, be commissioners for taking affidavits in the affairs of their own corporations. Surely as a matter of practice and development, the taking of an oath achieves its fullest effect if someone not connected with the affairs of the very corporation is the person who swears the deponent to the oath. Now this is swearing, the way it is phrased in this statute, and I say not much thought has apparently gone into it at all. It seems that factor is completely eliminated. People, mixed in their own affairs, may with impunity take affidavits from deponents concerning the affairs of that very corporation.

It does seem to me that a matter of principle, but a very valid principle of our law, is quite overlooked if not entirely violated.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, following on what my hon. colleague from Sudbury has said, I have many times read and observed that the main defence of poor innocent people who are in the toils of

finance companies, and are being sued for the unpaid balance of a note or bill is based on whether or not this note or bill was signed. And even when evidence is brought that a commissioner, who is not a party to the finance company—even when he is brought on the stand to prove that the note or bill was signed—it happens sometimes that there is difficulty with the evidence he gives. If what my hon. colleague from Sudbury has said is true, then it seems to me that there is going to be even more difficulty in the courts with reference to people who are unable to defend themselves and are sued by finance companies. There will not be a leg for them to stand on as far as whether or not they did or did not sign the note or bill in question.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the emphasis on this bill is that the hon. Minister is going to have a look at some of the merits of individuals getting the requirement of a commissioner for taking affidavits. I have been concerned, sir. I come from the west end of the city, representing many people who have come from Europe. To many of these people, the very name of notary public or commissioner implies this person has the full office and full responsibility of a lawyer.

I would suggest, sir, that for the life of me I could never understand just how there was any merit qualification in the method of giving the commissioner of oaths office to a number of people. I feel that it is very necessary the commissioner of oaths should be given to people who are closely in touch with large organizations. I am thinking of voluntary organizations.

I am still not clear about the basis of merit. I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. Minister in which he said that he would have a merit system by which the individual could apply. I would assume—I have had occasion where I have written for some people who I felt were doing a very commendable job, particularly with newcomers, in helping them get settled into the community. I wrote on their behalf, describing their work. They were turned down with no reason given.

We were told that the whole application process was under review. Now, if it is just met on a broad basis, then the question I raise, sir, is whether the hon. Minister could tell us when a person is turned down, would it be because of lack of education or would it be clearly stated why that person is turned down? I would like to follow up on the remarks of my two colleagues in connection

with people signing a note. Again I speak with respect to people in my own riding.

I can remember some of the most heart-rending situations where a man and woman have gone into a real estate office, for example, and where they have signed papers. The papers have been signed and they have not had a chance of second thoughts as to what they were doing. They have come to my office to claim that they really did not understand what they were signing, that they were rushed into this. I could think of nothing that is more apprehensive than if we had this spider's web of finance companies drawing poor people in to sign responsibility for high interest rates on loans, and to think that they would not have the opportunity for a second thought by having to go outside in order to get a signature authorized.

I summarize my points, sir. I would like to have a clear understanding of the merit basis. I would like to see, as the hon. member has suggested, that this is not going to be an easy way for finance companies to stamp their approval on the contracts that they arrange.

My third point, sir, is that I did not get completely clear what the hon. Minister mentioned about credit unions and Canadian Legions. Will it be available now for someone in the Canadian Legion to be a commissioner of oaths? I am thinking particularly of my own riding where I get a number of Legionnaires coming down to me about pensions. This would be a very wonderful service if one of their responsible officers could be a commissioner of oaths.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there is a certain ambivalence in the policy of the hon. Attorney General with regard to the issuance of credentials to commissioners for taking oaths. As the three speakers who have preceded me have pointed out, the door seems to be open quite wide for officials of certain types of companies. The hon. Attorney General and other gentlemen on the government benches have pointed out that the granting of an application made by such officials, or officers, is discretionary. But the fact that they are singled out for special mention in the law would indicate that it would normally be expected that they will be granted this power upon application.

I would imagine that the hon. Attorney General would always reserve a certain discretionary authority to refuse the application of a person who is clearly unsuitable. But the fact that the section is being put into the Act at all would indicate that he would

regard it as normal that these people will become commissioners for taking oaths. I would agree with the objections to the procedure that have already been stated. I will not bother repeating them because those objections have already been well expressed.

I would like to contrast this development with other developments, which, as far as I know, have been taking place. I regret that I missed the earlier part of the hon. Attorney General's remarks so I did not hear what he said with regard to branches of the Canadian Legions. But certainly the policy of the department a few months ago was that they were going to cut down on the number of people in Canadian Legions who would have this power; and, indeed, did cut it down. I know of a specific case, which the hon. Attorney General may recall, involving one of the largest Legion branches in Ontario to which I happen to belong.

I wrote a letter on behalf of the then president of that branch, who was applying for this authority. Traditionally there had always been one officer in that branch who had the authority to take oaths. The commission of the particular gentleman who exercised the authority was due to expire; he was quite elderly, not in too good health and he did not wish to carry the responsibility any longer. So another officer in the Legion applied. The hon. Attorney General's department advised him—and I think they were good enough to advise me, too—that their policy now was not to issue any more of these commissions to officers in Legion branches. The particular branch I am talking about has several hundred members. Legion members are getting older—like all human beings—and a good many of them are fairly elderly men now who have to make applications—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Oh, I am not that old, and I am a Legion member.

Mr. Bryden: But the average age is steadily increasing, and there are a lot of World War I veterans in these branches. They have made a tremendous contribution to the development of the Canadian Legion, but now they are in the position where they are applying for pensions of one kind and another and frequently these applications have to be notarized, especially in a large branch such as the one I am talking about.

It seemed to me sensible that an officer of that branch should be able to take affidavits or statutory declarations for at least members of the branch, and I would say perhaps all the veterans in the area even if they were

not members of the Legion. But this policy has been changed and now, as I understood the policy as it was expressed last fall, at any rate, there are only a limited number attached to the provincial command of the Canadian Legion who are to have the power to administer oaths. I cannot understand why what I regard as a necessary and legitimate function should be now withdrawn, and yet at the same time we have the proposal contained in section 2 of this bill.

While I am on the subject, I would suggest to the hon. Attorney General that if applications from officers of finance companies are to be treated as more or less a matter of course, then we should consider the position of major trade unions and major branches or locals of trade unions where there is a substantial amount of work involving the taking of oaths. I know that under present policy some of these people do have commissions issued by the hon. Attorney General's department. I hope they are going to retain them. I would think that they have at least as much right to be recognized specifically in the statute as the officers referred to in the proposed new subsection 1(a) of section 6.

I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand the reason for this extension, especially in view of the policy of the department in other directions where there seems to be a restriction on the issuance of this authority. I just cannot understand why it should be restricted in fields where the need appears to me to be demonstrated. Yet it is envisaged in the bill that there will be an extension in a field where the need is far from demonstrated. In fact, I would suggest, relying on the arguments already submitted by other hon. members, that in that field there is a serious danger of abuse of the power if it is granted.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to compliment the hon. Minister in submitting this bill. Just as a point of clarification, possibly the hon. Minister would clear a point for me. In section 1, which will be subsection 3 of section 2—

Mr. Speaker: I might remind the member we are speaking only to the principle of the bill. I think perhaps if the member is going to particularize, that is as to sections, he should wait until the bill reaches the committee of the whole House.

While I am on my feet, I would also like to inform the members on both sides of the House that when they are speaking to the principle of the bill it should be done before

the motion is carried, and not after it has been carried as has occurred in this case.

Mr. Bryden: We have to be pretty quick sometimes.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, most of what I wanted to say has been said, but there are one or two aspects of the principle involved in this bill that I find so alarming, to put it frankly, that I am going to, at the risk of repeating a bit, just draw attention to them.

As I understand the hon. Minister's explanation, he too is a bit worried about the proliferation of granting of rights to be a commissioner of oaths and taking affidavits. This I can understand because, quite frankly, I have been puzzled about concentrations in one area and apparent lack of them in other areas. So this effort to cut down and put it on a regularized basis strikes me as having some validity.

But then when he moves, as it were, to defeat his original purpose of cutting down, this is where his policy is ambivalent. You are granting them to corporations or to branch offices. Admittedly, it is "may", but the hon. Minister or his department is certainly going to get itself into a very invidious position in choosing between one corporation and its officers and not another, or one branch office and not another. In any case, in this instance it would seem to me that you are granting this power to a group whose exercise of it may well in many instances involve a conflict of interests. It is in relationship to business.

Yet the hon. Minister is hesitant to extend it to both unions and legions that have welfare committees and are working with people in the mass; dealing with their problems, coping with their pension needs and many other needs related to the thousand and one problems that a homeowner and a family man is running into. Yet this very area, where they could use it to benefit in meeting the needs of the people without any danger of a conflict of interests, here the hon. Minister is going to deny it.

There seem to be so many contradictions in the application of the underlying principle of this bill, that I shall certainly look forward with some interest to the explanation of the hon. Minister.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two about this. I think most everything has been said and I hope the hon. Attorney General will not take advantage of the fact that I am not a lawyer,

because some of my remarks will certainly not bear legal language.

As I understand this bill, it means that every manager of every bank in the province of Ontario would be a commissioner for taking affidavits. Every manager of every trust company, of every finance company, of the smallest company that we have in Ontario. I give you as an example—

Mr. MacDonald: Warton Dairy?

Mr. Whicher: Warton Dairy is an example.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. member can afford to go to a lawyer.

Mr. Whicher: No, but as I understand it, the secretary and treasurer of that corporation would be commissioners for taking affidavits. Now then, on the other hand, I had a case pointed out to me only yesterday where in a little village in Bruce county with 300 people this certain gentleman has been a commissioner for taking affidavits for the past 22 years. When he made his application only a few days ago it was turned down. I happen to know this situation most intimately. It is eight miles away from any other place or any other commissioner who takes affidavits. Eight miles away. It is a village of 300 and in the surrounding countryside live several hundred people. There is no bank there. There is no corporation there. There is no clerk of the municipality. This little village is in a township and the clerk lives many miles away.

So, in plain words: by taking away the opportunity for this gentleman to be a commissioner we are certainly causing a hardship, in my opinion, to the several hundred people who live in that immediate area. The nearest commissioner is eight miles away.

Now this may be a case that could be looked into again. I intend to bring it to the attention of the hon. Attorney General by letter, or privately. But it seems to me that where we have some towns—I am thinking of one of 3,500 people—there are four banks there and we have the clerk of the municipality and heaven knows how many corporations. Here we will have too many commissioners, and yet in this little village we have none at all. So I will listen most attentively when the hon. Attorney General makes his explanation.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clear up some of these matters, both as to principle and detail, which have been raised in this debate. I am exceedingly pleased,

Mr. Speaker, to have heard the expression of views from the hon. members, because I think we are all agreed, on both sides of the House, that this particular situation had gotten out of hand and that something needed to be done.

I would say that it would appear to me that certain hon. members who have spoken to it, Mr. Speaker, certainly did not put any more time in looking at the bill than I was accused of in drawing it. Because the bill is quite plain with respect to certain matters and the hon. member for York South did point out the matter that I wish again to draw to the attention of the House. I have taken legal advice and Legislative counsel advice on it, and I do wish to say that this advice is that section 2, with the use of the word "may," does give the Attorney General the right and the discretion to deal with these applications.

Mr. Sopha: How are you going to discriminate between finance companies—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Now you just wait a minute. Just wait a minute.

Mr. Sopha: You cannot do it at all.

Hon. Mr. Cass: You just wait a minute now.

Mr. Sopha: Do not talk nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am quite capable, Mr. Speaker, of dealing with this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member for Etobicoke that any note or other negotiable paper which is signed before the finance company officer or elsewhere ceases to be negotiable and of any use to the finance company if it has anything attached to it; such as a declaration, or an oath, and therefore this particular Act, has no application whatsoever to the very real problem which he raised.

I would like to say this generally, also. Over the years the policy of governments requiring returns has been to shift from requiring returns of companies and individuals to be taken upon oath, as in the old days with income tax returns which were so made, and other returns, to the signed statement. It is my personal opinion that this trend, Mr. Speaker, is continuing. A great deal of the matters which have been discussed here to-night in the not-too-distant future will cease to be of interest because of the changing way of administering and dealing with government returns.

I would like to say, for the benefit of the hon. member for Sudbury, who does know so much—and I say this not sarcastically, who does know so much law—and who is a very good exponent of what he does know, that this Act was given a very great deal of thought. It was gone over very carefully, several times, before its introduction.

The particular matter of finance companies is a disturbing problem. In answering that particular criticism, Mr. Speaker, I could also answer the inquiry of the hon. member for Dovercourt. There are, Mr. Speaker, some 70,000 companies operating under the laws of Ontario and if there were to be commissions issued to each one of those companies, even one commission, we would certainly be overrun with commissions.

There are many companies in which a commission is not necessary for the dispatch of business; there are many companies where it is. Each type of company is fairly well known to my officials through past experience with applications for commissions, and I have no hesitation in saying to hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that I have complete confidence, despite the doubting of the hon. member for Sudbury, that it is quite possible to deal with this matter.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, applications for issue of commissions will not be given to mortgage brokers, insurance adjusters, finance companies, funeral directors, real estate brokers and certain others who will automatically fall into the conflict of interest problem area which has been raised by the hon. members. I propose that this particular criterion will continue to be used, unless there is good reason for otherwise determining the criteria.

I would say to the hon. member for Bruce that his problem is the one which I thought I had covered in the last part of my statement—that is that these are matters of public convenience. He has undoubtedly brought to our attention, Mr. Speaker, a matter where public convenience will require the issue of a commission. Those are the special cases which will be dealt with individually. I have in my office, Mr. Speaker, a complete list of all applications which have been received, and either rejected or the applicant advised that when policy is fixed it would be reviewed. It is my intention, and I can assure hon. members that this intention will be carried out, that each of these will be reviewed. I will be glad to receive the representations of the hon. members and interested public affairs who feel that there is a definite need. Provided the qualifications of the

applicants are proper, and provided that the need is there, a commission will be issued.

With respect to the Canadian Legion, I would merely say this: The need in the legion, as has been pointed out, Mr. Speaker, is for someone to sign returns with respect to pensions and assets each year. A veteran who is getting a pension must sign a sworn statement, setting out the assets, as you may know, and his income. This is normally done by the service officer in the legion and, over the years, in various places he has had a commission.

It has been found, by the legion officials themselves, that it is not necessary that every Legion service officer should have a commission. After a considerable discussion with the Royal Canadian Legion's Ontario headquarters, it was agreed that the people they nominated for these appointments, who would service the legion members throughout Ontario according to the standards they felt were necessary, would be appointed—and they have been appointed.

Discussions are under way, and have been for some time, through certain channels with other organizations, both in labour and ethnic groups, with a view to determining how best we can meet the need in these areas by the appointment of responsible people where the need arises.

Then, I might say further to the House, Mr. Speaker, following what the hon. member for Dovercourt said, one of the great difficulties about these people who come to us with another language as their mother tongue and with, very often, an entirely different concept of law from what we have, is that they have been accustomed to consider a notary as a lawyer. And in their country the notary has been a lawyer, just as in Quebec he acts in many cases as a lawyer.

One of the great difficulties is that everyone who has been a notary or a lawyer, or done anything like that in his homeland, when he comes to Canada feels he is entitled to do the same thing for his people here.

Then, of course, we are in trouble, because he does not confine himself to the duties of a commissioner or a notary, but immediately gets into the practice of law. As a result, a great many innocent people rely on these people—with training in their own country it is true, but without the knowledge of our laws here—and suffer great loss. For that reason many such applications have been refused, both in my time as Attorney General and previously.

If these folk are properly qualified and understand the responsibilities of their appointment, and are not inclined to practice a wider sphere of law, then there is no problem.

But usually, by the time they have applied to the department, we have evidence, usually complaints, from people who have dealt with them, that these people are in fact going to use, or are using, their commission to practise law—about which I have no complaint, except that they do not know the law they are practising here in Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: Could the hon. Minister tell us the terms of reference of qualification?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, every case stands upon its own feet. The qualifications of any person who applies, as well as his character, have been in the past, and will continue to be, investigated. If the experienced officials—who are public officials in The Department of the Attorney General, and who have been there for a long time and have great knowledge—are of the opinion that the particular applicant does qualify, and there is need, then undoubtedly the commission will issue.

The whole purpose, Mr. Speaker, of this particular Act is to do exactly what some of the hon. members, including the hon. member for York South, have said: That is to try to see how we can, first of all, only have commissioners where they are necessary; second, to endeavour to cut out the undoubted conflict of interest. I agree a great deal has been said on the other side of the House with respect to that, Mr. Speaker. Third, to give the service which the public and members of the public are entitled to, in respect of their legitimate requirements for affidavits.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, and I am fairly confident, with the safeguards in this Act and the discretion which is practised by the competent officials who serve under me, that we will find a great improvement. I am not at all averse, Mr. Speaker, to say to this House tonight that if, in the year to come, as notary renewals come up and this Act goes into force, we find that it does not work out the way we anticipate, and find many dangers which are inherent in it—but which I am quite sure can be controlled—are creating difficulties, then, sir, I will be the first one to be here with the necessary legislation to ensure that the spirit of this Act is carried out.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the moving of second reading of this bill, I do have some observations to make about it.

It is the annual amendment to The Workmen's Compensation Act, which is of such interest to many of the people of this province and certainly to the hon. members of this House.

At the outset, may I say quite frankly that I was pleased we could get second reading on it this evening, in the hope this might be accomplished and we would have an early opportunity of sending this bill on to the labour committee.

The bill itself has been printed and in our books for a considerable time. I would hope that no one would have any objection if an effort were made to get the bill to committee possibly towards the end of this week. On that occasion of appearing before the committee, we will have the opportunity of having the senior officials of the Workmen's Compensation Board present. They will be able to give us, from their first-hand experience, the situation with respect to the principles which the amendments to the bill itself raises.

The bill deals with the extension of coverage of the benefits of the Act to certain situations where common law wives are involved. As I have pointed out on several occasions before, with respect to this matter, it is certainly not the suggestion or the intention of the government that the theory of common law relationship should be given any sanctity, or advanced by this legislation. But on the other hand, it is our view that recognition must be made of the position in which certain people find themselves; arising from a common law relationship, and particularly with respect to a situation where children have been born of this relationship.

Because of the recognition of that principle, which really bears on and has to do with what I call a proper and a responsible approach to this subject, whereby innocent people of this type of relationship are not left as sufferers, which I doubt is the intention of any of us in this House.

The provisions of the common law relationships, and the benefits which the Act provides, are based on what we believe to be—and the board recommends—as an acceptable basis for approaching this subject. It was out

of the acceptance of the principle which I have just stated, that an arbitrary time factor has been applied to the right to benefits from the section which I am advancing in this legislation. Therefore it follows that benefits would be available where a deceased workman has co-habitated with a woman for two years prior to the workman's death, and she has borne him one or more children. In a relationship where no issue exists, the benefits would be available to the woman involved if she has co-habitated with the deceased workman for six years prior to his death.

I do not think there is anything I could add about the principle of this matter. I think it is good legislation in a social sense, and I hope it will merit the support of the hon. members of the labour committee when it goes there.

Now, certain adjustments to payments are also provided in the amendments. For instance, an adjustment of the payments with respect to temporary compensation by reason of some matter arising out of the original accident. Those payments are to be paid on a current wage basis, if it is higher than the wage basis that was in effect at the time of the original accident.

Then, similarly, an adjustment in the platform of the minimum weekly payments for temporary total disability would now be on the basis of \$30 a week minimum weekly payment. Where a permanent total disability exists, it would be a minimum payment of \$130 a month.

Some reference should be made to the explanatory note number five, which deals with Section 8 of the bill and provides for an increase of expenditure to the board for rehabilitation work in excess of \$200,000 per year. This arises from, and has to do with, the activities at the compensation board's hospital and rehabilitation centre at Downsview. Possibly—it may be by the time the committee sits—there may be some other explanation and information available with respect to the operation of that centre. But in any event, I would hope that authority would be given to permit expenditures beyond the presently stated amount.

Then, of course, we get into the question of accidents. As a matter of fact, with reference to the hospital at Downsview, it might be—and I think it would be worth while and I will propose this to the labour committee when it meets—that possibly at an early date, and before the House finally prorogues, that those hon. members of the House and of the labour committee who are particularly interested in rehabilitation, a visit for them

might be arranged to the centre so we could see at first hand the nature of that operation.

Items six and seven in the explanatory notes really deal with safety and the relationship of the board to employers. It involves part of the programme to adopt a much stiffer attitude with respect to the prevention of accidents, not only in the construction industry but in all areas of employment. Particularly the subject is one that has been discussed in probably every magazine, publication and newspaper in this country over a period of years. The fact is that no system of compensation can really provide the kind of compensation that I am sure some hon. members of this House have in mind. I join in that category because money or monetary compensation is not a full compensation for much of the suffering, and those things which go with it that are endured by an injured person.

I would hope that the board would be able to use this demerit system in a way that would parallel and combine with an intensive drive not just to send out printed material or post notices, but to get at the grass roots of the cause of accidents, to get the education into the hands of workers; even to involve such matters as on-the-job training, because that is the kind of instruction that is necessary to prevent accidents.

Mr. Chairman, this is the nature of the bill. On the occasion of its reference to the labour committee, the senior officials of the compensation board will be available, at which time there might be a good discussion as to detail and whatever the committee is interested in.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister on these steps. I would say that we appreciate his elaboration of the principles involved. I congratulate the hon. Minister on step one. From the point of view of children particularly, I think this is something that is a step forward.

The step about rehabilitation: our party agrees with this principle, that this is an area of real concern, to rehabilitate and retrain a man. I assume we will be going into greater detail on this but I would feel that the objective of The Workmen's Compensation Act really fails if a man is not adapted to obtain another job. When I am speaking of this, sir, I am not sure that the National Employment Service has not seen a role for itself there, with its special service placement. Between the two, federal and provincial, I hope that this load may be taken because I see, particularly in my own

riding with individual cases, a gap of real significance.

I would say, sir, that in the other two points, in fact in the whole bill, for our part we feel this is very necessary. There are a number of details which we will certainly be interested in—such as safety education. May I also add that I for one, and probably a number of other hon. members of our party, appreciate the invitations to attend at Downsview. I look forward to it.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, of course we are all pleased to find that we are getting so-called improvements to The Workmen's Compensation Act. But when we deal with the principle, I cannot find anything in the proposed amendments to make us feel we have established an enlightened principle in regard to The Workmen's Compensation Act. I am not going to deal with the specific amendments at this point.

I feel that, somehow, we have lost track of the original intent and purpose and high principle of The Workmen's Compensation Act, as was applied to it when it was established first, some 50 years ago. I believe, if I recollect, in reading something of the history of The Workmen's Compensation Act, that words were used at that time which I have used since—inasmuch as many have said that it was established to provide, for the workman injured at his occupation, (1) the best medical attention possible and an amount of income maintenance with some relation to his total earnings.

I have not checked back to find out what the percentage was on the original conception of the Act; I am told it was 50 per cent. At that time, with the cost of living and the atmosphere of society, that might have seemed to be a fair percentage in relation to the principle of the Act. As time went on, it was raised to 66 and two-thirds; and now, at the present time, it is 75 per cent, up to a maximum of \$6,000. The thing we seem to forget is that the only place where this income maintenance principle is maintained is when the injured workman is off on temporary total disability, in which case he gets 75 per cent of his earnings up to \$6,000. In almost every other case, if he is on temporary partial disablement, it is reduced on a scheduled basis; for permanent partial it is reduced; for permanent total it is reduced to the scheduled basis.

What we find is that, in almost all cases, the injured workman has to look for funds from other sources, and this is a principle I cannot understand. He either has to apply

for municipal welfare or apply to rehabilitation departments, and in fact he is in the same kind of position as one who applies for disabled pension in the province. At the present time it is \$75 a month, if you are disabled to the point where you cannot earn a living. I would think that, in some sense, we are really getting away from the highly praised principle of workmen's compensation. And there are several areas to which we should look, to re-establish the principle of providing the best medical care and a proper relationship to income power.

First, I would suggest that we could upgrade the pensions to the present-day standard of living. If it seemed right 20 years ago when we established a rate of pension and said the principle is that one gets this amount to help live in these times, then we should look at it in the same light if the person still has the same disability—what is the cost of living and responsibility today, and apply that to the pension.

I would ask: What is the principle of a ceiling on income, on the amount on which you can receive your 75 per cent? Why set ceilings, in this day and age, of \$6,000? At the present time, at \$6,000, it means a man at that point would be making \$115 a week, or about \$2.85 an hour, and he gets maximum compensation of \$86 a week. But we have several in industry today who make much more than that per hour.

I had one particular case of a chap at Hamilton who is now on partial permanent disability. He was making \$3.50 an hour; 75 per cent would give him \$105 a week, and there is about a \$19 difference between the maximum and 75 per cent of his original earnings.

But, Mr. Speaker, why the difference in the ceiling? If he is working in an industry, and he is making that much money, then he should get 75 per cent of his wages if he is covered by the Act.

I think that we have to look at the waiting days. There does not seem to be any reason in not paying the workman for the first, if he loses one day off work. If we establish this principle under the Act, this is a cost which would be negligible to the fund but would mean an awful lot to the injured workman—receiving that one day's pay instead of losing it. It could run up to two days.

I would suggest that we have to establish the principle in regard to occupational diseases, particularly in the case of back injuries. In the occupation of operating heavy equipment, truck drivers and this sort of thing, where they are sitting down a lot—

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to be unnecessarily restrictive but is the member speaking to a principle or principles embodied in this particular bill, or is he speaking about principles on workmen's compensation in general? I think the discussion, or the debate, should be based on the principles embodied in this bill only. I do not have the bill before me but it seems to me the member is straying into general principles relating to workmen's compensation which are not embodied in this particular bill.

Mr. Gisborn: I might agree that in one or two cases I did stray from dealing with the principles involved in the specific recommendations, but I think two or three of them did come within the scope of my discussion.

On the last point—and I believe it is covered in the bill—that is in regard to the safety educational section—I think the principle we have to establish there, which has never been established, is that wherever there is a safety programme, and any monies are spent or allocations made, we should have joint representation on those committees.

I mentioned the waiting period. What I want to establish is: Is the real principle established in the changes to give workmen a certain relationship of maintenance of income, or it is just to provide an amount which leaves them in the position of being almost an indigent in society?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to sound unnecessarily contumacious tonight; I am not really in that frame of mind. But every man should have a fetish of some sort in order to stimulate him on to activity. One of my fetishes is that the statutes of this province are so badly drafted. Heavens, but they are badly drafted. Some day I am going to make a study when I have some time. I am going to make a study to calculate the thousands and thousands of dollars which people have had to pay to have the statutes of this province interpreted in the superior courts of competent jurisdiction.

Have a look and see. How many litigants have had to go to the Supreme Court of Canada, for example, to have a proper interpretation put on statutes. Then we look at this one, sir. Look at this one and it will cause shudders throughout the whole of Canada in jurisprudential circles, for in its very first section it adopts the vernacular into the statutes of the province. Common law wife, it says. I will repeat that. Common law wife.

There never has been any such animal of the *homo sapiens* variety as a common law wife. In fact, the common law had nothing to do with wives at all. Wives were left to the ecclesiastical courts, which had all the jurisdiction over them; their property, their marriage and everything else.

In order, I suppose, to get across to people the meaning of the statute now they import that term into a statute of the province and dignify it with statutory prestige.

My submission is that the principle dealt with in section 4 could have, if care had been exercised in framing it, been enunciated without making any reference to the term common law wife at all, because it is a matter of policy, of principle. We still, in this province, I hope, recognize the sanctity and the integrity of marriage. It is people in the married state, having been put there by bonds of holy matrimony, with which we are not concerned about at all.

Surely, if we had wanted to, as we should have done years ago, accord to this other group that are dependent upon the injured workmen, the deceased workmen, we could enunciate that in words of a statute without importing that horrible term common law wife into it. I hope that my words will have some effect, and before my words come to the labour bills committee that the hon. Minister will ask his advisers if he could redraft that section in such a way so as to leave out that very distressing term.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer so I cannot speak in legalistic terms. However, I would like to commend the hon. Minister on presenting this legislation because it is a step in the right direction. It still does not go far enough. I would like to refer to the fourth principle in there, which provides a minimum weekly payment of \$30 for temporary total disability.

Now, \$30 a week today certainly is not sufficient for the individual to maintain any decent standard of living. I just wonder why inclusion was not made for individuals suffering from total disability for the payment of both medical insurance and hospital premiums, because after the individual pays for two items the \$30 has dwindled substantially.

Now in the next—and that is the principle of rehabilitation my colleague, the hon. member for Dovercourt had made reference to—it hardly recommended the principle. However, with the rehabilitation the individual receives workmen's compensation up until the time he is rehabilitated. But that still does not provide him with employment.

He may remain unemployed for a long period of time after, and I think consideration should possibly be given to the extension of benefits up until some type of employment is obtained for the individual because he is still not rehabilitated unless he is actually put to work somewhere.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I, in common with all other hon. members of the House, intend to assent to the second reading of this bill because, as I think the hon. Minister has indicated, it is a definite step forward in many respects. But before I do so I cannot refrain from expressing my disappointment that once again The Workmen's Compensation Act is opened, including the sections related to accident prevention, and still we do not have any recognition of the principle that employees and their representatives have at least as much interest in the prevention of accidents as employers.

There is no recognition of the principle that prevention of accidents should be a joint effort of employers and employees. We have a continuation of the principle laid down, I think, in 1915 when the Act first became the law of this province that this was a prerogative of employers, and they were provided with certain funds out of the accident fund to set up industrial accident prevention associations.

I am not criticizing the work of these associations. I am just suggesting that they are like birds trying to fly with one wing. A former Minister of Labour used to take the position, when we raised this matter, that the money that was financing these associations was employers' money which, of course, is a ridiculous proposition.

Once the money goes into the accident fund it is no more the employers' money than the money I pay to The Department of National Revenue continues to be my money. It is money in the accident fund, and in return for that payment, let us bear in mind, the employer receives a significant benefit. That is the freedom from legal action with regard to industrial accidents. He is relieved of that hazard in return for a payment, sir, which is an insurance type of payment. So that type of argument holds no water at all. I think we should look at the broader picture. We often hear assertions—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I do not remember ever advancing that argument.

Mr. Bryden: I said a former Minister of Labour. I do not suggest that the present hon. Minister did so. I was trying to deal

with the argument in advance, just in case you might. I am not suggesting that you have used this argument. But one of your predecessors used to advance it regularly, almost every year when we raised the question.

I hope that the present hon. Minister does not consider that that particular form of argument has any merit at all, because I do not think it has. If he does, then perhaps he would care to look at the broader picture, which is the mutual interest of employers and employees in preventing accidents.

We often hear—and sometimes with justification—that accidents arise because of the ignorance or negligence or foolhardiness of employees. There is truth in that. Sometimes employees contribute through ignorance or foolhardiness to the accidents they suffer. That makes it all the more important that they should be involved, through their representatives, in the whole process of the prevention of accidents and of education to make all people safety conscious, both the employees themselves and the representatives of management.

I cannot understand why the hon. Minister persists in the antiquated and obviously fallacious philosophy that this is a special preserve of the employers, and that they alone should be involved as far as direction is concerned or at any rate in the work of the accident prevention associations. I think representatives of trade unions—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is not giving credit for a major step which was taken in this field: the first major study with respect to a specific subject which might provide a solution for the general matters you are talking about, which is the prevention of accidents. The first major study in recent years that I know of is being undertaken by a committee on which are leading men from labour as well as management. That study is presently under way and—

Mr. Bryden: You are referring to the labour safety council?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The safety council.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I certainly think that is a welcome step forward. Just to conclude my remarks in a sentence or two; I hope that as a result of the efforts of that council we will not only have a full recognition across the board of the principle of labour-management co-operation in this field, but perhaps we will get some co-ordination of industrial safety.

This is another difficulty and it is not easily solved. It exists in every jurisdiction that I can think of. It is the division of authority and responsibility in this field. The Workmen's Compensation Board has an interest in it, the Labour Department has an interest in it; and in some fields other departments such as the Mines Department and The Department of Lands and Forests have an interest in these matters. I think it would be desirable to try to develop some degree of co-ordination at least in the field of safety education and accident prevention.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments concerning this bill. I am not a lawyer but I have looked through the bill and it seems to me that one of the principles inherent in this bill is that we want to provide an adequate income to those who get injured in accidents of one form or another.

It seems to me that people who have been injured, and I think back to cases in the 1930s, and perhaps the 1940s, when the cost of living was not as high as it is now, some of these people received dismemberments at that time and were compensated. I can think of one case where the chap was compensated in the amount of \$22 per month for a dismemberment. He lost his arm just below the elbow.

It seems to me that we should—and I would ask the hon. Minister to consider this—we should fill that very obvious gap between what is now being paid and what was paid at that time. I think that these people should be considered. I think there should be a consideration given to these people to raise their amount of compensation more in line with the present-day cost of living. It seems to me that these people, if they had lost their arm or perhaps another limb of their body today—and we know this is a very unfortu-

nate thing—but they would be compensated in a much greater amount than perhaps the fellow who had lost his arm or leg back in the 1920s or 1930s.

I would ask the hon. Minister to consider this problem. I think it is a very real problem. I think there are a great many people across the province who are in this very position and it seems to me we have a vacuum here between these two groups.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, tomorrow I would like to go back to the order paper. There are further second readings and there is a lot of work in the committee stage. The next estimates to be taken will be those of The Department of Public Welfare; after that will be The Department of Travel and Publicity.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask my hon. friend when he intends, or if he has a plan in mind, for finishing up the Budget debate?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have, I think, as of now, perhaps three or four names of hon. members who wish to speak. We will have a couple of hours of the Budget debate this week, I would hope, but I do not think I will finish it before Easter. It is just simply that, as three or four speak, then three or four more names come on the list, and we will keep going until everybody who wants to speak in that debate has spoken.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.45 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

Second report, standing committee on natural resources, wildlife and mining, Mr. Rollins	1755
Standing committee on education, health and welfare, Mr. Downer	1755
Statement re Operation Blackbird, Mr. Stewart	1755
Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile	1756
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	1793
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1793

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We welcome to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from St. Pius X Separate School, Toronto; and in the east and west galleries, students from Oak Ridge Public School and Prince of Wales Public School, St. Catharines; and in the Speaker's gallery, the advisory committee of the conference of women of The Ontario Crusade.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. C. T. Rollins (Hastings East), from the standing committee on natural resources, wildlife and mining, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-62.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe), from the standing committee on education, health and welfare, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act;

Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act;

Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): **Mr. Speaker,** before the orders of the day, may I have your permission to read an article from

the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of today's date? It is entitled:

MATHEMATICS COMPETITION FORT WILLIAM STUDENT BEATS 5,000 RIVALS

A 17-year-old Fort William Collegiate Institute student has topped 5,000 competitors to win an annual high school mathematics competition for schools in Ontario, Quebec and Newfoundland.

Richard Ferch, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Ferch, scored 106.75 points out of a possible 150 to win the Mathematical Association of America and the Society of Actuaries annual competition. A Grade 13 student who hopes to become a nuclear physicist, Richard was described yesterday as the outstanding student in the school, which has an enrolment of 900.

Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to bring this to the attention of the House, and the students who are assembled at this afternoon's session but not out of any desire to boast about the prowess of the people of north-western Ontario. They are definitely known to be very shy, self-effacing and modest people, as exemplified in our hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope).

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): **Mr. Speaker,** before the orders of the day, I would like to refer briefly to a matter which is of growing concern to the farm people of Ontario, particularly in south-western Ontario.

During the present session of the Legislature, hon. members of the House have heard of the great economic loss occasioned by blackbirds, particularly insofar as the corn crop is concerned—a loss estimated in excess of \$1 million a year.

Today, I am pleased to announce that the government, following a survey of the situation, is taking immediate steps to make a thorough study of the problem. Under the direction of Dr. De Vos, Ontario Agricultural College, a group of experts, representatives of Ontario and the federal government, in liaison

with the United States authorities, will make a complete and comprehensive study of the problem. Dr. De Vos will have the assistance of an advisory committee in the persons of Dr. D. N. Huntley, director of agricultural research, Dr. C. H. D. Clarke, chief of the fish and wildlife branch of The Department of Lands and Forests, and Mr. J. E. Brant, wildlife biologist of the Canadian Wildlife Services, Canada Department of Northern Affairs.

It is estimated that the study and remedial measures will encompass a period of five years and will cost an estimated \$260,000 over that period. I need not tell the House that such a sum is a very small price to pay to bring about the control of a scourge which costs the farmers of the province an estimated \$1 million each year.

Objectives of the undertaking will be to assess the biological basis of damage by blackbirds and to develop economical and acceptable methods of controlling the depredations of the birds. It is proposed that most of the field work will be conducted in Kent and Essex counties, with the laboratory and research phase being conducted at the agricultural college in Guelph.

Projects envisioned under the programme will include a basic study of the food habits of the birds, a study of the breeding habits and the factors influencing flock movement. Of particular importance will be research into the effects of gametocides, or breeding inhibitors, and their possible application towards meeting the growing population of the birds. Protection of areas through electronics will also have a large share of attention.

It is also proposed to keep a close liaison with the extension branch of our department in order that farmers may be kept aware of known control measures. The study of control measures will get under way April 1 and will continue until March 31, 1969. It will be a flexible study, in that it will tie in various interested groups and people who are fully appreciative of the economic loss being entailed by the ravages of the blackbirds.

Some idea of the magnitude of the task can be gained from the fact that there are approximately 200 million red-winged blackbirds on the North American continent. I point out to the House that there is no sudden easy solution to the problem. There are, however, two major factors with which we must be concerned.

One of these is the fact that the United States is giving a great deal of attention to the reduction of bird numbers. It follows that any developments proceeded with in Ontario

should be co-ordinated with those south of the border. It is our intention to co-operate in that regard.

The increase in blackbird population and the economic damage to crops is of increasing concern in southwestern Ontario. Representations urging immediate action were received from the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough), supported by the wardens and chairmen of the county council agricultural committees of the five southwestern Ontario counties—Essex, Kent, Elgin, Lambton and Middlesex—in December last. Farm organizations have also supported such action as is now being taken.

Of 420,000 acres of commercial corn production in Ontario in 1962, some 335,000 acres were produced in the five counties of southwestern Ontario, with the damage by the birds being estimated at between eight and ten per cent. The birds attack the ears during the milk stage, open the husk and feed on the soft corn. As well as the corn that is eaten, there are secondary effects which are probably more important.

Damaged corn becomes dwarfed and warped, permitting insects and fungi to invade the ear, resulting in a greatly lowered price to the producer.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the setting up of Operation Blackbird is one which will commend itself to all hon. members of this House, and to the farm people of Ontario.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted, on behalf of those people from the corn country, to say a very sincere thank-you to the hon. Minister and to the government for taking these steps. We very much appreciate it, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 41st order; House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that Ontario has enjoyed a favourable year. Employment has been good throughout the province and farm income has generally kept apace with the economic growth. I would anticipate, from all current signs that in the coming year we shall be able to continue our advance and benefit from the progressive steps being taken to provide opportunities for a better standard of living. Nevertheless,

despite the overall improvement in the economic climate, the estimates of expenditures by The Department of Public Welfare, being presented for your consideration, will exceed the previous year by approximately 15 per cent. This seeming anomaly, however, is largely due to increases in the allowances for recipients and because of the expansion in programmes.

Under our legislation, a gross expenditure of almost \$118 million is anticipated—an increase of about \$15 million over the past fiscal year. Ontario's taxing sources, alone, will be responsible for about \$71 million. This is an increase of approximately \$9 million over last year and \$14 million in excess of the expenditures two years ago.

I should say further, although I do not have the most recent figures, that Ontario provides about 51 per cent of the gross cost of welfare services; the Ottawa government, 32 per cent; the municipalities, 15 per cent; with two per cent coming from other sources. In any given month under the maintenance programmes, we have upwards of some 230,000 persons receiving aid, in one form or another—with 55,000 of this number being eligible for medical and hospital services only. This latter group represents the federal old age security cases.

The growth of welfare services in the last decade has been substantial. Recent additions include the provision for the granting of allowances to widows and single women which, in effect, reduced the age from 65 to 60 years for qualification for a type of aid similar to old age assistance. Another important measure adopted last year was that which extended mothers' allowances to families where children are continuing with their education beyond the age of 18 years.

I have indicated the approximate sharing agreements in meeting the costs of the variety of our welfare programmes—particularly as related to the federal and provincial governments. I have high hopes that discussions with the Ottawa government will lead to the establishment of a comprehensive agreement which will serve all persons in need, and under which we could design our own legislation.

Or, as an alternative, sir, we might look forward to the combining of three categorical programmes—old age assistance, blind, and disabled persons' allowances. This could be developed on the basis of an agreement that would establish acceptable standards for the cost-sharing arrangements, but leave to the province the design of the details in provincial regulations in the light of the needs of

the people of this province. In this way, much of the inflexibility which now exists under the present agreements could be removed.

I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, as a result of the federal-provincial negotiations, that the House of Commons at Ottawa will give approval, this year, to the necessary legislation to bring about the changes in approach which I have cited. At the present time we share welfare expenditures with the federal government under five different agreements, designed primarily at the federal level. These are the agreements respecting old age assistance, disabled persons' allowances, blind persons' allowances, rehabilitation services and unemployment assistance. The first three agreements are most rigid in their approach. We have almost no room to move in introducing even minor changes. On the other hand, the latter two—rehabilitation services and unemployment assistance—give more latitude. In the light of the last federal-provincial conference, there is hope that the federal authorities will accept the proposal of the province that mothers' allowances become a shared programme.

In proposing new and amending welfare legislation from time to time, the government has been aware of the long-term, so-called "irreversible" type of case. For example, some years ago, it was felt that the municipalities could readily be relieved of assisting large numbers of totally and permanently disabled persons. Thus The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act was introduced in Ontario—the first Act of its kind in Canada. This legislation was administered by this province alone for several years, before its development at the federal level. Other refinements through the years have removed other more permanent types of cases from municipalities, such as the extension of the mothers' allowances programme to include unmarried mothers and Indian families. This same approach led to the development of the programme for widows and unmarried women at 60 years of age, since it was felt that this group of cases might best be served directly by the province. It may thus be observed that the provincial welfare programmes are mainly involved with providing public assistance on a long-term basis.

In contrast, the direct relief programme—known as general welfare assistance—which is administered by the municipalities, shows a much different pattern. About 30 per cent of the cases which apply for and receive relief remain on the rolls for three months or less; with 50 per cent of the total receiving

aid for six months or less. In other words, half of the cases are of short duration. As a matter of fact, about two-thirds of all relief recipients require public assistance for periods of less than one year. It is perhaps interesting to note that women who apply for general welfare assistance remain on the rolls longer than men, averaging about ten months; while the men average out at less than five months. This pattern should alter, to some extent, when the widows and unmarried women cases are wholly transferred to the province. We are anticipating that when the majority of these cases have applied, we will have a total of about 8,000 women receiving this new type of provincial aid.

The development of certain special services has, of course, created additional responsibilities, both as they affect the province and the municipalities—and, to some extent, community organizations. Take, for example, homemakers' and nurses' services — a most worthwhile programme. We find these services relate not only to the province and the municipalities, but to private organizations as well—particularly children's aid societies. There is no doubt that homemakers' and nurses' services could have more considerable bearing on the care and treatment of certain types of hospital patients who might be discharged more readily to their homes as a result.

Nursing homes, which are proprietary in nature, are primarily the concern of municipalities. But day nurseries and rehabilitation services are related to a variety of organizations, both private and public.

It should be noted that the servicing of these many welfare measures has placed a strain on welfare personnel, not only in the department but in municipalities and private agencies. To meet the added responsibilities, some extraordinary steps have been taken towards acquiring suitable persons for work in the public welfare field. I should add that difficulties in recruiting trained workers are universal. A shortage exists throughout the North American continent.

To encourage recruitment, the department—for some time now—has been making special grants to the two schools of social work in Ontario. In addition, during the past year we entered into an arrangement with the federal department of welfare to provide bursaries to students who will eventually be employed in the welfare field. At the present time, a total of 31 such students are in attendance at the University of Toronto School of Social Work and St. Patrick's School of Social Welfare in Ottawa. The province

underwrites two-thirds of the costs of these bursaries.

Beyond this, however, our advisory council on public welfare training—under the chairmanship of Professor Charles E. Hendry, director of the school of social work, University of Toronto—has negotiated an arrangement with the Ryerson Institute of Technology to conduct continuing courses for the training of personnel to carry out the range of welfare services at the intermediate level. We feel that, in this manner, suitable additions to staffs will be acquired.

I am indebted to Professor Hendry and the other members of the council—namely, Father Swithun Bowers, director of the St. Patrick's School of Social Welfare; Miss Robena Morris, welfare commissioner for the city of Toronto; Miss Bessie Touzel, executive director of the Ontario Welfare Council; Mr. Stuart Legge, an executive at Massey-Ferguson Ltd.; and my deputy Minister, Mr. James S. Band—for the determined efforts they are making towards acquiring staff and in the development of training programmes within the department.

The growth of Ontario has been remarkable in the past three decades. We have doubled our population and new Canadians, on the whole, have been integrated into and accepted well in all of our communities. We are sometimes, Mr. Chairman, inclined to forget the great contribution which is being made to the economy of Ontario by these new citizens. There is every reason to be proud of the manner in which this inflow of new blood has served to be of benefit to all peoples of this province. Personally, I would be most favourable to a greater flow of population from other countries after seeing the successes achieved by the many fine people who chose Ontario as their home.

There is one racial group in Ontario, however, which has been the source of much concern. I refer to our native Indian population, and particularly to those Indians living in our northern areas where there has been little opportunity for association with our civilization. The native Indian population has a higher birth rate than the population as a whole. Their normal sources of livelihood have disappeared to a large extent and, as a result, there has been an influx of Indians into and on the fringes of several centres in northern Ontario, notably at Red Lake and Moosonee.

The majority of these Indians speak only in their native tongue and their presence in these centres has created acute problems in housing, health, law enforcement, employ-

ment, welfare and education. The circumstances of these people are such that no one of these factors can be treated by itself. Multiple services and a combined approach is required.

Commencing a year ago, the department, at the request of the municipality of Red Lake, placed a development officer and field worker in that area, specifically to give all assistance and direction possible in serving the Indian population. The results within the past year have been, in my opinion, quite remarkable in their accomplishment. I note that, whereas only three of the several hundreds of Indians living in Red Lake were previously employed, 63 permanent jobs have been found for them in the past year. More than that, many casual and temporary jobs have been obtained.

There has been much attention given to law enforcement, with favourable results. As a matter of fact, our development officer was appointed by The Attorney General's Department to serve as a probation officer. He works closely with the court, the Children's Aid Society and the police. I need not add that the drinking habits of many of these people have been the cause of much concern, and a large number have been placed on the interdiction list.

The health of Indians, to say the least, has been one of the most difficult of the areas of service. I am afraid that the attention available to them, at present, is inadequate. Not only are bodily afflictions in evidence, but the lack of sanitation measures is deplorable.

Housing has been a matter of real contention. Many of the Indians were living in hovels of indescribable filth and squalor. An experiment has been carried out in housing in which six prefabricated homes were brought in and placed at the disposal of Indian families, at the request of the municipality. This housing, however, has proved to be costly and of inferior construction. It is imperative that the additional needed housing should be made available, probably with local labour and material being used to provide economically suitable accommodation for these Indian families.

The education of Indian children, in addition to the white population, is placing a very decided strain on local resources. Emphasis must be placed on the teaching of English, in addition to the other regular subjects. The future place of Indian children in the province is dependent on their ability to communicate.

Training and retraining measures, while essential, are most difficult to arrange because

the adult Indian is not familiar with the English language. He has had no training or understanding in following normal employment activities. Nevertheless, every effort is being made to re-establish them on a gainful employment basis.

Welfare services, while not costly, extend into counselling and child welfare. These services are time-consuming, but pay worthwhile dividends. For the first time in memory, eight Indian children were placed for adoption at Red Lake.

I have outlined some of the basic requirements in resolving the unsavoury conditions among the Indians at Red Lake. The same problems exist at other centres in the north, particularly Moosonee and Batchawana, and to a lesser extent at Hornepayne. We are determined to give all possible advantages to Indians in these northern areas. I am convinced that we must make a massive attack on the problems presented if we are ever to lift the Indian out of his poverty-stricken way of life. This will mean some agreements with the department concerned at the federal level. I am sure that this can be resolved in the discussions which are scheduled to take place in the month of May.

I should make favourable comment on the manner in which the Indian reserves in the southern part of Ontario are managing their own welfare services. You will recall that some years ago we decided to have the elected councils of Indian bands act in the same manner as the councils of municipalities for purposes of local welfare programmes. This venture has moved forward in a very satisfactory way.

Now, I should like to turn my attention to the universally popular subject of women. We are all aware of the extensive changes which have taken place in family life. It has been said that the law of progress has made the woman of today a different woman from her grandmother.

According to *Changing Times*, which refers to a study in the United States—the same results would presumably apply in Ontario—a girl born in 1900 could look forward to living 48 years. Today's female baby has a life expectancy of 73 years. In 1900, 145 babies in every 1,000 live births died before they were a year old. The figure today in Ontario is only 24 per 1,000. In 1900, working women were still something of a novelty and made up only 18 per cent of the labour force. Today, one-third of all workers are female, and over one-half of these are married. Women, of course, outlive men by some five to ten years. More than this, women today

have the vote; many are active in politics; and they hold all types of professional and executive positions.

There can be no question that the family is the basis of our civilization; and women, as mothers, are primarily responsible for family life. I have questioned the advisability of mothers accepting employment, unless there is every assurance that adequate provisions are made for the care of their children. Substitute services such as day nurseries are available, but there are not enough of them.

I am afraid that there are several thousands of children in Ontario whose mothers are employed full time and their children are being left without adequate care and supervision. I am referring particularly to those families where both the father and mother are employed, in many cases quite unnecessarily from a financial point of view. In the light of this disregard of some women for their offspring, I can appreciate the reasons for a number of the difficulties that teenagers have experienced in their brushes with the law, and in their rebellion against society.

I have said before that, in my opinion, the boy and girl of today are much better, healthier, finer and more intelligent children than those of past generations. We need have no worries as to the future when we look at the quality of the average youngster of today. Nevertheless, I do think that the complex of employment and homemaking has contributed to many of the social problems which have to be faced and treated.

A great deal of our legislation is directed to services required by families, women and children. In fact, throughout the statutes of the province and the federal government very full recognition is given to the place and rights of women.

I am proposing, at this time, to form a representative committee of women to review their many roles in our current society, and to consider any betterment that might be made through welfare legislation. No doubt there will be related matters which concern education, employment, the place and contribution of women in the life of the community, our province and country, and the all-important subject of child care.

But, in the main, I would prefer to have the committee review, broadly, those features which relate to welfare legislation, particularly those that might contribute towards the fulfilling of that most important role of all, the role of wife and mother. Perhaps I should promise that no males will serve on the committee, although I would expect the

full facilities of the department, including the males, will be available to give every assistance and advice.

In the child welfare field, adoptions of children in Ontario have reached their highest level. Commencing in 1959, you will know that we took a bold step in using an extensive advertising campaign to draw to the attention of the public the children available for adoption—particularly the so-called "hard-to-place" children. These are the children who are beyond the readily adoptable baby stage, sometimes with physical handicaps, or of mixed racial origin or having a specific religious background.

During the last calendar year 5,493 adoptions were completed, 411 more than last year, which was the highest on record up to that time. Over the last five years—with the advertising campaign in operation—there has been a yearly average increase of 33 per cent in the adoptions of children through children's aid societies when compared with the year 1958, the year before the advertising campaign was put into effect. It seems evident that, during the five-year period, almost 4,300 additional children have been adopted solely as a result of the advertising campaign. In round figures, it is estimated that these additional adoptions have resulted in a saving of some \$10 million in public welfare expenditures. But more than this, all of these children are now members of families, assured of a permanent home and parents of their own.

During the past year, the relationship between adoption and religion has been frequently raised. I feel I should point out that part five of The Child Welfare Act, which governs all adoptions in Ontario, makes no reference to the matter of the religion of the child, his natural parents or to that of the adopting parents. It will be understood, however, that the children's aid societies, in placing their wards on adoption, have full authority, as the legal guardians of these children, to select the adopting parents. No doubt they follow the precedence and custom established by the foster-care section of the Act, as well as what would appear to be local public acceptance and attitudes.

I cannot let this occasion pass without making reference to the willing, whole-hearted and progressive steps taken by television station CFTO, channel 9 in Toronto. This station has continued to make free programme time available in order to promote the adoptions of children. I can assure the hon. members of the House that this has been a fine instrument for good and we are most

grateful to CFTO. I am sure that the programme must be costly because they designate a very skilled staff to the venture, including Mr. Kevin Holen, promotion manager and Mr. Pat Murray. Refreshments are provided for the children and other participants, and everything is done to make the experience helpful and memorable. This is private enterprise at its best.

At the other end of the life span, the needs of the aged, through the establishment of a select committee of the House, will receive careful and detailed study—that is as to how we might deal with the many-sided aspects of care and services. I would anticipate the varied measures now available, such as homes for the aged — both public and private — special-home care, the geriatric research projects, maintenance allowances, housing, social and recreational services will be reviewed and, possibly, recommendations will be made towards expansion of these and other measures. We in the department will welcome the opportunity to contribute to the knowledge of the select committee as they conduct their comprehensive examination of the economic, social and medical needs of elderly persons.

As I have already indicated, Mr. Chairman. I would anticipate that the government of Canada will be clarifying their role in public welfare in relation to the legislation and programmes of the provinces. It seems likely that the federal government will arrange for some form of consolidation of their legislation and thus permit this province to realign some of our welfare services in a more effective way.

At the present time, there are four major levels of operation in the welfare field—financially and administratively—namely, the federal government, the provincial government, the municipalities and certain private agencies. All have a part to play; but the main factor to be considered is that which will assure assistance being made available to those who qualify, whatever the cause of dependency.

I do not think there is any magic wand which can reduce to a single formula the multiple needs for public assistance. Each of the categorical programmes established by the Ottawa government has a specific factor of need to which it relates—whether that of age, blindness, disablement or some other specific cause of dependency. We also have to recognize that many cases require aid for relatively short and variable periods of time, while others are provided with assistance for specified periods, or over a lengthy span of life.

The question has been raised that, possibly, there is too much welfare legislation on the statutes. But in reviewing the expenditures, programmes and services, I am certain that it would be quite unrealistic to attempt to eliminate or curtail the progress that has been and is still being made. Each advance has, indeed, meant the expenditure of additional funds; but the steps that were taken have proved to be justified and necessary.

In the treatment of the aged, for example, we embarked some years ago on a forward-looking programme of capital expenditures to assure that suitable, adequate and proper accommodation would be available for those elderly persons who are unable to live in the community on their own. These capital commitments on the part of the government have been applied to the establishment of both public and private homes for the aged; and, of course, provincial subsidies are also being paid on the operating and maintenance costs.

Provincial assistance under The Elderly Persons Housing Aid Act has served a worthwhile purpose in the construction of low-rental apartment units for older people who can continue to live in the community. Maintenance allowances in the form of old age assistance and supplementary aid are available to all needy persons 65 years of age and over. Allowances to widows and unmarried women at age 60 years have already proved themselves as being a necessary and proper advance.

Far-reaching studies in the field of geriatrics are proceeding with the benefits accruing not only to persons residing in the homes for the aged, but also in relation to our general knowledge of the aging process. We have also moved forward in promoting the establishment of social and recreational centres for elderly persons and we feel that this programme will prove its worth as time proceeds.

A range of services for neglected children is supported by the province and municipalities through the children's aid societies. I have already referred to the significant achievements in relation to the marked increases in the adoptions of children, especially during the past five years. Much progress is also being made by societies in their protection services which are designed to prevent child neglect.

Our mothers' allowances programme has been consistently broadened and is well integrated in providing maintenance and other supportive services to families where the breadwinner has died or is incapacitated.

Day nurseries have proved themselves particularly beneficial for the adequate care and supervision of young children whose mothers accept continuing employment.

Children's institutions are being supported by the province for those children who require a specialized form of group care in order that they may better adjust to family and community life.

Handicapped persons are assisted in several ways. Disabled persons' allowances are made available to those who are totally and permanently disabled by reason of physical or mental impairments. A special programme has, of course, been designed for blind persons. In addition, rehabilitation services are provided in the form of restoration services, assessment, counselling, maintenance allowances, vocational training and job placement for any handicapped persons who may be enabled, with such help, to accept some form of gainful occupation.

General welfare assistance is granted, in the main, to those who require short-term aid. Special provisions are included in this municipally based programme for those who need care in nursing homes. Post-sanatorium allowances are provided for patients discharged from TB sanatoria; and special incapacitation allowances may be rendered on behalf of those unemployable and disabled persons who do not qualify under a special welfare programme.

Homemakers' and nurses' services may be used to excellent advantage in keeping families together when the mother is ill at home or has to go to hospital; or in other family emergencies. Elderly and handicapped persons may also be cared for in their own homes, and persons may be able to return home from hospital, much sooner than might otherwise be possible, through the use of this programme of services.

Public assistance recipients, regardless of the type of aid that is provided, receive medical services without charge from the doctors of their choice as well as free hospitalization.

Mr. Chairman, in this thumbnail sketch of the multiple forms of aid that are available, I would again repeat that each and every service is essential. I think, too, it is obvious that many of our programmes do not lend themselves to consolidation into one overall public welfare Act. Some of our services are primary in nature, while others are basically supportive.

As Minister of the department, I have covered the province extensively in my travels. I have been impressed with the response of

the municipalities and of most private organizations towards the work being done. I also have a great respect for the hon. members of the Legislature for the efforts they devote in serving the individuals who come to their attention.

I must, at this time, pay a tribute to the newspapers of Ontario for the coverage they give to the welfare services. They have never failed to provide the information which is of help, particularly to the persons who require assistance, and have sometimes taken extraordinary steps, especially for the benefit of the children who are available for adoption.

Editorial comment, in dealing with the complex of welfare services and programmes, has been welcomed. I was much impressed with the series of articles which the *Toronto Daily Star* ran this year as written by Arnold Bruner. The *Toronto Daily Star* took a most positive approach towards outlining the variety of services on a factual basis. This series has proven to be of such interest that reprints are being made available to the public, as well as to welfare workers in the employ of the province and municipalities.

Within the department we have always had a high regard for the members of the Queen's Park press gallery. Their duties are heavy at times; but they never neglect to outline and explain the meaning and provisions of any new legislation which is being made available to the public.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would want to take the opportunity of expressing my personal sorrow—along, I am sure, with the hon. members of this House—in the passing of one of our most outstanding civil servants, Mr. Arthur T. Bosanquet. Mr. Bosanquet's funeral was held on the day on which he was to retire officially from his work with the department, just a day or so before his 70th birthday—a very sad turn of events. The municipalities of Ontario, in particular, had great respect and high regard in the day-to-day operations of this valued servant of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Bosanquet was certainly one of the best known of the government officials in this province. He was a capable man with a very large administrative chore in relation to direct relief in earlier days and the general welfare assistance programme as it is known today. There is no question that these duties absorbed his full-time efforts—often both day and night. He was indeed a most helpful and thoughtful person and we regret, so much, that his death has occurred—particularly at a time when he should have been able to enjoy his years of retirement away from the

onerous tasks to which he had devoted his life. I am sure the sympathy of this House goes out to his wife, daughter and grandson.

I feel obliged to refer to the heavy tasks which the staff of my department have to carry out. The responsibilities are not lightly held I can assure you; and I am certain that case problems are on the minds of the staff beyond working hours. I feel we have moved along rapidly in expanding our programmes and services and in the development of new opportunities to assist people. Yet, with continuing added responsibilities, the staff carry out their duties willingly, capably and, I am certain, always with the best interests of the persons being served.

I sometimes marvel at the durability of the senior members of our staff in withstanding the intensity of the work and in maintaining the continuity of services. It is no easy task to give attention and find solutions to the never-ending problems which are presented day to day. There is no simple answer which can be applied routinely to our cases. All are individuals and require individual treatment. Nor is there any easy way in the administration of the legislation for which we are responsible. It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I would take off my hat to my staff for the collective services they provide, for their devotion to their duties, and for the durability they exhibit, and for the out-going manner in which they render their respective services.

In closing, may I express my appreciation for the consideration you will be giving to the estimates now being submitted for your approval.

On vote 1801:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I say I was sorry that the hon. Minister did not get his wish yesterday. He passed me a letter which I am sure I can mention—a note—in which he hoped for once his estimates might come up on March 17. But because of circumstances beyond his control, this did not happen.

I would say at the outset, sir, that I would like to start where the hon. Minister ended: to express my appreciation and that of my party for the very dedicated work of your staff. It is natural that we should single out the deputy Minister, Mr. Band, who, after all, is at the head of the department. I think all of us have known of the very great personal interest and kindness which he shows in connection with any of our inquiries concerning people who come before his department.

My hon. colleague from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) unfortunately is indisposed. Perhaps he will be well enough to be back in the House before the estimates are through. I know he will then have something to say on a number of points he wished to make.

I wish to point out what, to me, seems to be one of the problems of welfare. This was brought up by the hon. Minister. That is the levels of authority. The hon. Minister has mentioned four areas with respect to administration, suggesting the federal, provincial, municipal and voluntary organizations. If I could come to the particular, about these areas of responsibility; and I am thinking of people who come to my office, and I am sure they are representative of people all across Ontario. When it comes to welfare and trying to see what rights these people should have, I become a Philadelphia lawyer.

I cannot say I become a lawyer, because I am not a lawyer. I start phoning to see if they fall into the category of the federal government. Can we somehow work something there? I come up against the difficulty that it might be an elderly man, but he has a mortgage on his house. He has struggled through many years, with supposed prudence in trying to get some financial resources so he can retire in dignity. Because of ill-fortune all that he has is the mortgage on his house.

Then we come into the bureaucratic red tape which suggests you have got this house, you must not have it or you will not be liable for certain welfare assistance. You come into all these situations. We have fought over this before, where if one had twelve rooms, or so many children then one does not come under a category.

I think of the wife of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis), who seems to be a very able person in her writing and who showed up this mish-mash situation. If you are the deserted child of a deceased veteran that is a better break for you than if you had been in some other category.

Surely what is being pointed out is what we must do: that is to get at the need of people and not the categorization of people. Now, sir, that is perhaps an easy thing for me to emphasize when I am not administering the finances. I can understand that you, sir, have got to watch that money. You cannot hand it out to everyone who asks. But on the other hand I would suggest that there does seem to be such a mixture of categories that perhaps we may have to look more closely to see that we are not categorizing cases to such an extent that we are blocking out needs.

I could go into this at considerable length. I could refer, for example, to unwed mothers. As I understand, there is greater encouragement, and I can see this, the child of an unwed mother would be adopted, or would move into a foster home. I was just looking, taking one example from the *Toronto Star* of March 5, where Thomas P. Abel, the treasurer of the Metropolitan Children's Aid Society, suggested that:

The need for service work for unmarried parents is expanding at astonishing rates; and that we are going to have to have a look at what they do in European countries and that is to consider that the government may be forced to have some kind of policy for subsidizing unmarried mothers to support their own children.

The point I am making is that if I were to be the child of an unmarried mother, and she wants to look after me herself, from the point of view of the child I would not get as much opportunity for assistance as if I had been adopted.

I know, sir, that you grasp that the main point is to give equality to all children.

I notice you do, you refer each year to the fact that unemployment could be a factor in connection with welfare needs. This brings up the point that welfare, after all, should be a whole part of a full programme.

There are many interrelated factors, if your narrow department is doing something but if there are other departments that are not doing things, really what you do is inadequate.

May I clarify a little more: I am thinking, for example, of many cases that have come to my office. I will take one.

A mother who has, say, a child who is unfortunately retarded. She and her husband have a family of six. He has been working as a truck driver. She needs to get some kind of housing; and in this city, among other things neglected in your human betterment programme is the area of low cost housing.

This woman cannot get adequate housing. This is not your area of responsibility; but because there are not these additional social measures you cannot be too helpful if the person remains in a house made with cardboard and the children have colds, and so on. The welfare paid will be going down the drain. It comes back to this point that we have not got adequate housing for people, and as a result money is being paid out for cough syrup and so on.

Take another situation! I noticed last year

that the hon. Minister emphasized that we should have a broad contributory old age pension. The hon. Minister said that this really could be a bolster with respect to the programme for older people. Of course it could be! If we had a pension programme that provided dignity for the people, perhaps so many old age homes might not be needed.

I am suggesting, sir, that this whole picture of welfare, as Professor Morgan has said, should not be a patchwork or a bit as if you have a bucket to take the leakage that comes through holes in the roof. Let us patch up the whole roof and get everything together so that we do not need this welfare bucket below.

In a sense I think that welfare has been relegated to be a department which is looking after the needs of people because there are large gaps in your human betterment coverage.

Therefore, to summarize, what I am suggesting is that you scrutinize your whole social welfare service. When you go to Ottawa I hope you will talk, as you have agreed in principle, in favour of a contributory pension programme. I hope that you will look at the medical insurance programme and I hope that you will look where there have been obvious inadequacies.

It comes down to you, sir, having to fill these gaps with your department. Because of your experience in these areas, I am sure you are in the forefront for progressive legislation across this province. I can see the hon. Minister, like a knight in armour, a crusader, standing up to Ottawa and going after a pension programme, an adequate medical insurance programme, so that the hon. Minister is not having to do this piecemeal job.

With respect to some of the programmes the hon. Minister has talked about, the homemaker programme, for example. I think that last year 112 municipalities were using this legislation. I will be interested to know how many municipalities are using it to date.

This brings up another area which should be looked at and that is, and I said this before, the hon. Minister provides, and I congratulate him on this, some very progressive legislation in the homemaker service. I think it is progressive because it keeps families together, it is preventive. I would like to see much more of the preventive approach, rather than an approach that is taken in order to pick up the pieces. I think this is a good service, but I still raise the question, since only 112 municipalities have

this service, is this because some municipalities cannot afford it or is it because they do not want to pay the cost of having a homemaker service? I suggest we may find that the municipalities that cannot afford, or are reluctant, to pay the cost, are possibly the municipalities which most need a homemaker service. I raised this before, sir, and I will appreciate hearing from the hon. Minister about it.

While I am on administration with municipalities, we came from an educational committee meeting today at which the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) was asking us to pass a bill in connection with county units of administration. I think all parties agreed with this principle and I would hope, as the hon. Minister has stated, that he agrees with the principle of having county units of welfare. I hope that he will be able to report that his department has encouraged more such units to develop during the past year.

Moving again to what the hon. Minister discussed with respect to children's institutions: last year I remember asking the hon. Minister a question concerning children's institutions. I understood the research by Miss Bessie Touzel had been finished and that certain qualifications, suggestions and recommendations were made by her committee.

As I understood, there were four categories which justified children's institutions. Very briefly, my understanding was that one category of children's institutions was for emotionally disturbed children. I asked the hon. Minister what kind of staff were in these institutions; were they people skilled to deal with such children? He replied: "Well, we really have nothing to do with these institutions."

Then further on he admitted that he did provide grants to the institutions. I suggested surely he could have some qualifying clause relating the grants to certain standards. I never did get clarification from the hon. Minister whether he is doing this. I asked him what number of institutions were below and what number were above standards. He at first answered that he did not know.

I pointed out then, and I point out now, that I hope the hon. Minister will know completely—

Hon. Mr. Cecil: I do not think I ever stated that.

Mr. Thompson: All right, perhaps I am interpreting that in my own way. If I am, I take it back, but I ask the hon. Minister: After this, when we come to the children's

institutions, will he tell us the number which have fallen below standards, and tell us how he is encouraging these institutions to come up to standard? And if they do not, will the hon. Minister close them down?

I say this with some considerable feeling, because if we all go back not too many years ago, and think of some children who were out at Mom White's—I think that was the name—really it was a very unfortunate situation for those children. Again I say that the real test of humanitarian approach by any government should be its responsibility to the helpless children who are wards of that government.

I move now to day nurseries. The hon. Minister had mentioned his dilemma—whether or not to promote day nurseries. Do they encourage women to go out to work, leave children and their home responsibilities? I realize that quandary. But, with respect to day nurseries, again on standards, I would like to know which kind of standards the hon. Minister demands. I am thinking particularly with respect to staff.

Coming to the next remarks of the hon. Minister, I notice they were about Indians. He mentioned having sent a worker up to Red Lake. I would say, having read accounts of conditions in Red Lake, that he should be congratulated in that he moved in when there was this emergency. Perhaps the department should be criticized that the crisis had to be exposed up there before it moved in. However, that is past, and it did move in.

I often think, when I think of Indians who have left the reserves, of the role of the government of Manitoba—and this is going back four or five years ago, at least. They set up a commission. It was not just one person; it was a commission to work with both Indians and Métis in order to rehabilitate and help those Indians off the reserve to integrate into the community. I am not sure, since the hon. Minister has assumed the responsibility for this, whether he should not be having a look not only at Red Lake, which was given publicity, but also at other areas where Indians have left the reserve.

I am thinking, particularly at this point, of my own location in Toronto. Several years ago, I think the hon. Minister told us something about giving a subsidy to an "Indian House". I think he himself had certain questions about an "Indian House" and the role it would perform, whether it might segregate by being distinctive or whether it would really act as a bridge to the Indians moving into the community. I would be interested to know what the feeling of the

hon. Minister is now, and what else he is doing, with respect to the Indians.

The hon. Minister mentioned with considerable pride, and if I could say so, with some Gallic emotion, that he was going to have a representative committee of women.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Emotion is where the blood is.

Mr. Thompson: I acknowledge that. The only other group I can recall like this was a group which I think the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) had formed. He has been out of the House so much. I really have forgotten which seat he represents—I think it is Riverdale. With respect to this committee, it seems to me that it was called prior to the election. I do not see that it has the sort of vibrant life one would have expected when you had a Minister, so active as the hon. member was, behind it. Some people suggested that it might have been formed just for political purposes. I would sincerely hope that would not be the hon. Minister's intent, although I noticed he mentioned something about women having a vote when he said it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That would be the last thing in my mind.

Mr. Thompson: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That would be the last thought I would have.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I appreciate that.

I was interested in that you can ascribe many characteristics to the female sex—but it seems to me the hon. Minister picked out one which must have some significance, and that was that they had a vote.

However, I am saying that certainly it is an important area to look at—the changing role of women in our society. We will be interested in knowing which organizations they represented and, really, just what the hon. Minister's purpose is in getting these women together; also the terms of reference of the discussions.

I think the hon. Minister is going up to Ottawa. Is he going to Quebec in connection with the federal-provincial conference?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do not know. Are we going to Quebec?

Mr. Thompson: Since the hon. Minister asks me, I apologize. I wish I had the authority to say he is going. I would assume that, having seen the letter from the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada to our hon. Prime

Minister—a public letter, I hasten to add. I had no privilege or anything—I notice in that letter—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Which letter is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. Thompson: I am talking about both the opening remarks by the Rt. hon. Mr. Pearson to the federal-provincial conference, sir, in which it mentioned that one of the discussions would be on amalgamating welfare services; and I am sure, if the hon. Minister is not going, that the hon. Prime Minister will have something to say at this conference.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can assure the hon. member that the hon. Minister will be there.

Mr. Thompson: He will be?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we had better clarify this. The agenda for the conference is not finally settled, therefore the list of those who will attend is not formally settled; but I cannot imagine the federal-provincial conference taking place without the hon. Minister of Public Welfare being present.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Especially when he is going to be interpreting.

Mr. Thompson: I am sure he will add a real contribution.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I say, as a potential interpreter, that the hon. Prime Minister speaks very good French and understands it well.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: All I can say is you are very kind.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, the question I ask—because this, after all, is fundamental to the whole of your estimates—is: Just what are you going to stand for when you go up to the conference? You are asking us to vote on your estimates; you are going to Quebec with the idea of making some kind of arrangements in connection with federal-provincial responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: May I answer my hon. friend immediately? The only thing I will stand for, when I am in Quebec in the presence of the other provinces and the federal government, will be for the people of Ontario. I can assure you.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that you could also say you will stand for motherhood and you will be against sin—that is about as useful to us.

I would say, sir, when you go there, that if that is going to be your contribution then I take back my kind remarks to you. I think you will have to be a little more detailed than that. The concern we have is this: You are going to Quebec; you prefaced your opening remarks on the importance of an arrangement between federal and provincial authorities; and I wondered—I know that you mentioned one particular need. Last year you mentioned the need for a pension plan. All these things fit in. With these estimates, could you give more detail of the points you will be making? I say that because, previously, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) stood up before us and I do not think I am unfair to him in any way, about the impression I had. He was for the Fauteux report which suggested that the province should take the responsibility for those offenders of six months or less, and that the federal government should have the remainder of offenders. We learned roughly what his thinking is.

When your estimates are coming up, sir, particularly with your preoccupation about the federal-provincial responsibility, I would hope that you will clarify for us just what you mean by that.

I would just like to end with this point, that I do feel The Department of Public Welfare has to be backed up by social legislation from the federal level, and at all levels. When I say social legislation, I am thinking of such things as hospitals. I could dwell at considerable length that it is most important that we have hospital beds, and hospital staff. Otherwise people who are sick are not able to get treatment. Eventually they are going to be thrown on you.

I suggest workmen's compensation. If we do not have adequate programmes in connection with workmen's compensation, the recipients are going to be thrown on you. If we do not have adequate opportunities for retraining, people are going to be thrown on you. My own feeling about the people of this province is that the last thing the majority of them want to do is to be thrown on welfare. I remember one voice that would give the impression to us that people on welfare were no good and just naturally lazy and shiftless.

From my own experience, I can recall two years ago, testing that premise. I had a group of people who were on welfare. I heard of a job that was open for about three people. The wage was \$1 at the time. You did not have a minimum wage then. These people had families. I got my secretary to

phone a number of them. They had to get on a street car and get away out to Mimico, I think it was. Every single one of them went out to try for those jobs. There were two of them who walked there in the hope of getting it. My impression from the people of my riding is they want the dignity of work and self-sufficiency. I feel that in the welfare area, so that you do not get encumbered with a great load, you must have other adequate services backing this up.

I would say, sir, that you should take a hard look—and I am not sure whether we should not have a commission on this—at the division of responsibility. We have talked about the federal. We will hear from you, I hope, sir, what you are going to ask from the federal government. We have talked about the municipal problems. I question whether in some cases the municipalities are not getting such progressive legislation as homemakers, because they are crippled financially to provide these services. I suggest those so crippled, or who think they are, may be the ones that should provide the service.

And then I come to the voluntary agencies. I am not sure, sir, as I look at the role of this provincial government with voluntary welfare agencies that if in a sense this is not getting so confused. With the grants that you give some of these voluntary agencies, they are almost quasi government agencies. I say this because of the past situation.

Though I respect very much the numbers of people who work in the voluntary agencies, it seems to me still that the role of a voluntary agency is not to quietly take up the gap which your legislation permits, as to have to supplement the unemployment insurance and so on; but it is to experiment. This is a main role of a voluntary agency. To experiment, also to have a strident voice, to push the government, in order to expand to take more responsibility.

I think that the voluntary agencies have a very important role. I think we can be proud of their dedication. All I say, sir, is there seems to be a great deal of confusion with areas of responsibility of welfare. If I could come back to the particular, this debate is so important because you are dealing with human beings.

One aspect that came home to me more than anything, one major responsibility of being in this House, is that in the debates we have had over welfare, in the legislation that has been passed, you go back to your riding and you meet a mother or a child and you realize that through our discussions here we have translated legislation to the

benefit of these people. That is why, sir, I hope that during the estimates, and I feel sure it will be, that we will get very clear answers from you. And, sir, that you will be patient as we ask our questions.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, apparently the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare have a certain psychosomatic effect on the minds and bodies of those who speak to them. The hon. member for Parkdale is indisposed today. I was indisposed last night. I may say to the hon. Minister that he and I may come soliciting at your door for some of the services that your department provides. You amply open your arms. I have no doubt that we will be received with some favour.

I might say that as a new member in this House, I think it only fitting at the outset of such estimate remarks to say in personal terms—and I expect that I echo the words of the hon. member for Dovercourt and everyone in this House—that the services rendered by your department, particularly the graciousness and facility of the deputy Minister, is something almost unparalleled in other areas of government. We congratulate you for it.

The only reservation I have is not a personal one. It is, in a sense, a public reservation, because one of the sad and true facts of political life is that the vast majority of human beings who approach their individual members for assistance in one area or another have justifiable complaints and justifiable causes. One wonders how many people are alienated from the process of knowing what is due them by never having access to the channels. The department of the hon. Minister offers a very wide degree of public service. I would think that it could be better advertised than merely sending around small brochures in multiple quantities, such as many members of this House recently received, describing welfare services in Ontario.

I recall that just prior to the provincial election last September, the government—The Department of Labour to be specific—launched on a very widespread campaign to advertise minimum wage legislation in the province and what it was offering. I would think that certainly The Department of Public Welfare might institute a similar campaign so that the citizens of this province would know to what they are entitled.

Mr. Chairman, while as an individual member it is virtually impossible to take exception to the administrative handling of individual problems, the burden of the re-

mains I would like to make this afternoon—and I hope it will be a theme which the hon. members can follow from beginning to end—is to say that we in the New Democratic Party take profound exception to the social philosophy which appears to animate The Department of Public Welfare.

Throughout society at every level—I think this is true municipally and federally as well as provincially—we continue to suffer from an antiquated, forlorn, condescending—I am reminded of the British and French imperialists—welfare psychology which is essentially handout in nature. Alas, into the middle of the 20th century, the mentality of the dole still perpetuates.

The ironic fact, Mr. Chairman—and I trust I will be able to document it in the body of my remarks—the ironic fact is that the mentality of the dole is becoming more, rather than less, entrenched in this society. I think it has certain social and economic reasons. We have fallen *en masse* for the myth of the affluent society which most certainly is not pervasive. There are still some who subscribe to the Horatio Alger dictum and there are many who have no reality whatsoever about the social and economic groupings in North America.

It is all very well for the hon. Minister to say blithely that economic circumstances have recently been fairly good; but it is worth pointing out that others are gradually having a change of attitude about this society. With the emphasis on higher education and higher educational needs, certain facts become apparent which were hitherto not apparent. With the spread of the technological revolution—an area in which the deputy Minister of the department is exceedingly well versed—again facts not hitherto apparent become so. With the widespread publicity of poverty and the embarkation on the part of the President of the United States on a crusade against poverty, certain political and economic facts of life in this society become apparent.

But the reality which those facts demonstrate has not yet caught up with the welfare mentality. I wish to take some time now to demonstrate that, with implicit and explicit criticism, and then finish with a specific ten-point alternative programme to be outlined for the next three years. So this becomes in a sense a study of misdirected social attitudes which have a profoundly asocial effect on society.

First, Mr. Chairman, that misdirected attitude complex was demonstrated at the municipal level most graphically towards the

latter half of this last year, 1963, when certain of our municipalities grasped the idea of working for relief. An unemployed person who lacked sufficient financial resources to provide for his basic needs and those of his family, was requested by certain municipalities to work for relief.

Now I say, to the credit of The Department of Public Welfare in the province of Ontario, that they have not endorsed this principle. But it is interesting to note that for the sake of five per cent more money, municipalities in Ontario were prepared to demand that men work for relief so that they would be paid 80 per cent of the labour cost under public welfare instead of 75 per cent of the labour cost under other works assistance programmes. It betrayed an attitude of mind on the part of large numbers of municipalities which viewed welfare recipients as essentially unworthy.

Of course, this particular allegation has been frequently vitiated by the evidence.

The social planning council for Toronto put out its work for relief brief and I want to point one paragraph from it.

It is unthinkable that because of a small number of malingerers or lazy persons, that the majority of employable unemployed relief recipients should be dealt with in a punitive fashion.

—a fashion of “enforced” labour, Mr. Minister, and yet that was the attitude of a vast number of municipalities in the province of Ontario.

Now the sham attitude towards welfare, the dole mentality, the basic perversion, is demonstrated in the provincial level most unhappily, I think, by the very statutes which this Legislature has endorsed. I want to be exceedingly specific, I do not want to range over them all, so I chose only two from the welfare statutes available.

The fact of the matter is that the greatest pieces of window-dressing legislation which the government provides, the so-called far-seeing examples of building and bulwarking the welfare apparatus, are defeated by their own regulation. We have a peculiar sort of refrain where we pass a reasonable Act and then simply hand down regulations which undermine its total purpose.

Now the hon. member for Dovercourt and the hon. Minister himself mentioned the homemakers' service. I think the hon. Minister called it, and I am quoting, a “most worthwhile service”. And so in essence it is. But the homemakers legislation is somewhat fraudulent, Mr. Minister. There is something

profoundly wrong with it, because although a homemakers' and nurses' service Act is passed in the province of Ontario, when the money spent is analyzed on the basis of the hon. Minister's own report in 1961-62, it is found that only \$70,000 to \$75,000 was spent providing homemakers' service throughout the entire province.

When the regulations are analyzed, Mr. Chairman, it is found that again and again the objectives of the Act are frustrated. It is said in rather highfalutin language in this new little pamphlet “The government of Ontario contributes 50 per cent of expenditures incurred for services rendered to those unable to meet the total cost themselves.” Well, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, that is simply not true. The province provides a maximum of \$4 to homemakers for an eight-hour day and agencies do not survive on that kind of money. In fact the voluntary Toronto homemakers association gets 80 per cent of its financial resources from the United Appeal, only 15 per cent from monies which come from municipalities.

Moreover, it has been demonstrated by the report on the homemakers' services done by the Ontario Welfare Council in February of this year, that the average daily use of homemakers is nine hours or nine and a half hours or ten hours. The government does not begin to pay 50 per cent of the cost, and a large number of people require around-the-clock service as well. Indeed, let me say to the hon. Minister that when only a maximum of \$4 for an eight-hour period is contributed, it is perilously close to defying the government's own minimum wage legislation.

But it goes further. In most municipal eyes, homemakers' services allowances will not be granted unless the individual requesting it is totally indigent. So to suggest that it goes to those unable to meet the total cost themselves is fallacious. Most municipalities require proof of indigence before being willing to supplement it. The city of Toronto is an excellent example of that, and yet the need lies precisely in the area of \$3,000 to \$5,000 income a year.

Let it be said, when you talk about homemakers' services for the aged, Mr. Minister, that vast numbers of elderly people within municipalities have been found to be cheaper burdens on the municipality to place them in nursing homes, because the provincial grant is more. So we have big agencies like the Toronto Homemakers Association which have been forced to remove from their waiting list all service to elderly people.

Similarly one gets no sense of urgent provincial promotion. Let it be pointed out that for a service to cover the entire province, there was at its inception one woman at the centre for informing 900 municipalities of what was required.

So no matter how one analyzes this so-called showpiece legislation, one finds on the basis of the regulations that the intent and objective of the Act is defeated.

But it is not only the homemakers Act, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister. The Children's Institutions Act of 1962-63 is another piece of legislation of which this government is profoundly proud. This Act, I think, characterizes the provincial attitude towards emotionally disturbed children, and its regulations suffer from that "whichever-is-the-lesser" refrain that resounds again and again.

The hon. members of the House might be interested to know that in this Act individual beds are subsidized \$2,500 or 50 per cent of the cost—whichever is the lesser; that a child who is accepted is subsidized to 50 per cent of its maintenance or 50 per cent of the maximum established by regulation, whichever is the lesser; that the regulations are even more specific, they pay 50 per cent of the average daily cost of \$4, \$6 or \$8, depending on the kind of institution, or whichever is the lesser.

Now I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that that kind of phraseology is precisely what perverts basic social welfare attitudes, and that is not 19th century, but worse. I did not study much history, Mr. Chairman, but what little I did reminds me that that kind of phraseology was first embodied in the Elizabethan Poor Law legislation in the 16th century, and it is not acceptable to this provincial Legislature.

The travesty of the showpiece legislation defeated by its own regulations goes further, Mr. Chairman. In The Children's Institutions Act, the institution involved, must reapply for the grant every month and fill out the most indescribably complex form in triplicate, so that the secretarial service involved virtually utilizes the total grant.

The regulations state a need for trained staff and psychiatric experience, but that cannot possibly be achieved on the present basis of part grants. And as always, Mr. Chairman, and this is the profoundly sad fact, it is the child who is penalized. Under this children's institutions legislation, in the case of any child whose parent is judged able to pay a part of the cost but does not pay that part the child is denied. He is not accept-

able. And so you have a parent guilty of neglect—to the devil with the child. Then one reads cases, as one does today, in the *Toronto Daily Star* and the *Toronto Telegram* and the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of a nine-month old baby who died because of inadequate care.

The means test in regard to this legislation is left entirely to the discretion of the provincial supervisor, who tends to interpret it on the basis again of total indigence. Now the point is, Mr. Chairman, that the basic attitudes of the government cannot possibly be positive when regulations in one piece of legislation after another defeat the intent and the purpose of the Act. The best intentions of provincial statutes are strangled by their regulations. Mr. Chairman, it betrays an attitude of mind which should not be.

But we go further in the provincial field. Another frame of mind, which is basically perverse, is the dependence on the present administrative units. Now I am here simply repeating the point that the hon. member for Dovercourt was making, but I want to make it in a slightly different fashion. The hon. Minister of Education has presented in this House a consolidation of units that everyone thought eminently desirable. At every level the Opposition in the provincial Legislature has been requesting consolidation of administrative units.

If you maintain your present basis, you perpetuate the jaundiced welfare view in the following way: To begin with, individual municipalities with Neanderthal social views continue to see welfare recipients as unregenerate and undeserving. Secondly, the rural and, many times the local urban welfare officer, is handling a plethora of duties ranging from sewers to roads. He has to handle the welfare payments as well—and that too is manifestly unjust. Thirdly, obviously trained psychiatric and social work care cannot be provided on a minuscule administrative basis. Fourthly, inefficiency runs rampant. Indeed, the whole principle runs against the trend of this society, Mr. Chairman.

It is not enough that you have accepted the integration of Peel, and it is not enough that you have accepted the integration of Wentworth county. In the report of the deputy Minister to the hon. Minister, he said this at page 14, and I would like to read it into the record:

It is our view that this administrative unit, namely, Wentworth county, is proving to be most successful in every detail. All favourable features have been adopted on

behalf of the individuals and families who require public assistance. It is felt that in taking this step, the collective local municipalities within the county of Wentworth are adopting a modern approach which will ease the administrative pressures on them individually.

At the same time, the cases qualifying for the variety of municipal welfare services are reaping the advantages of this consolidation.

Why, when the hon. Minister hands down the estimates of his department before this House, does he not speak of the extension of larger administrative units? If welfare services in Ontario are to cover this whole range of services, if they are to be integrated with the entire range of shared federal services, if they are to be integrated with plans like general assistance administered exclusively by the municipality, and if they are to be integrated with voluntary agencies ranging from the Red Cross to anyone the hon. members may wish to name, then we must have large administrative units or we mock public welfare in the province.

There is very little co-ordination presently, very little co-ordinated planning. This vast document of study of needs and resources for community-supported welfare in Metropolitan Toronto makes 150 recommendations, all of them depending in essence on the request for larger administrative units.

Now let me take the next step in this demonstration of perverse basic attitudes in the government welfare policy. I want to deal with the sometimes difficult and perilous field of child welfare services. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that nowhere do the conflicting mentalities and approaches demonstrate themselves more strongly. Even given that the Children's Aid Society and the department itself do nobly, and even given that they do all in their power; somewhere something is profoundly wrong. And I want to take the department's own report to recognize this, and to document it. I think it is interesting that we have a report from a department, which report is not mirrored in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and which recommendations, sir, do not come forward in the remarks of the hon. Minister.

Apparently there was a survey made, research done, under the sponsorship of the hon. Minister's advisory committee on child welfare. It was taking a random sample of 186 children under care and it found the following: That only one in six cases in this review had remained in a single foster home.

And what does the deputy Minister of the department say, Mr. Chairman? He said this:

It is frightful to consider that when a child is taken into permanent care by society he may face, if he is not placed on adoption, the deteriorating experience of being moved time and again from one set of foster parents to another.

And he goes on:

It is questionable, however, as to whether this incessant shuffling of children in care from one foster home to another, is not inflicting greater damage on some children. Perhaps we should be giving greater recognition to the development of group care facilities on a smaller scale than in the past for certain children who find it difficult to adjust to normal family life.

And yet, one asks, where is this mirrored in the estimates of the hon. Minister?

Well, let us assume for a moment that the answer will be that the hon. Minister will say, "I am going to give you the answer when the advisory committee reports on child welfare." And I take the hon. Minister back to April of 1962 when the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), the leader of my party, said as follows:

How many years does the hon. Minister expect will go by before he finds out whether or not this committee can do the job and whether they will get on with it?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I might be in a better position, Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. member next year.

That is 1962. In 1963, *Hansard* again, in the body of the hon. Minister's estimates:

May I also say that the advisory committee appointed to review activities within the child welfare field will soon complete its studies and I expect to report within the next few months.

March of 1963. It is now March of 1964, close to three years having elapsed since the committee was set up and not a single word mooted in the estimates of the hon. Minister.

Now, I say to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that again something is profoundly wrong. If the hon. Minister accepts—as he must—by having established the committee, that child welfare in the province of Ontario is inadequately handled, then the hon. Minister has a responsibility to table the report of that committee before the House. We implore the hon. Minister to let us know. There must be guide lines.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that there are

unhappy and critical whispers abroad in the land. There is a growing body of opinion saying a multiplicity of things. There are those who say that ultimate control should not rest with semi-private religious agencies. There are those who say, like the eloquent plea of the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Eagleson), a member of this government, that the entire adoption system is archaic and estranged from reality. There are those who say that the disposition of children should not be determined behind the scenes, but that children lacking adequate homes and parents should be wards of the state and wards of the state only. And there are those who say—experts in the field—that sufficient monies are not forthcoming, particularly for emotionally disturbed children, to do the job; and thereby children, their parents, and the society suffer.

Mr. Chairman, a very excellent speech was recently made by Mr. John Brown, the executive director of Warrendale, to the Windsor Children's Aid Society on February 20 of this year. In the body of the speech he said as follows, and I want to read it into the record because I think child welfare must surely be important to the hon. members of this House. I am quoting:

We have heard about the high cost of welfare and we will go on hearing it as though we can measure human need or misery in dollars and cents. We demean ourselves to the same degree, that we withhold the necessary resources to properly meet the needs of the children who become wards of society because of parents or family failure to meet their needs.

Those who read the recent budget for Ontario may recall that the interest on the provincial debt was \$20 million more than our total welfare budget. I can certainly work up more enthusiasm for paying increased sums to better our standard of service to children and families in need than I can about paying off interest charges.

Mr. Brown goes on, and perhaps this is the psychologist's analysis:

I think we can afford it, and when we don't afford it it isn't because of lack of cash—it is because of lack of motivation. We somehow want the inadequate and maladjusted person around to reassure ourselves of how very adequate and really well adjusted we all are.

Now, there are those who might dispute it, but it is interesting that a trained man in the field is willing to put it that way, that the basic perversion of government attitudes is

such that, in the area of child welfare, we are failing. He ends up by pointing this out:

It has been estimated that upwards of 25 per cent of children in the Children's Aid Society need special treatment if they are to adjust. They are not getting it, of course, and they are not adjusting. We must begin to request the resources that will make the full parenthood of our children possible.

End of quote.

So there you have it, Mr. Chairman—a state of intolerable indecision in the area of child welfare; inevitably the children's lives are sacrificed and, one asks, "At what human and social costs?"

The further, and perhaps most fundamental, evidence of basic attitude distortion lies in the means test rationale being the sole criterion on which welfare is allotted. We say strongly that categorical aid should be eliminated. It should have substituted for it, public welfare programmes on the basis of need; that way you eliminate the sting of rebuke and social scorn.

I think that the hon. member for Dovercourt, Mr. Chairman, made the same point; and I say to the hon. members of the House that admittedly this would mean a dramatic overhaul, but I ask them, "How else do you reform the government welfare policies?" And I add that the prevailing mentality is sadly exposed by the following set of conditions—and every member of this House has dealt with individual public welfare cases and knows the set of conditions for himself.

We have arbitrary income ceilings and maximum allowances, into which recipients must arbitrarily fit, no matter what their circumstances. We never hear talk of minimums, only maximums, and we always demand a continuing demonstration of need.

Further, Mr. Chairman, allowances are based on totally inadequate definitions of financial needs for food, clothing, shelter, fuel; and again they must always fit within the maximum. Pre-added budgets, let it be pointed out, are based on what every human being in this society deems purely marginal. All experts deem them purely marginal; so the poor become less poor, but their dignity remains denied them.

The federal Liberals are apparently overcommitting this kind of principle by the present contributory pension plan idea; where is evidence of that reality in the provincial Department of Public Welfare?

And then we have antiquated and irrele-

vant residence requirements—even more irrelevant in a highly mobile society.

The most interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is that all these specific categories delineate—let me say in an aside that they sometimes disqualify—certain deserving groups. That deserving group idea is an insidious term, for precisely the same principles, applied by The Department of Public Welfare, harshly discriminate against the so-called “undeserving”—the general welfare recipient.

I say to the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that pre-added budgets are different for general welfare recipients. The grants are lower for general welfare recipients.

Mothers on mothers’ allowance can obtain a higher maxima than mothers on general welfare—and I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister answered the following questions for me later on. Are they different human beings, Mr. Minister? Have they different needs, Mr. Minister? Are certain children born with an aristocratic privilege, Mr. Minister? Is it that the Conservative Party subscribes to a Marxian class structure, Mr. Minister?

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Oh, come now!

Mr. S. Lewis: What I want to know is: How does the hon. Minister—with the greatest respect to the people on the left of me, and I am glad they are on the left of me in this context—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Most class-conscious people in the world, the—

Mr. S. Lewis: I think the hon. Minister owes it to this House to explain where the needs and responsibilities, and dignity and rights, of a mother and her children are less in one case than in the other. I say to the hon. Minister: There is no explanation. The explanation lies in the fallacious principle of categorical aid which should be dismissed by this government.

It should be dismissed, Mr. Chairman—I want to go one step further—because it discriminates against and discourages those who wish to become self-supporting and self-sufficient. If I may say to the hon. members of this House, that is the greatest anomaly of all. Surely, and I think one can speak frankly and openly here, surely it is the aim of a public welfare programme to make the recipients of that welfare wholly self-sufficient, and integrate them into society. And it is the greatest paradox that this government persists in preventing that.

You see, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision for the transition period between welfare and self-sufficiency. Many who would wish to achieve self-support are positively terrorized out of it. Let me state some examples with which I know the hon. Minister cannot but agree.

Suppose you have a family, on public welfare, who take in a boarder to supplement their income so they can reach a viable economic state and self-sufficiency. They find their allowances drastically cut.

Suppose you have a woman on mothers’ allowance desperately seeking renewed self-respect through employment. According to the regulations she cannot work more than 24 hours a week, and even a percentage of that pittance earning is subtracted from the total allowance, or vice versa depending on how you view the regulations.

Suppose a man finds work, he is immediately cut off welfare. If he has accumulated debts the unhappy syndrome begins again.

Or let us take the adults’ retraining centre. Perhaps the hon. members will not think it invidious if I refer to this article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* by Michele Lansberg outlining the adult retraining centre difficulty, where people who are paid \$6 a day to retrain themselves so that they can become dignified and self-sufficient members of society. On the basis of being paid \$6 a day they are disqualified from all, or a major part, of their welfare receipts.

How does a government sit in a state of resignation when the end objective of its welfare programme is defeated by its own regulations and by its own set of attitudes? I know not the answer, Mr. Chairman, but I hope it will be forthcoming from the hon. Minister.

The hon. Minister indicated in his remarks, and the hon. member for Dovercourt made reference to it, that he was going to form a representative committee of women. I was interested in hearing him say that he wanted that committee to study women, particularly in the role of wives or mothers. That may be very well, Mr. Chairman, but that is not sufficient. We are not simply dealing with the area of wives or mothers. We are also dealing with women as independent human beings who, at certain points in their life, and those are the points the committee will be dealing with, want to gain self-respect and an adequate income.

When you emphasize the other aspect, I think you detract from it. I know the hon. Minister has a good deal of *jolie de vivre*; he probably has read Simone de Beauvoir’s *The*

Second Sex in its original language, from cover to cover. I want to say to him that he should not, in this House, subscribe to an attitude of women solely as wives and mothers, which tends to regulate them to the sort of subordinate position which North American society tends to accept. The emphasis should be twofold and it should be demonstrated in the hon. Minister's estimates.

But the final point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, and I will then conclude with our outline in the New Democratic Party, is that nowhere is the folly of this particular approach better demonstrated, and I must say that this surprised me, than in the report of The Department of Public Welfare itself. It stands as a remarkable piece of self-indictment and I commend it to all the hon. members of this House.

The department undertook a study, a most interesting study, and the deputy Minister is to be commended on it. It analyzed 200 chronic, long-term welfare families. It divided them up into two groups of 100 each. Let us call them group A and group B. Group A of 100 families were given routine welfare services and, in the words of the report, it says as follows: "to measure the effectiveness of the services which may normally be rendered by the staff of a welfare department."

Group B of 100 families were given all possible help and treatment and personal counselling, short of additional funds, and again, to quote the report of The Department of Public Welfare: "the results exceeded all expectations."

Twice as many people in group B given personal help and counselling were rehabilitated within six months, and twice as many of those people in Group B did it on a voluntary basis. Forty-three out of the 100 families, nearly 50 per cent, and these people were supposed to be long-term chronic cases. What the hon. Minister's report itself describes as the normal welfare services rendered by his department, were only half as effective as the specialized services which his department undertook in the survey.

Now the hon. Minister has presented his estimates to this House and I ask him forthrightly, where is the extension of what this case study demonstrates in the apparatus of The Department of Public Welfare? Why can it not be extended? It is a sad fact that one did not have to be a prophet or a clairvoyant to demonstrate that such would be the result; and the result bears out, Mr. Chairman, most effectively, three areas:

First, the persistent allegation that only chronic dissolutes join the welfare rolls is totally absurd. Half the cases returned to work in six months, with specialized attention.

Second, if you reject the normal approach used by the department itself, then you save families, you save money and it is twice as effective. Let me quote from the department report, page four:

The additional cost of the unit was, of course, offset many times over by the re-establishment of a substantial percentage of the families and their removal from the welfare rolls.

The hon. Minister said that welfare was up 15 per cent. He implied that it might be nice to lower that somewhat. Surely in his own department he has canvassed the study which demonstrates that it is feasible.

Third, the welfare mentality which tends to permeate our system is demonstrably fossilized, Mr. Chairman, and the deputy Minister wrote this in his report, page three:

It is evident that in the administration of welfare programmes today there is a primary need to revise our thinking. It is not enough merely to maintain persons on public assistance. Increasing efforts must be directed toward re-establishing individuals and families on a self-supporting status within their communities wherever this is remotely possible.

So there you have it from the department itself, a complete refutation of the normal services it has provided, an appeal for the specialist approach which it has delineated, and not a word from the hon. Minister of Public Welfare in his estimates before the House.

Mr. Chairman, in view of all that I have said in attempting to outline the perverse welfare attitude which is characteristic of the government; in view of the criticisms both implicit and explicit, it becomes necessary, I think, to enunciate a new programme and to enunciate that new programme on new principles.

I fully admit that this will be a somewhat dramatic and revolutionary departure when compared to the present welfare system, but we deem it to be necessary. We deem it to be necessary within the next three years and we urge that the department give consideration to implementing the following ten points:

One, abolish all categorical aid, which is seen as totally self-defeating and replace it with a broad programme of social aid which

will respond flexibly to the needs of each individual and family in order to rehabilitate, not just maintain.

And that implies point two, Mr. Chairman, the elimination of the rigid means test as the sole qualification for aid, to be replaced with an assessment of need, including the need to live decently while being helped to become self-sufficient.

Three, eliminate the residence requirements which are fallacious and antiquated and administratively expensive in a mobile society. They often disqualify needy individuals, or trap families in depressed areas where employment and retraining possibilities are limited.

Four, create large administrative units so as to permit more economical use of professionally trained staff and equipment, better distribution of skilled persons and more cohesive supervision.

Five, assess the study—if the hon. Minister will provide it—of his advisory committee on child welfare, and implement all those proposals which place absolute priority on children who are now inadequately cared for, including a vastly extended network of trained workers and facilities. This should be viewed as the question of utmost urgency.

Six, increase financial assistance to schools which train social workers while establishing other schools to provide a large number of trained but non-professional field workers, and encourage on-the-job training and recruitment of older workers and part-time workers to fill the "staff gap," so-called.

Seven, establish a provincial interdepartmental council representing welfare, health, education, the Attorney General, labour, citizenship and reform institutions for a more integrated and comprehensive approach at every level.

Eight, establish a local appeal board and a higher appeal court to replace the present three-man board appointed by the department itself for appeals on provincial grants only. It is shocking that an individual welfare administrator can eliminate a person from the rolls or deny them the right to go on the rolls without any appeal being granted.

Nine, throw the entire weight of the province behind a retraining and rehabilitation programme including that for disturbed children, on the assumption that the welfare department exists primarily to encourage people to become self-sufficient, responsible and self-reliant.

And finally, ten, create a special fund for on-going research projects to reform existing

legislation and to specify a series of plans in every field of public welfare for the decade ahead.

Now I feel, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, that implicit in this particular programme for the next three years is a profound change of attitude. While complimenting the department on pieces of social legislation which are far reaching, and while recognizing the difficulty of administration in a field like public welfare, I think we deserve and need a profound transformation of mentality, attitude, approach and pattern. It is that which we advocate and that which we commend and that which we hope will be acceptable.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me congratulate the hon. member who just sat down for a great flow of words. I am sure that I would not even think of competing with him in ability to use the English language in the way that he has done. But I might tell him this, that in more words than he has used, I have heard this gospel of the socialist point of view and I appreciate it.

You have full right to have those views and express them. But unfortunately, I am not in that thinking group, although I appreciate the statements that were made in this respect, and I must confess there are some good things among them, things that we feel we could associate with our thinking in the matter, and which we will be pleased to take into consideration and possibly use. But until such time as the people of Ontario are satisfied to have a socialist government in Ontario, by which they will be regimented and for which they will be paternalized, well, until then, I will leave it up to the people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: And we are dealing with welfare problems. I am not here to express in so many words, as you do, and say they should have done this and that. We are doing it all the time. These reports are not there for the fun of it, and in fact they are given out to the general public, which is proper, you may add your innuendoes as you see fit.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, I have been here for the last 16 years. I have seen the socialist party, either the CCF or the NDP, and I have often wondered one thing. Are there only three places in the world where you find the perfect man—either in an Ontario hospital, the cemetery or the NDP?

Mr. MacDonald: This is the kind of brilliance that is worthy of welfare.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, we will see. We have heard that for many years.

With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Dovercourt, he has asked me especially what my attitude will be when they have the conference in Quebec City. I think we have had some very useful conversations with the officials of public welfare in Ottawa at the last federal-provincial conference in Ottawa. We are sure to have more useful discussions at this particular conference which will be in Quebec City. Also in May we will be dealing directly with matters of this kind with the appropriate Ministers, not in the general conference.

Mr. Thompson: What kind?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Everything dealing with The Department of Public Welfare and the—

Mr. Thompson: What will you be dealing with?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The whole programme as we know it and where we have participation with Ottawa.

Mr. Thompson: Could you give us the areas you are going to discuss?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The whole thing, sir.

Mr. Thompson: What do you mean, the whole picture?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I mean the whole question of disability pensions, old age assistance and mothers' allowances and also all the programmes that we share in equal participation, or in unequal participation if you wish, and those particular matters that are dealt with by this department.

Mr. Thompson: Could you clarify one of them? Mothers' allowance. How are you going to deal with mothers' allowance? What is going to be your stand when you go to Quebec? Nothing else, just mothers' allowance? If I could get your point of view on that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to deal with that particular problem when in Quebec City. We will do that possibly in May. As you noticed in Mr. Gordon's budget the other day, it was not mentioned. Naturally, I am not making any comment about this because there are some reservations. When the pattern of equalization is mentioned, we have to go very carefully. However, it was mentioned that they might possibly induce the provinces to accept

the full responsibility, with the federal government providing the taxing powers which we should have in this respect. That is one of the things for discussion.

But, my hon. friend certainly would not expect me to give anything away regardless of how friendly he feels towards the people in Toronto and Ottawa. Certainly he would not expect me to reveal all my lines of battle beforehand.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister has told us, not in this report but the previous report, of his enthusiasm for a contributory pension plan. We have found from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), when I asked him during his estimates, that apparently the integration of existing pension plans with a contributory national pension plan has been studied. When I asked specifically of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, has the Ontario civil service been discussing this, I got the reply that they do have the technical answer, but it now rests on the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario to find other answers. But that I assume is the political answer.

Now we know you are speaking on this. What is going to be your stand on the national pension plan? You, yourself? Obviously this is so important to your whole fabric of welfare services.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give any comment upon a national plan, because we have no such thing as yet. There is an Ottawa plan. That is what we have. We have no national plan. Now after the Quebec conference, we might have and then it will be possible to give some expression to our point of view concerning it. I am sure my hon. friend can understand that.

Mr. Thompson: Well, is this going to be on the agenda at Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do not know. I am not the man who deals with the agenda.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have asked for it to be put on, but I have not yet been told it is going to be on.

Mr. Sopha: Do you want us to ask Prime Minister Pearson for you?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If you think it would help.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister—I am sorry, were you going to—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to allow the Minister to reply to the questions that have already been asked.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, a question was asked of me by the hon. member for Dovercourt. He talked about county welfare units.

I have not got the full answer here. I will give it to you later, if you will bring it up again. But I know there are two county units in full operation, with six counties now attempting to go into it. As you can appreciate with me, if my hon. friend has any knowledge of members of county councils, they are not people who usually jump into a new situation of any kind very quickly. They have to study it well. I think we are making progress. If you will ask me the question later, I will be able to give you a more definite answer on this matter.

Mr. Thompson: Could I just say we came from a meeting today, sir, this morning, with The Department of Education in which they have a bill which is going to encourage far more than just two units of education. I wonder whether you have given any consideration to a similar kind of bill to get county units of administration? We will discuss this later.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if the questions have been answered, I wonder if I could ask a question of the hon. Minister relating to some of my remarks. I preface it by saying, Mr. Minister, that I accept the validity of the difference between you on that side and we on this side, and I would hope that you also accept that validity without impugning its integrity.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am not doing that. In fact, if my hon. friend thought that was it, I am sorry. I did not intend to do that.

Mr. MacDonald: What about your cheap references?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, who are you to talk that way about cheap references, my hon. friend from York South?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Just get back to the point—

Mr. Sopha: No bloodshed.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I am going to ask the members to ask the questions under the different items under this vote. Continue.

An hon. member: That is what we are doing.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am genuinely interested. I think this is the place to ask it, Mr. Minister, as to whether you have any date in mind for the report on child welfare in the province? Is the committee on the verge of submitting it?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the hon. members, through you, that point was covered in my remarks. I expected a question of that kind and I might say I give notice there are no monies in the estimates for this committee. They are through now and I expect the report any time within the next month or two.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question about his department and these various items here? I do not want to miss the opportunity—and this may stimulate him not to answer my question—but I do not want to miss the opportunity to say to him, through you, sir, that his remarks to the thoughtful presentation of the young man from Scarborough West were unworthy of him.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: A great deal of thought went into the preparation of that address. It might be idealistic, it might differ from your pragmatism, but you should not get up and ascribe to a youthful person in public life the things you did.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): The pot calling the kettle black!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on the main estimate of the hon. Minister—

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Attorney General had better keep silent because he was not even here.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Socialist element!

Mr. Sopha: Could I ask you, sir, if in any place in these votes there is any money voted for family counselling services?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Not as such, Mr. Chairman, I would answer the hon. member for Sudbury, but this service is provided by the different organizations, and by some of our own staff, if you want to refer to that. But named as such, no.

Mr. Sopha: Well, there is a phenomenon within our society which worries me a great

deal. I want to be very careful what I have to say about this problem, but a good many of the hon. members of this House, as well as a great body of people outside the House, will have noticed in recent weeks the rather startling series of homicides that have occurred in household units, whereby mothers apparently have been responsible for the deaths of their children.

In my own community, I am very depressed to say, that within a period of two months two families were obliterated, literally obliterated, as a result of homicidal action of one or other heads of the family.

But it does occur to me that, let a half dozen people in Ontario, or a very few number of people, suffer from something like muscular dystrophy or some other rare form of disease, and immediately somebody will proceed to set up some pluralistic association to bring aid to those who suffer or toward the elimination of that disease. But I ask, rhetorically, what have we done in the province toward the creation of some vehicle whereby we look into the problems of the family?

I would think that in this, the seventh decade of this century, all our major urban communities would have some sort of counselling service where a parent that is in a home where the bonds of matrimony and the conjugal union between the parties has disappeared, that they could go to some form of agency and seek relief and assistance and advice. I ask, when are we going to arrive at that point where we have enough social workers and the mechanics, the vehicle, of some assistance to the family?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. member for Sudbury that one of the main groups that deal with that to a very large extent are the children's aid societies. Also I know there are many private agencies which do the same.

The hon. member has suggested that possibly there should be a special grant for this. It is a matter that possibly could be looked into, but then again he mentioned a certain tragedy that took place in Sudbury. I am sure these tragedies, as my hon. friend will recall well, are not only of our modern society, they have been going on for many years in different areas, in different places, for different reasons.

There might be a larger prevalence today, and I do not wish to excuse anything when I say this. But I suppose the population is larger. I suppose as you say, the morals might be a little looser. You might go on to very many extensive reasons. I might even

dare say this, and I am not doing as the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) did yesterday, but I might also be taking my religious principles within my own hands—I do not suppose I would be ex-communicated but however I think maybe we are all lax in this—each and everyone of us. Possibly the church also could do their part to a larger extent than they are doing in dealing with particular cases like that. We would avoid, I am sure, many of these tragedies that happen by doing a lot of counselling ourselves.

I can recall the day when people used to go and take counsel, which maybe they do not do so much today. However, it is a very large problem. I believe that the hon. member for Sudbury brought this up if only for the purposes of encouraging more people to enter the social service field and go to university to take social service courses instead of some other courses they might wish to take. I am sure there is a great field there, and I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. Sopha: This government equates everything in terms of the amount of money that it gives. It seems to me we never measure up to our responsibilities at all.

As long as the government says, we give \$75 million to universities, give \$100 million next year—we are starting universities in Niagara Falls, Peterborough, and Sudbury. This government never apparently gives any stimulation toward the training of the type of people that we need.

Everybody with glass in one eye and sand in the other knows that there are not enough social workers, there are not enough people induced to go into the field. But in the meantime, when the wife, and it is most often the wife, is in a period of distress with her marriage and it seems to be going on the rocks; within our society there are two people she can turn to.

She can turn to the clergy. Most of the clergy, of course, have a large flock and they cannot give individual attention.

Or she can turn to the lawyer, who is utterly ill-equipped by his training. A lawyer, after all, is not more qualified to advise a person on their marital problems than is the baker, or the man who picks up the shirts for the dry cleaning—such a person might have more knowledge of family problems than a lawyer. My hon. friend from Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) says the milkman—but they come in large numbers to the lawyer.

I sav to them when they come, "Really, I can tell you about your legal rights, but I am

not qualified to advise you on how you keep your home together."

And then about two weeks ago I happened to be at the police station—on business, I hasten to assure you—and when I was there a woman came in carrying a brown paper bag. I could not help but overhear what she said to the sergeant and she said, "I have a gun here and I would like to leave it with you". So he took the gun and he looked at it and he gave her a receipt for it. And when she went out, I said to him, "Am I thinking the right thing? Am I thinking the right reason that she brought the gun here?" He said, "Indeed you are." I said, "How often does that happen?" He said, "At least two or three times a week when they are fearful of their safety at the hands of their husbands who are into the barleycorn, they bring the gun to the police station."

On many occasions, Mr. Chairman, they do not bring the guns soon enough, when a family is destroyed or great harm is done to them.

I say this, and I am not going to elaborate and I am doing my duty in pointing this out here, in the light of recent events that have happened in my community which have, I cannot help but feel, given my community a bad reputation throughout the province if not the country, when we had two terrible tragedies within a period of a month or two. We have got to come to the point where, in every major urban community, we establish some sort of agency where people in distress about their marital problems, or when their home is breaking up, or one or either of the spouses is demonstrating anti-family tendencies, can go to get counsel and, what is more important, follow-up care or follow-up attention. That is more important.

It is all right for the husband to pledge off the drink, but unless somebody in our society is going to go around and see that he does stay off the drink and encourage him to do so, and to lift out of his temperament and personality the nobler emotions, then we are allowing the basic institution of our society—the family—to falter and be destroyed.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to this. The hon. Minister has said that he has studied the research done—I mean the research which was done by Miss Bessie Touzel, a pioneer project of a county system approach. I would like to concur very much with the remarks of the critic of the New Democratic Party. I listened very attentively. I did not say it as ably or as fluently as he did, but for the most part I think a number

of the points I made were similar to his. I do not consider them socialist whatsoever. I think—

Mr. Bryden: They are socialist; that is—

Mr. Thompson: I think there has been an Elizabethan attitude in respect to residence clauses and in a number of other things; but, to get back again, one of the points the hon. member made was in knowing when the research was being done and when it will be implemented in practice. One of the points Miss Bessie Touzel made was that if you have a county unit you should have a family counselling service attached to the county unit. You should have a trained family counsellor. She stated that if this was done eventually money would be saved. She suggested that, eventually, money would be saved because, just as in many other things, the old proverb is true: Prevention is far better than cure. I agree with what the hon. member has said about having trained people in these units.

In the sense of having municipal units, particularly in small municipalities, there is no question that in some cases they have relegated the role of the welfare officer to the dog-catcher, or some such position. Until you get a larger unit you cannot get capable staff. I appreciate that desire for county units, but I would hope that there would be an infusion of real vigour into getting this.

We have asked, time after time, about the county units. We notice where The Department of Health has gone after this. We see that The Department of Education, facing the political reaction to some small school boards being amalgamated or consolidated, has very courageously gone after it. And yet we come back to this hon. Minister and each time it is admitted it is important, and then the hon. Minister tells us there are only two of these county units. If we had county units then we could have the kind of services which my hon. friend from Sudbury has so ably emphasized—that is to have units staffed with qualified people—and I wholeheartedly concur with his remarks.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to those remarks either; nor did I have any in respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough West. But I am asking the hon. member one question: Does he think, or would he prefer, that we have a statute establishing welfare consolidation as a law and forcing all the counties to do that? I do not think that would be very wise—at least I found that out.

What we are trying to do is to educate

them along that line; and if we establish, as we have now, two projects which act as pilot projects—they will come in and they are coming in very quickly now. That has always been our understanding.

I understand the district of Sudbury is now coming in, and that area is very enthusiastic about it. You can get the ball rolling, so to speak, and I am sure we will have results; but I just cannot accept any other method in the sense of forcing counties into consolidation. That has been my problem.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I have been saying this, frankly, since I first had the honour of representing a riding in this House. Surely the hon. Minister can look at Britain, where it can be seen there was encouragement by tax inducements for more industry to move into Wales. We can look at our federal government. We can look at the situation right here. As well as just talking about it, you can have tax inducements. You can offer such inducements; if they organized a county unit, again you could provide certain administrative areas, free of cost.

But, not just talking, I do not think the carrot is then quite juicy enough. I think that, knowing the motivations of not only people but also of the small administrations, the hon. Minister must present a fairly juicy carrot to get the local person, who perhaps is a dog-catcher, to say, "Look, I agree. I give up my position to be part of a broader unit and for the good of the people." I suggest the hon. Minister look at carrots and try to see which kind of carrots would induce the small municipalities to join together; because for four years the hon. Minister has been telling us about this, and the report shows only two of them coming in.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with my hon. friend from Dovercourt that the carrot is useful in this situation, but let us face the fact that the prod is also essential. If the hon. Minister of Public Welfare would take a look at the experience of the hon. Minister of Education, he will find that there comes a time when you simply have to lay down the law.

The Department of Education was also following the permissive policy, and they continued to have over 3,000 school units in this province. It is obviously impossible to carry on modern education in such a situation so they have now, or are in the process of providing by law, that the number will be reduced. There will be a compulsory amalgamation of some of them; that, I think, is only the beginning of a process.

The hon. Minister is going to have to face up to the problem that if he really wants to get larger units, and more efficient units, of welfare administration, his present *laissez-faire* attitude will not be sufficient, nor even the carrot approach of the hon. member for Dovercourt.

The hon. Minister is up against the problem of the petty vested interests of big toads in small puddles, who will never give up. And since the protection of their little principalities is the least, or should be the least, of our concerns, the time has come when we simply have to lay it down that the principalities are abolished, and there will be larger units of administration in the interests of the people who are using the services. That should be the paramount concern. As long as we give prior consideration to little vested interests then the people who require the services which can be provided, are going to suffer.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, concerning the amalgamation of units, my own municipality did amalgamate the health units. We had a metro health unit, and it is now being expanded into a countywide unit—as of, I think it is, July 1. When the municipality appealed to the municipal board for annexation of the suburbs, the interim report suggested an amalgamation of the utilities commissions, after a fashion.

Surely, if such a recommendation or suggestion was made by the municipal board, then amalgamation of social services would be in order at this time also? We have four or five municipalities receiving various types of assistance from this department. It certainly would be much simpler for administration if they all were under the one unit, operated as a single unit.

However, I would like to pass on to a different topic; that is, concerning the day centres. We have a senior citizens' centre in the community and it is functioning exceptionally well. It provides all types of beneficial assistance to the senior citizens. It is in operation practically seven days of the week. Now it has proven itself to the point that I think it merits duplication in other parts of the province. Are other centres being contemplated throughout the province? Is the province recommending centres similar to the one in my own community?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that we have inquiries now from two or three different places, like Kitchener, Peterborough, and, I guess, Toronto who have been

discussing it. It is there for them to undertake the project. As you know, under the conditions that were explained in Windsor. Windsor is a pioneer on this matter. In the case of any municipality that wishes to do so, we are quite willing to look at the proposal and advise them.

Mr. Newman: It is more than simply a case of having the legislation there and allowing municipalities to take advantage of it if they wish. If it is something that merits duplication, I think it should be the policy of this department to suggest that here is a centre that is of definite value to the senior citizens, it overcomes a lot of their problems and it should be copied.

However, I would like to get away from that into another topic and that is the grey area in which we find our senior citizens who no longer require hospitalization treatment, and at the same time are not well enough or cannot get accommodation in the old age homes. We take care of three different categories of people, those who are seriously ill, who need active treatment and intensive care. We place them in ordinary hospitals. We have those who need some medical supervision and therapy, but do not need intensive medical care. They may be chronic or convalescent patients. And we have a facility for them likewise. We also have those who need custodial care, bedridden or semi-bedridden.

But we finally find another category. That is the older person who is unable to fend for himself entirely, but who is able to get up and about. There certainly should be some facility provided to accommodate this fourth category of individual. Would the hon. Minister care to comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I wish to understand the ideas of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville when he talks about the aged people. I know that in the homes for the aged there are three different categories of care—the ambulatory, the bed care and also the special care. Is that what the hon. member had in mind when he mentioned special care? If the space in the Windsor home—in Huron View Lodge, which I guess is what he is speaking about—is not sufficient, I am quite sure the local people there will take a look at the picture and will possibly enlarge the home. Or even, I would suggest, if a new home is in order we are quite willing to discuss this matter with them.

Now, if you deal in another sphere beyond that, then you may be talking of those who are chronic cases. That is another story. I could not advise the hon. member about that. I am

speaking strictly about those I believe he had in mind—those that we entertain in homes for the aged.

Mr. Newman: Well, just recently the Riverview Hospital had to release a large number of patients because they apparently were simply boarders in the hospital in the eyes of the department. Now where are these patients to go? They will not take them into the homes for the aged. The department is requesting that individuals in the municipality house these people. It is not that simple to come along and say: Here is a patient, take care of him." These people need some special type of accommodation to which they can go. The hospital treatment is too expensive for them and we should save the hospitals for the patients who need hospital treatment. These people do not need this type of treatment. They can fend partially for themselves.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: In other words, Mr. Chairman, this would be a person who would be eligible for the home for the aged except there are no more rooms there? Is that what the hon. member had in mind?

Mr. Newman: Well, they need some type of nursing care in addition to that. Now the home for the aged does not necessarily provide that.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member over there means would be that some of them would be eligible for a nursing home which is comparable to the homes for the aged in what they do. Let me assure him now that there is already a committee formed including the members of my staff, myself, and The Department of Health, to look at this matter. I know we have, as an example, the situation that exists in Windsor, sir, as regards what the hon. member is speaking about. What is going to come out of the discussion, as yet I do not know and I could not say.

However, I still say, and I say this not only for the county of Essex or the city of Windsor, but for the province as a whole, in the building programme of the homes for the aged we have no restriction at all. I am quite sure if another home is required in Windsor we would be quite willing to sit down and talk to the people interested, if that would serve the purpose.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister. He had one official from his department go into the community and make a comment to the city fathers at one time, so the department should be well aware of the problem.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on this home for the aged I want to support my hon. colleague in connection with research. I just throw this out to you. Why are we having old people today who have to go into homes? Is it because of a lack of responsibility on the part of the younger generation? Is it because of the cost of living? There are many questions that one could raise.

If you had, for example, some kind of tax incentive—and it is unfortunate one even has to raise this—suggestion to have a family take responsibility for their grandparents, would we get people staying within the family unit rather than having to go to old people's homes? Have we ever thought, for example, and again I raise the question, where you have low-cost housing—and I am thinking of a plan in the United States—a municipality with the province will buy a couple of homes on a street? Have you ever thought that instead of having a large old people's home, you might actually choose individual homes on a couple of streets, say something like a Markham street where artists were invited to live after the homes clean up. Have you ever thought of doing this with old people instead of relegating them to the institutions?

I am suggesting sir, that we could just experiment, that you might take one house on a street and you can have four old people there. They can still stay in the community rather than moving out to an institution.

I am suggesting as well that if you have homemakers, perhaps the old people that my hon. friend has talked about so sympathetically, perhaps if you threw some weight behind the homemakers' services those old people could still stay in their room and so on and never need to go to an institution.

I raised about four possibilities off the top of my head, but I am hoping that ideas are receptive to you. I think that research should look into why these things happen. These suggestions I gave of experimentation are all such things that should be encouraged by you.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased my hon. friend brings these activities up because we have been doing just that to a large extent. I wish you would put that same question to my friend the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) when he has his estimates—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh yes, he is going to get a lot of questions.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is one question I would like you to put to him, because we

are embarking on a programme similar in description to that of which you speak in conjunction. I think, with the federal government. As you know, we also have low cost housing for any group of people such as a service club who will form a company. They can borrow money from the federal government, and \$500 is given by the province as an outright grant to help those projects. Also we promote the idea of encouraging people who can live in the community to remain in their own homes.

I am sure the idea my hon. friend mentioned is a good one. We have been doing, not exactly what you are talking about, that is, taking a whole street, but certainly there are elderly persons housing projects where elderly married couples live together, especially in these housing centres that you have here in the city of Toronto, the city of Windsor, the city of Hamilton, the city of Kingston. They have them in quite a few places and they have proven very worthy. I accept ideas at all times and I am sure this one will be considered as we carry on with the programme.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, four years ago I mentioned in the House family allowances in reverse, where a family might receive sort of a grandparent bonus if they took care of their aged parents. Now, has the department conducted any studies as to the feasibility of that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do not get my hon. friend's idea. If he means to say that instead of holding myself responsible for taking care of my mother and my father, if I can afford to do it, I should have the state do it, I do not think I would like that idea very much; if that is what he had in mind. But if he is talking of foster children, that is another story. We already do that.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, allow me to explain to the hon. Minister. A family receives a family allowance until they reach, today, 17 years of age. Now the family would receive a grandfather and a grandmother allowance if they took care of parents who normally might leave them and go into a home for the aged. Rather than saddling the province with the additional cost of taking care of the individual in one of these homes for the aged, the family would take care of their parents, which they should do in the first place but they do not always do. For taking care of their parents, that is, those who normally would not, some type of allowance could be made available to them.

I suggested this four years ago and I

thought possibly the department would have done some type of studying on it and come up with the advisability or feasibility of implementing something similar to that.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I think the old age pension covers this area. Normally, if it is a woman, she can now receive a pension at 60 years of age and if she is a widow, and many can get old age assistance at 65. We also have old age security. I do not mind looking into this proposal about grandparents but I have not much faith in it, really.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not mean it is just general, but I know of dozens of cases in my own community, and I imagine everyone else does in their communities, where parents are a financial burden on their children, that is, aged parents. As a result the children have them placed in homes for the aged. Now, rather than have them in homes for the aged, if the province made some type of allowance, a baby bonus in reverse, then possibly the family would maintain and keep their parents with them rather than relegating them to a home for the aged.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, with regard to grants to adult homes. Is an individual who operates a nursing home which The Department of Health will not approve, eligible for a grant from your department or must the home be operated by an organization?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There is no grant to residents as such, but, as you know, nursing homes are all operated privately and we reimburse the municipality, based on how many of their citizens are in the home. The rate is 80 per cent up to \$100. This refers to the grant to the municipality.

Mr. Troy: In your public accounts there are such adult homes; there is the Nipponia Home board and Salvation Army Eventide Home, Sisters of St. Joseph, Cambrian Hall and so on. You must—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: They are charitable institutions.

Mr. Troy: You cannot have an individual?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, our charitable institutions are not the type of nursing homes we were speaking about.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, under the item of children's institutions, I would like

to ask the hon. Minister again, sir, on this study of children's institutions—it showed a shocking situation. It was shown there are children in this province of Ontario placed in institutions and there is no reason for them being here at all. If we have a look at other studies that have been done on children's institutions, a child who has been kept in institutional care often is shown to be very detrimental to his emotional upbringing. There have been studies of schizophrenics which have shown the condition in part to be the result of being brought up in an institution.

It was strongly recommended from the children's institutions study—referring to the three-year study done under the chairmanship of Miss Bessie Touzel—it was strongly recommended that you should be getting children out of the institutions, because they were healthy kids and had no reason to be in the institutions.

It was recommended there should be four groupings. As I understand, there should be a grouping for emotionally disturbed children, there should be those for whom group activity would be useful; there are the kind who do not fit into a family; and so on.

Now, I asked the hon. Minister last year had these institutions to which grants are given—children's institutions—had they come up to the standards which are wanted, that is the standards which the research recommended in connection with staff? Have they come up to the standard, and if they have not how are you encouraging them to work toward such standards?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I wish I could give an answer which would fully satisfy the hon. member. I do not like to mislead him.

As you will appreciate, this is a very difficult area, and all I can say to him is that there has been some improvement in the fact that we have tried, at least, to be stricter with them by asking them to have people that are more knowledgeable in doing that kind of work. But I must confess to you that there are not too many such people available. This is our difficulty.

I am unhappy, as the hon. member is, with this situation, but all I can say is that we have not lost sight of it and we are looking at it every day. We are doing the best we can about it, but I cannot assure you that the improvement is 100 per cent, but there is improvement.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, could I follow on to make my point clearer? As I understand,

there are orphanages in which children are placed and in some instances they stay in these institutions for a long period. These orphanages, and I dislike that word intensely, these orphanages get grants to continue. I would feel the whole philosophy is that these orphanages be closed down and that the children placed in foster homes or to be adopted. My question is: Without embarrassing the hon. Minister, may I ask him whether the Orange Order, for example, gets a grant to continue an orphanage?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, but I am advised that their operations are very highly approved. I might point out to the hon. member that the one safeguard which exists in this, is the small number of children who are affected. I am informed that about 90 per cent of the cases in children's institutions or in homes of that description, are placements of the Children's Aid Society; and they certainly, I am advised, have constant supervision there. The situation of the other ten per cent of cases, which, I agree with you, should not be in institutions at all, is being looked at; and although improvement is not as fast as I would like, there is improvement. I am assured by my people here that the place you mention—the lodge up on Highway 11—does receive grants, but we are satisfied that the progress has been good in the last year.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister was courageous enough to make some suggestion about the role of the church. You said you were speaking as a person. I come from the north of Ireland. I will come out in connection with the Orange Lodge and say that I think that the day of an orphanage for children in this province is past, unless they are dealing specifically with the particular problem children as Bessie Touzel, paid by the department to do the study, outlined.

I stress that aspect in that study that emotionally disturbed children could be in institutions, when it is difficult for them to develop in a family setting; but when there are institutions for this type of child. How many such institutions do you have for emotionally disturbed children?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that we have 22 children's institutions. They are not all in the category the hon. member speaks about. There are 12 providing, more or less, board and lodging care. That is what you had in mind mostly—

Mr. Thompson: No. I want to know about emotionally disturbed—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There are eight providing specialized care for children with behaviour problems, and one providing specialized care for emotionally disturbed children. Is that what you—

Mr. Thompson: Yes. There are eight which provide care for emotionally disturbed children. Could I ask how many of those fall short of the staff requirements as stated by Miss Bessie Touzel?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: All I can answer the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a shortage. I have to admit that there is a shortage, but to put a figure on it would be very difficult for me.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I have said this before and I say it again: I do not think it is good enough that grants are being given to these institutions which fall short. Take the example of community chests: When an agency which is a recipient of a community chest does not come up to the standards, then it is thrown out of the community chest; any vital community chest will do that.

The hon. Minister similarly should be able to tell me about the institutions to which he gives grants, yet he cannot give me an answer with respect to the standards of the staffs. I simply say it is not good enough.

As the hon. Minister who is indirectly responsible for the lives of those children, he should know who is falling short of standards, and should be able to tell us what is being done to raise those standards.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am not saying that, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to argue with the hon. member, but I know this: As I said a moment ago, I just cannot draw up a staff out of paper and place it there. I must have a body which will make these studies and go in there. There must be actual persons who will undertake child studies and accept employment in these homes. I have to deal with that; and I think, with the staff we have now, that we are doing a pretty fair job of it.

I admit to you that there is a shortage of staff. If my hon. friend, with his influence and his natural ability in this field, can convince more people to go into this field he would certainly not only help the people of Ontario but he would be helping me at the same time, I am quite sure. This is what I mean by that. After all, I cannot take the responsibility of developing people who will undertake these studies. That is what I mean by saying that—I have a shortage of staff.

If there were people available they would be taken in very quickly, I assure you.

As far as the general standards are concerned, they are all set out in the regulations. These places are inspected, and although they are not perfect they are not doing too badly with whatever they have at their disposal.

Mr. Thompson: I do not want to belabour the point, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. Minister does have to take the responsibility on this. These are public funds which are being given over to these institutions, and I would say that the hon. Minister should know.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do know.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister does know. Does the hon. Minister say that he does know the number of institutions which as yet do not have the proper qualified staff? The hon. Minister mentioned eight institutions which look after emotionally disturbed children. Miss Bessie Touzel, in her study, suggested that there were certain qualifications with respect to staff who would look after emotionally disturbed children. The hon. Minister has paid for that study. He said that this had to be the standard toward which to aspire.

What is the point of having this study done? What is the point of knowing what the standards are when the hon. Minister stands up each time in this House and tells us that he cannot tell us who has fallen short or who is up, but that, "We are all trying the best we can." Surely the standards are a guide, and the hon. Minister should know where he has fallen short. And because the hon. Minister, with all respect, comes into the House as a Minister of Public Welfare, he is falling short on the job when he cannot provide those answers.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not know the answers the hon. member wants. I told him that there were eight institutions providing specialized care for children with behaviour problems. In those eight institutions there is some staff which is knowledgeable, but not as much as I would like to have. After all—

Mr. Thompson: Of the eight institutions, how many are up to the standards as described by Miss Bessie Touzel?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that these eight at least meet the regulations as set out under the Act. They meet the regulations. I have one home providing specialized care for emotionally disturbed children, and eight

others that are also following the regulations. Naturally, following regulations, I appreciate, might not be enough. There is something else over and above that. I am quite satisfied and disposed to take the hon. member's criticism about this. That is quite all right. I have no objection to this because we can always improve on these matters.

There are 12, as I stated before, which provide, more or less, board and lodging. That is a different proposition. The ones in which you were especially interested are the other nine. I can assure you that I may come here for 20 years perhaps, and tell you the same thing: I am doing my best to get that staff in there, but I just cannot invent the people to go there.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what is the Minister's best? Is he providing training systems? Is he providing scholarships? Are his salaries competitive? These are things which would attract new staff. I am just unable to follow the hon. Minister when he says, "I am doing my best but we are still short of staff."

In The Department of Education, the public accounts committee was having a look at some of their staff problems this morning, and their officials admitted quite frankly that one of the reasons they were short of staff was because they were not able to compete with other people on the salary basis. I wonder if this does not apply to your department. If it does then surely, Mr. Minister, this is your responsibility. If the salaries fixed by the Treasury board and by the civil service commission are too low to attract the sort of people you need, then you should be telling us that and you should be saying that representations are being made to increase the salaries, and to increase the training. Surely it is not enough, with the greatest respect to the hon. Minister, to say I am doing my best. There is a shortage. The hon. Minister recognizes the shortage and he should tell us how he is going to cope with it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Again, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to argue with my hon. friend. This is an argument, and I know I have not got the ability of the hon. member across the way to argue with him. But I can tell him that we give bursaries; we also give grants to the two schools of social work, one in Ottawa and one in Toronto, and we were able last year to get 31 students.

Our competition is not strictly money. Our competition are all the welfare agencies in the municipalities, and everybody around

who use these people. This is our great competition. As you know, 31 bodies is not an awful lot of bodies to deal with in the great field of that description. But we hope that we have been progressing in this field. I can recall when there were only seven bursary students. We hope, next year possibly, to double that number of bursaries. That is all I can tell my hon. friend.

I do not mind taking the blame for it, if that would satisfy anybody's feelings. However, I am just putting the facts as they are.

Mr. Singer: We do not want to blame anybody. We just want to have the schools built up to strength.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister consider giving grants or scholarship aid to students attending American universities but resident in Ontario if they are going to study in the field of social work?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: My only answer, Mr. Chairman, is that we have a lot of places in Ontario for this training. I do not know why they want to go over to the United States for it. We have even a better course here in Ontario.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can very easily answer that in my own community. The individual only has to cross the river and he is two miles away from the institution. If he wanted to study in Ontario he would have to travel to Toronto, or to Ottawa, so would it not be an advantage for the province to provide the scholarship for that individual to cross the border, take his training, and then supply his services to Ontario? Then the brain drain would be in the reverse.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Let me make a suggestion to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. He lives in what I know is a great country. I know it better than he does because I was born there and lived there for many years. I would make a suggestion to him that instead of making the suggestion he made to me, why not approach the university in Windsor about having their own course? That would be much easier yet.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I will do that, but in the meantime and until the time that course is set up at the university—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That could be done in four weeks.

Mr. Newman: —in Windsor, why not take advantage of the facilities that you do have

across the border? Our American friends will train the individual and then we take advantage of the training they gave him. Is there something wrong with a suggestion such as that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have one other question for the hon. Minister. The individual in later years, after he is 45 or maybe 50, finds it most difficult in obtaining employment. As a result he falls in the ranks of the individuals receiving general welfare. Has the department ever made a suggestion that possibly certain types of employment could be reserved for elderly people? I am referring to such things as ticket takers, building guards, watchmen, desk clerks and receptionists in certain institutions, parking meter checkers, elevator operators, toll collectors.

I have mentioned about six or eight different categories of people, elderly people who could provide this service if the job does not require any physical endurance. It would give this elderly citizen an opportunity for some type of employment, rather than have him fall in the ranks of general welfare. Has the department ever considered making a suggestion similar to that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I can recall having said that in speeches I have made across the province many times. And I would say that all I can do is suggest it. We have worked with different people, like Mr. George Gardner in Windsor, for instance, suggesting that he do his best to investigate and place these people. That has been the general policy, but to propose it for everybody, I do not think I could do that.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I said—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The fact that you make it as such is a public statement. It should give it effect.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gardner, back in Windsor, will certainly look into it. He is a most capable man.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, following up on that, I would like to raise another suggestion for when you go to Quebec. I am thinking of other countries with respect to disabled persons. In Germany, for example, industry is encouraged to give opportunities to disabled persons. Tax inducements are granted the industry to have a proportion of disabled people. Again, it is really returning to my opening remarks, as well as those of my hon. colleague from the

new party, that there should be a better look at the broad scene. There are people, who are probably in institutions, being given just maintenance help, rather than an urge to get back into the economy of the society.

My hon. friend has talked about opportunities for older people. I am thinking of opportunities for people who might be disabled in some way. I am thinking in my own area there are fellows who become partially disabled and are, frankly, caught in the gap. They are partially disabled and get a small pension. They go down to the National Employment office to try to get a job, and they say "We are sorry we could not get you a job, you are partially disabled." They are trying to get a light job, and they cannot get a job so then they come and get welfare. We need such tax inducements and more retraining. I noticed yesterday that with workmen's compensation there is a greater emphasis on retraining.

But I would like a bold hard look at this. Let us talk about a sort of new frontier approach—not people going off to Asia or somewhere as it applies in the States. I read a little while ago about another new frontier approach in which the United Church, or some spiritual voluntary group are taking a group of people up to the Arctic to work with the Indians.

And yet I think of Canadians in our cities in Ontario in connection with poverty, and the recurring generations of people who are on welfare. Here is a really challenging problem to be faced. And I am not sure that it has not to be faced from a number of facets. I am thinking of the co-ordinated approach of departments suggested, and I whole-heartedly concur with this. We need such an approach on the hard core group, in places where children are probably going to grow up without opportunity and become welfare cases themselves. Let us encourage top-notch teachers in this area. Let us go further than that. Let us give opportunity in education; really make opportunity for these children in order to pull them out of their environment. Scholarships and so on. This really comes to the point of research.

I am sure if that study was done on a hard core group approaches would be developed. I would be interested to know, as my hon. colleague has asked, about the completed study. The deputy Minister wrote up the study stating there would be new approaches. In fairness, can we not ask what are the new approaches to the grave problem of the hard core of welfare? What are the new approaches, sir?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only answer I could give to this is that our approach is through constant research and improvement.

Mr. Thompson: No, I am really concerned about the hon. Minister. This is almost like an itch. One can keep itching away all the time just on research. At some point you need action.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is your answer. All right.

Mr. Thompson: When is the hon. Minister going to stop research and apply it? Implement it? How much more research is needed? Is the hon. Minister doing research on the report he has, and thus research the research?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I have answered the question.

Mr. Thompson: No, the hon. Minister has not.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I think I have.

Mr. Thompson: Well, let me just ask this again, or we are going to get into a fight about it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, I am not.

Mr. Thompson: Because we are talking about men and women and children who are suffering, who are not getting opportunity, and you are taking the most dilettante approach. A study has been done and the hon. Minister turns around—and what is his answer? He has had the ground rules suggested to him, and he stands up and suggests the answer: "Research, research, research." I suggest to the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I said we will try—

Mr. Thompson: I suggest that, as the Minister of Public Welfare, I do not think the hon. Minister is too adequate.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Balderdash!

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to pick up—

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister would listen instead of defending the indefensible.

Mr. S. Lewis: I want to pick up immediately from where the hon. member for Dovercourt left off, and say that not only Mr. Minister, do you display an anti-humanitarian attitude, because we are dealing with human beings—but you make no fiscal sense. Your research study is saving the government

money—half of the people came off the welfare rolls and went back into regular employment. If that is the case, if people become self-sufficient and integrated into the economy, why cannot a specific answer be given as to whether the hon. Minister is prepared to make the results of this study actual departmental policy?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, this research was only the first project. It was a joint effort between the city of Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto, and ourselves; and it is being applied as of now. These things do not show up prominently in the public eye like a big balloon—that is what I meant to say a few moments ago. The results of that research have been applied, but research will not stop. It will continue at all times; even the results obtained in the application of this research will be again researched; I think that is the only way to do it. I cannot give any better answer than that.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I think there is a distant communication between us. The deputy Minister in his report suggests that there would have to be new thinking. I am trying to find out where he said it, but it was read out by my hon. friend. All I am asking is what I think is a fairly simple question: The deputy Minister said “new thinking” and I am just asking if the hon. Minister could tell us what new thinking? Can the hon. Minister not tell us that? It was written up in the report that from this study there was going to be new thinking. Could the hon. Minister tell us what new thinking there has been?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I suppose, the new thinking is simply that you improve upon what is being done and has been done—that is in line with new approaches. Many new approaches have been made, and we will have new approaches to make in the child welfare situation when the report is in. I hope it will be in by some time next May or June. And as far as mothers' allowances are concerned, we made new approaches in this respect in dealing with them more in an economic sense, as well as in any other sense. These things—I just do not know what my hon. friend wishes me to lay my finger on, because it is a subject that is so general. I might point to some instances here or there which are obvious, and in other instances it is some improvement that you might not see. But this was a joint research with, as I told the hon. member, the city of Toronto; and I am advised further that the city of Hamilton is involved in this also. These cities are doing research for their own purposes as well.

To have me tell the hon. member anything different from that, and point my finger at one particular part of what it is being accomplished—well, that is very difficult. I would say, in a general way, that that research has opened new horizons, and is leading to experiments and the research will continue.

Mr. MacDonald: Words, words, words!

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East has the floor.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, having been associated for many years with one of the largest children's aid societies in this province, I am a little upset by an item of \$20,000 for a demonstration project for preventive services to the city of Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, this province has, at the present time, one of the best organizations for the care of children—

Some hon. members: Wrong vote!

Mr. Racine: Shall I discuss that on the next vote, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: We are still on vote 1801.

Mr. Racine: Thank you. I will reserve my comments for the next vote.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. George.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls has the floor.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): There are three questions I would like to ask the hon. Minister. How many counties has the county welfare office in operation? Does the hon. Minister have that before him?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Wentworth county, and Prince Edward.

Mr. Bukator: How long has the first one been in operation?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: A year, I would say.

Mr. Bukator: Then my third question is: How is it operating? Is it going along well? Are they giving the service you believed they would in the first instance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: From all reports I have had so far, the thing is running very well.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. Minister made a comment here, a while ago, that he did not

wish to force the county system on the counties because we do not do business in that way in this province. I believe that is what the hon. Minister said about an hour ago when we were discussing this matter. I tried to get to my feet before this on that subject. Is there any way the hon. Minister's department could persuade counties to apply the county system in other counties of the province?

The reason I ask is that most of the townships and villages—yes, and towns and counties—have to administer the affairs of welfare of that municipality through their clerks when they are a small municipality. In many cases the applicant should be investigated. The clerk should not, and does not, have time to do the job properly. Is there any way the hon. Minister's department could, through publicity or through a circular letter to the counties, persuade them to go into the county system?

I do not want to relate my remarks to certain municipalities in my riding, but I know that the clerks of most municipalities are capable and decent people. I am not pointing my finger at any of them. But I do believe that this burden should be taken off their shoulders because they have other work to do. I am wondering what the department can do, and will do, to assist counties to start in on the county system because I believe that is the answer to that one problem. Is there any comment the hon. Minister would like to make on that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We try to use the services, as much as we can, of the municipal welfare officers who know about the proposals, as well as our own officers, we wish to give them the whole picture of what they are getting into, if they should get into consolidated welfare services. Furthermore, we provide staff for the counties for a period of at least six months, longer if necessary, to get them completely started. My deputy Minister advises me that the next county he thinks will be coming in line in this matter—and this might be of interest to the hon. member—is the county of Welland.

Mr. Bukator: Yes. Well, we have been pressing for this in our area—the county council especially. The chairman of that committee was, or still is—there is only one thing wrong with him—Malvin Swart. He is an exceptionally fine man, but he leans to the New Democratic Party. Mal has worked hard from the county level to put this into existence, and that is why I mentioned his name. The hon. Minister says that Welland

county will be the third, or is heading in that direction.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It appears that way now, yes.

Mr. Bukator: Any assistance the department could give them through its experts would be appreciated by everybody in that riding.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, it is very pleasing to see the front part of your head for a change instead of the back.

I wanted to speak on a couple of these grants, Mr. Chairman, that are not listed in the main office vote. I am sure the hon. members of the House who have Indian reservations in their ridings welcome the assurances which the hon. Minister gave them in his opening remarks. But the remarks of the hon. Minister were dealing with some of the problems that Indians have on the reservations, and of course the problems that I want to present to the hon. Minister again this year are the problems of the Indians in urban areas, especially here in Metro Toronto.

Last year I spoke about this problem, and I hope largely as a result of my remarks to the hon. Minister, two grants were later approved—presumably as Treasury warrants—one to the Central Neighbourhood House on Sherbourne Street here in Toronto, and the other to the Canadian Indian Centre of Toronto on Church Street—again in my riding.

At the time those grants were made, it was my clear understanding—and I certainly stuck my neck out for both of these groups—that these grants last year were both part of a two-year grant system to be continued this year in the same amount. While I would not swear an affidavit to it, I can remember a public meeting last year on Bloor Street to which the hon. Minister was very kind to come. I think it was entitled “Tory Night in Toronto”. I think I can produce some witnesses to the fact that the hon. Minister at that time, clearly and unequivocally, indicated to that group—and it was a public meeting—that these were grants to be made for a two-year period.

In any event, I opened the estimates, Mr. Chairman, and I am horrified, I am aghast, to note that under the head office vote there is no grant listed for either of these two centres. I am just wondering if the hon. Minister can reassure me, so that I can reassure these people, that their programmes which they are continuing this year and which is based on the concept that these grants from the province were going to continue this year, will be made to them this year.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for St. George: As he knows, this was a matching grant with the federal government. He is quite right in that I have assured him we shall again match the same grant, this was to be for two years, that is true. That is why the grant is obtained by warrant, because I am not too sure if the federal government will give it or not, but if they do I can assure the hon. member that the organizations will receive the same grant.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: The only trouble with that, Mr. Chairman, is that my understanding is that the federal government is saying they will give the grant if the province will.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister did not say anything about matching the grant.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Was the hon. member there?

Mr. Sopha: No, but I know of 40 or 50 Indians who were going to move into Toronto, when they heard that.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the federal government is now taking the position that they will make the grant if the province makes a grant. The hon. Minister now indicates that the province will make the grant if the federal government will make the grant. Perhaps he can remove all doubt in everybody's mind by indicating that the province will make the grant.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I can assure the hon. member that I will take the matter up with the hon. Minister of Health and Welfare in Ottawa.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to come back—the reason I rose a few minutes ago—to the question that the hon. member for Niagara Falls had asked. The hon. Minister assured us that there was staff help available to get these plans under way and to get the county unit set up. Now my question to him is: is there staff help to initiate this process?

That is, are there staff members who are moving in the province, meeting with the smaller municipalities, and getting them organized on a county basis, selling them the idea that this makes sense, that specialization is possible this way and persuading them that this is good and getting the whole movement under way?

I think if there are staff doing this, this is good. If it is just a case of helping them after the initiation of the move, then we have not enough Mal Swarts perhaps in the province to get the initiation under way. We need this other business of the staff itself, at a provincial level, meeting with the municipalities, getting the county units set up. Is this happening?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I can assure my hon. friend that is what is happening. As a matter of fact, this evening and tomorrow there will be meetings in Welland, in Bruce and a couple of other counties, for that purpose. We are doing that, instructing and advising the people of the advantages and what might result from the whole thing. The moment the county council decides to go along with consolidation then we provide them with staff; that is we provide them with persons, from our permanent staff we have here, for six months or more if necessary to get them going. That is done regularly, as the hon. member suggested, and he is quite correct.

Mr. Thompson: On vote 1801, I would say I appreciate that the hon. Minister, in answer to a question I raised previously, amplifies that research is the cornerstone for his department. I think that was pretty well what he was suggesting. Some people put it another way, on which I will refrain from remarking.

The hon. Minister placed a great emphasis on research. He told me that he would do research and more research. Could the hon. Minister tell me where in the grants he has placed the emphasis? Could he tell me how much he is giving to research?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I have no specific item as such, because there are many departments doing research along with their regular work. I have had a research body in respect of the children's aid society which has completed its work now. Miss Touzel undertook that research the hon. member spoke about, which is terminated now. I hope I will be successful in having research done by some of the women that will be members of the proposed council. While I am speaking on this point, I would like to leave the impression that I was not only thinking of research on the problem of a woman as a mother and as a wife, but I was also thinking of her as a unit, if you want to call it, a social, economic unit with problems similar to those of a man.

Mr. Thompson: I do not want to belabour this point either, but I would say that, really, if there is to be emphasis on research, surely

to goodness the hon. Minister should provide some financing to back up his faith in research; he should have some areas that he wants to study, instead of saying that they may come up again. I will not, but I could, go into a number of areas in this where there should be research projects, even on a broad basis. I am thinking of a book—which I am sure the hon. Minister has read — “Beyond the Welfare State” questioning how far we go in all this. I am thinking of a number of questions raised about welfare and its effects. I would hope that, with your enthusiasm, it has been an oversight, this lack of some grant for research. I would hope that you will give reconsideration to not only an emphasis by word on research, but an emphasis by financial grants.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1801, item 11, I notice that you have a grant to the Canadian Welfare Council to the amount of \$17,000. Could I ask the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, why the grant to the Canadian Welfare Council has been reduced from \$18,624? I am quoting from page R8 No. 1 public accounts for 1963. I see that this grant in 1963 was \$18,624. Now in view of the increased demand that we had to make on the Canadian Welfare Council, could the hon. Minister explain to me why the grant for this year has been reduced?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I would tell the hon. member for Ottawa East, I think you will find the amount was reduced last year and the amount of the Ontario Welfare Council was raised. We put them on the same level.

To give you a reason; the only reason I gave, as I recall last year, was that we raised the Ontario Welfare Council grant because we were working with them more closely possibly, than the other council. You might consider it was arbitrary, in a sense, but we felt at the time that they should receive the same amount instead of having the Ontario council lower than the other one.

I think the Canadian Welfare Council calculated it on a per 1,000 head basis, but we have left that and put them back on a basis of equality. In other words, we raised the one and lowered the other. In other words, I was using the same money to serve two groups of that description.

The reason I gave for raising the Ontario

council was the fact that we had closer relations with them than the other. To give a very definite reason why the other one was put at the same amount is to say that I had only one certain amount of money, and to raise the one, I had to decrease the other one to even out the money.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister for his explanation. Now, I definitely do not suggest that the grant to the Ontario Welfare Council be reduced. I know the work that the Ontario Welfare Council is doing. But on the other hand, I think that in view of the additional expenditures that the Canadian Welfare Council estimates for this year, sir, that the hon. Minister could reconsider and, perhaps, adopt the method of determining the grant as suggested by the welfare council. It would give the Canadian Welfare Council possibly a few thousand dollars more.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister one or two things about The Children's Institutions Act of 1962-63. The regulations of the Act suggest that there should be provision of such psychiatric privileges, including the services of consultation, as are from time to time deemed necessary by the physician for the institution. It makes it quite clear, in the four categories involved that when you are dealing with emotionally disturbed children there is a great amount of specialized treatment required.

Now the department's per diem payments range in the area of two dollars, three dollars and four dollars a day maximum. I am wondering whether the hon. Minister feels that is sufficient to undertake the kind of treatment the Act implies.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out, first of all, to my friend, the hon. member for Scarborough West, that the cases of the Children's Aid Society, as you know, are paid for 100 per cent. I realize what the hon. member says has merit, and we have been looking at that picture as late as this year. We hope to make an improvement on it. But the great amount of children's costs go on the per diem rate of the Children's Aid Society and they are paid 100 per cent.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I am delighted to hear it, Mr. Chairman. I raise it because although a good part of the money goes to the Children's Aid Society, the per diem rates listed in the Act affect 44 other separate institutions dealing with children in various

degrees of emotional disturbance. Well, having asked that point and got a partially optimistic reply, I shall dare to venture further.

What does the hon. Minister think about the situation in which parents who are deemed able to pay an amount by the provincial supervisor, and refuse to pay a specific amount, thereby disqualify their child from entry to an institution under this Act? Does the hon. Minister think that perhaps some alteration might be forthcoming whereby children could be brought within the scope of the Act even if their parents were negligent?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Before that is answered, Mr. Chairman, would my hon. friend have any specific case in mind?

Mr. S. Lewis: Frankly, no.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I understand that is also research. These regulations are being looked at now, as we mentioned a moment ago. I do not know how far it can be gone into, but I am sure this also is being looked into at present. That is why I was asking you if you had any particular case, because it is so much easier to deal with if you do, and make it a matter of research into what should be done. You see, if we have a particular example to show, we can maybe obtain better results by looking at a specific case. If you do have one, I would appreciate having it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I suspect one could be found. What little I know about The Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Chairman, has taught me that vast numbers of people who are deemed ineligible for assistance of one kind or another, fall precisely at the subsistence level. They are not totally indigent. They are the people who might be able to pay a fraction of the cost, and they are thereby dismissed by various municipal welfare offices.

However, I am delighted to hear that the Act is being overhauled, and will be interested to see the changes in the regulations.

Could I ask another question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, which relates to the housing for elderly people? I am sorry I was not able to get it in earlier. I wondered whether there is any specific co-ordination between The Department of Public Welfare, The Department of Municipal Affairs and The Department of Economics and Development in the construction of such units?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, with respect to housing I must tell the hon. member, through you, that as far as the

department is concerned, it is strictly an outright grant of \$500 that is made to any group who will form a unit to erect housing for this particular group you speak about. I understand this year, The Department of Economics and Development is entering a programme with the city and with the federal government. That I cannot explain to you. I would not dare in case I might lead you astray, but I am sure the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, when he has his estimates, will be able to explain that. I do not know if this will swallow up what I am doing, or if it will be in co-operation with this. This is being discussed at the present moment.

Mr. Thompson: I am thinking of co-ordination in connection with departments. Surely there is quite a close relationship just in the matter of housing. I raised the question previously. I got down to the particulars of a woman who had not adequate housing. Her children were ill to a large extent because of the housing problem. She had a child who is macrocephalic and had to go to the sick children's hospital. At the moment we are trying to get a home for her and the other children. I have been writing letters to the mayor of Toronto; writing letters all over the place. There is no adequate low-cost housing for large families in Toronto. This is part of the picture with respect to the hon. Minister's department.

Now, sir, I would like to ask, not just on the housing question, but on all of these situations, is there a co-ordinated committee that gets together to look at the large picture? If so, who is it made up of and how many times does it meet?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I cannot assure the hon. member that there is a committee, but I can assure him there are consultations regularly about those matters between the different arms of government. That is how I was able to speak about this other thing, because we are consulted on that and compare notes and see what we can do about that particular housing.

You will appreciate, with me, that the main concern I had was for elderly persons' housing and not housing in general which is what the hon. member is speaking about. Does the hon. member have in mind the case of a large family? That is another thing altogether. But I was really mentioning housing for the elderly.

There is no committee of which I know, but I assure the hon. member there are consultations regularly between not only the

Ministers themselves, but also the staff. Generally speaking, this staff is the education, economics and welfare and health specialists.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I think if there is constant consultation, perhaps it might be even better. It may be more flexible than if there is rigidity. It does seem to me there is such interrelationship.

I would like to ask this question, and I am thinking of the hard-core family groups getting welfare: Is there an emphasis on the children in trying to provide educational opportunities for them? I remember, in some instance in the past, asking whether there was some kind of an incentive, some kind of bursary given to children whose parents were on welfare and who could thus go to the university.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: In what sense does the hon. member mean—is this for people receiving welfare from the municipality, for instance? Is there any incentive for sending them to university by giving them bursaries?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am thinking this, sir. I have noticed a study was done, I think, by the Atkinson Foundation which showed that in poor economic areas there is often poor teaching, which meant recurring cases of lack of opportunity for young people. If the hon. Minister will excuse my mind jumping away to another example, I am thinking of a problem group which we have out in the Kootenays—I am moving away out to B.C. I am thinking of the Doukhobors and of the situation where—I am not sure if this was successful either, or whether it is the approach that should be taken, but I raise it to the hon. Minister. Where you have a group which, because of a number of factors, causes problems in recurring generations, you try to concentrate on the children and provide them with opportunities of education. I am wondering, where there was a recurring situation of hard-core welfare cases whether there can be any kind of concentration on the children while still respecting the sanctity of the family?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: In the relief field as such—and particularly I am talking of mothers' allowance—we do naturally have something to promote the idea of having less drop-outs. I do not know of any programme we would have in respect of promoting attendance at school. It is an interesting question and might be worth looking into; I do not know.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, under this vote—section No. 9, administration of northern units—I would like

very much to discuss general welfare administration through the regional branches in the north. I am wondering whether I should do it on this vote or wait for general welfare assistance. This will take some time, and I do not want to be cut off at six o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Might as well have it now, yes.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Well, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member has said he is going to be some time discussing this particular subject, and I imagine he does not want to start into it now.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, obviously we are going to go on with these estimates on some other occasion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. The report of The Department of Travel and Publicity.

2. The report of The Department of Public Records and Archives for the province of Ontario for the year 1963.

And, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Auld), on his behalf,

3. The annual report of the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission for the period ending December 31, 1963.

I may say that the hon. members of the House will find copies of this report in their mail box; they were put in this afternoon, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Travel and Publicity.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 19, 1964

First report, standing committee on agriculture, Mr. Root	1797
Ontario Food Terminal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	1797
Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1797
Law Society Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1797
Juvenile and Family Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading ..	1798
Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1798
Collection Agencies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1798
Mortgage Brokers Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading ..	1798
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading ..	1798
Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1798
Short Forms of Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading ..	1799
Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1799
Registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen, bill to provide for, Mr. Cass, first reading	1799
Statement re drilling in Lake Huron and Lake St. Clair, Mr. Roberts	1799
Extending welcome to hon. George Drew, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Oliver	1800
Report of Ontario Police Commission, Mr. Cass	1800
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	1801
Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld	1801
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1833

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east and west galleries, students from Mill Street Senior Public School, Leamington; and in the east gallery, members of the Progressive-Conservative Ladies Association of Belleville and district.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin), from the standing committee on agriculture, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act;

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Milk Industry Act;

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act;

Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE POLICE ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this is a series of amendments to

The Police Act to define more particularly the powers of the Ontario Police Commission, and to give to it certain additional powers, particularly with respect to determining the adequacy of policing and the designation of areas under The Police Act where municipalities are required to have their own police force.

It provides, as in The Firefighters Act or The Fire Departments Act, during certain periods, for negotiation with a time limit to ensure that, as quickly as possible, there may be a determination of the rights of the police with respect to their contracts.

It provides for the issuance of commissions to officers of the Ontario Provincial Police force and, in that manner, brings them into line with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Force. It also provides for the control and the direction of the Ontario Provincial Police force in a manner similar to that now used by the federal government with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this is mainly an administrative Act. It provides that retired justices of the Supreme Court of Ontario, the Exchequer Court of Canada, be no longer *ex-officio* benchers. The Law Society has pointed out that a great many judges now retired have returned to private practice, and it is essential that the governing body of the society be properly elected.

It also provides for certain administrative changes with respect to the position of benchers, or the members of the governing body of the society, concerning payment of dues. They have been in a special position; this Act removes them from that and puts them in the same position as any member of the Law Society.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): In that respect.

Hon. Mr. Cass: In that respect. It provides also for certain administrative details with respect to compensation fund administration charges and the printing of reports.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for the elimination of the title of deputy judge in the juvenile and family courts.

It provides that the judge will now be known as "senior judge," and when there is more than one judge there may be an associate senior judge.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: This bill, Mr. Speaker, can be divided into two parts. The first part consists of several amendments which have to do with taking the real estate brokers, and the collection agencies and others, out of The Department of Insurance and placing them under The Department of the Attorney General. There is provision made also, for the collection of statistical information in the case of insurers for fire, property and sprinkler damage; it is in the same terms as provisions for automobile insurers.

It also provides for the issuance by the superintendent, or the approval by the superintendent, of a form of certificate of automobile insurance which may be consistently used throughout all those jurisdictions which adopt it. It is the first step, Mr. Speaker, towards having one certificate evidencing automobile insurance which will be accepted in all jurisdictions. In concert with The Department of Transport, a great deal of progress has been made and we think the time to give this authority is now.

THE COLLECTION AGENCIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Collection Agencies Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this bill will put the administration of this Act under the director of registrations branch of The Department of the Attorney General; it is in line with the other amendments previously or now being introduced by me to transfer these enforcement areas from The Department of Insurance to The Department of the Attorney General.

The bill also makes certain provisions governing licensing, investigations and enforcement standards in the above-mentioned Act.

THE MORTGAGE BROKERS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this bill as well as the one I am about to introduce, are the same as the amended Collection Agencies Act. They provide for the transfer of duties and authorities from The Department of Insurance to The Department of the Attorney General, and provide the same series of administrative and semi-judicial actions with respect to hearings.

THE REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this too is a bill transferring the real estate and business brokers licensing and disciplining from The Department of Insurance to The Department of the Attorney General.

THE MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, basically this bill provides that no mortgagor may lose his equity under the power of sale contained in a mortgage without notice. At the present time it is quite possible, if default continues for a certain length of time, for a mortgagor to lose his equity under the power of sale in

a mortgage, without being given notice so that he could try to refinance his deal. This provides that, in every case, the mortgagor will not be able now to contract out of this. This applies in every case, and notice must be given. The notice may be given after ten days of default. Before the power can be exercised, 35 more days must elapse, during which time the mortgagor will have an opportunity of refinancing or paying up the arrears.

THE SHORT FORMS OF MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Short Forms of Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this is complementary to The Mortgages Act and makes provision for the changes in the forms authorized by the statute.

THE WAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this bill has for its purpose to remove the existing confusion and abuses arising in the granting and enforcement of wage assignments and wage attachments. Procedures governing the implementation of wage assignments are provided to preserve attachment remedies and to make wage assignments more effective.

THE USED CAR DEALERS ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I can do no better at this juncture than read the explanatory note attached to this bill:

The bill provides for the registration and control of used car dealers and salesmen and contains provisions for investigations similar to those now existing for mortgage brokers, collection agencies and real estate brokers.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, before we get into orders of the day I wonder if the hon.

Attorney General could advise us if all these bills will be going to committee. There is a lot of new and important legislation here and I think the committee should have a look at all of them.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I think they would all go to committee, Mr. Speaker, except perhaps The Police Act which might better be discussed in committee of the whole House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a few remarks which are basically to allay the apprehension that seems to have arisen concerning the matter of drilling for gas or oil in Lake Huron and Lake St. Clair.

The government does not contemplate any change in the present prohibition of such drilling. Over the last three years we have had an established policy not to issue any licences or to permit any drilling and this policy continues in effect.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I beg the indulgence of the House to introduce to the hon. members a famous, if I may say so, resident and citizen of the province of Ontario, a man who has been a servant of the people in this Legislature and in the House of Commons and in the foreign service of our country. Of course, I am referring to the Honourable George Alexander Drew.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there are a few men in the House who sat here during Mr. Drew's time, one of whom, of course, is the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). I would just say that Mr. Drew sat in this Legislature from 1939 until 1948. During that time he led Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition from 1939 until 1943 and he was Prime Minister from 1943 until 1948. Thus he knows both sides of this chamber and this is something that is not known to some of us on this side.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not mean that in any facetious way. I sometimes think—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But Mr. Drew entered the House of Commons in 1948 and was the leader of the Opposition there from 1949 to

1956. He became High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom in 1957 and from that last position he has just retired.

I think I can speak for all of us here when I say "Welcome", to him on his return to take up residence in Ontario again.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would of course like to join with the hon. Prime Minister in welcoming back to these familiar haunts, our friend the hon. Mr. Drew. The hon. Prime Minister has correctly stated that Mr. Drew had experience in this Legislature on both sides of the wide carpet. In the early days, he sat just about in the seat I sit in on this side of the House and he piloted the Opposition through very difficult times for it, in days when the numbers were small but their enthusiasm seemed to go beyond the actual numbers that it had in the House.

He finally defeated the government in 1943. I shall always think in my own mind that the cause of that defeat was as much a comedy of errors on our part as it was any capabilities that my hon. friend may have been endowed with. But once having assumed the office of Prime Minister, he moved over naturally to the other side of the House.

He was always a keen debater, a fervent debater, one who never pulled any punches and did not seem to mind too much how many were handed out in his direction.

I was thinking as I was sitting here that the techniques employed by the hon. Mr. Drew as Prime Minister and by my hon. friend are as far apart as the poles and history alone will record which technique will be the better. At the moment they look to be about on a par.

I would say to the hon. Mr. Drew that we welcome him back to this Chamber. We have the feeling in extending that welcome that he is but paying us a visit. It may not be that he intends to re-enter the active political arena. I think perhaps we would welcome his intrusion into the field at the present time if he so desired, but we welcome him today in any event as a visitor, one who has played a very large part in the deliberations of this assembly and in the government of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second annual report of the Ontario Police Commission.

Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I am submitting to this House the report of the Ontario Police Commission on organized crime. The Ontario Police Commission is an

independent body responsible to this Legislature through the Attorney General. The report has not been censored or altered in any way by any person but is presented in its entirety as submitted to me by the commission.

However, that is not to say that this government is not concerned about the disclosure of sources of information, and the names of individuals. The hon. members and others who have received copies of the report will recognize the great difficulty which would face the commission in making such a report without disclosing the sources of information and the names. Indeed, this may, in some opinions, be essential. It is our hope, therefore, that the responsible persons who have copies of this forthright report will recognize that harm and embarrassment might be caused by the injudicious publication of the whole or any part of the report. I most earnestly ask the co-operation of all in ensuring that this necessarily frank disclosure is not abused.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. Prime Minister, is this report going to be debated in the House; is it going to be put on the order paper in such a way that it will come up for debate at some future time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I really have not given that much consideration. But it is a report to this Legislature, and if there is to be a debate on it, if it is considered there are things that need to be debated here, I will list it on the order paper as an item of business and we can carry out the debate in the way we have other reports.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would certainly support the representations of the hon. leader of the Opposition that the tidiest way to deal with this would be a debate on it as an item on the order paper.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rose primarily to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. I have not had a chance to glance through anything other than the index at this point but I am deeply puzzled as to what exactly he means when he says that he hopes that everybody who reads this will treat it with responsibility and judiciousness with regard to names in it. If copies of this have gone to the press, everybody is then going to become his own self-appointed censor. Surely anything in this report is available to anybody who wants to read it, and therefore, what is the significance of suggesting we should be judicious about using names that are in it?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member for York South could better answer himself after he has had the opportunity of perusing the contents of the report.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the eighth annual report of the Ontario Water Resources Commission for 1963.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 41st order, the House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, before going into the detailed plans and estimates of this department, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to my predecessor in this office, Mr. Bryan Cathcart. Mr. Cathcart's retirement last August as a Minister of the Crown and as member for Lambton West marked the end of 18 years of service in this Legislature.

Both as a private member and as a Minister of the Crown, he worked long and diligently for his constituents and for the province of Ontario. It is largely through his efforts as Minister of Travel and Publicity for the past eight years that I am able today to present a report reflecting both past successes and the promise of an exciting future.

As I am sure you are aware, Mr. Chairman, Ontario has long been a pioneer in the field of travel in Canada. It was Ontario which first established a department to deal directly with the tourist industry, to encourage and promote travel within the province. Other jurisdictions watched our success in this field and one by one they followed suit. Through the years, this province gained an excellent reputation for its work with the tourist industry. Other provinces were able to emulate our successes while being able to avoid the pitfalls into which we, as the experimenter and pioneer, inevitably were led from time to time.

The tourist industry, as you well know, sir, is a highly competitive one. It is not enough simply to match your competitors. You must stay ahead of them if you intend to continue to increase your share of the truly tremendous benefits of the tourist industry. We in the department find that other jurisdictions,

following in our footsteps have now in many cases caught up with the leader. If we stand still, we will be overtaken. We must move ahead at an accelerated rate.

In the seven months I have been Minister of this department, a great deal of time and effort has gone into assessing its role and determining what course of action must be taken for future years. There are two distinct possibilities. Firstly, aside from our work in the advertising and publicity fields, the department can continue to act only as a regulatory body; or secondly, it can provide a programme of positive leadership for the industry.

Let us study the first possibility, namely, that of functioning as a regulatory body. This, in essence, means the department would exist in a primarily negative function—following the leadership of the private operators and ensuring only that they meet certain minimum standards contained within the Acts administered by the department.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this approach is no longer anywhere near sufficient. If we are to meet the needs of the 1960s, a new outlook must be adopted. I think it is obvious that the travel industry of today is vastly changed from what it was 20, or even ten, years ago. We, sir, are faced with a great increase in the amount of leisure time available to people. This, of course, is coupled with the fact we have a rapidly expanding population, particularly in our urban areas.

These two factors, plus an increase in the amount of money available for spending on travel, have brought about a tremendous demand for recreational facilities. All of these factors—more people, with more money, and more time, demanding more facilities—are leading to what I think can be termed a crisis in recreation and travel. It is a crisis which can be solved only when this department meets the need for positive leadership in the tourist industry.

Perhaps I can underscore the size of this crisis if I take just a moment or two to tell you exactly what the tourist industry means to the province of Ontario. In past years, you have been accustomed to hearing that tourism was a \$1-billion-dollar-a-year industry in Ontario. Those concerned frankly admitted this was really little more than an educated guess. Now, through the use of available statistics and our own research branch, we have arrived at what we believe to be a far more accurate figure.

We know that last year American and foreign spending on travel in Ontario totalled

\$350 million; and, incidentally, that is 60 per cent of the total of such tourist spending for all of Canada. This \$350 million represents approximately 25 per cent of all tourist spending in Ontario. Another five per cent—or approximately \$70 million—is spent by visitors from other provinces. The remaining 70 per cent—a total of \$980 million—is spent by Ontario residents.

This, Mr. Chairman, means that total tourist spending in Ontario is \$1.4 billion. To put it another way, \$1,400 million. That, I think all hon. members will agree, is a lot of money. It means that the travel industry is as big, if not a bigger influence in the provincial economy than either agriculture or mining. I believe hon. members can see why I believe that what I have to say today merits the closest attention of all hon. members.

Why, then, if Ontario tourist spending totalled \$1.4 billion, do I say there is a crisis in the industry? I say there is a crisis because we know the competition from other jurisdictions will get tougher. We know that this level of spending has been achieved as much by good luck as good planning, in the years we were feeling our way forward in a strange industry. We also know that while the amount of leisure money available to the people has grown immensely, the percentage of that money actually spent on travel has declined.

Here, I think, is proof that the tourist industry is not selling itself strongly enough. It simply is not meeting the challenge of competition with other industries in every sphere of the economy. Why? Because to a large extent there has been a lack of strong central leadership within the industry. This is precisely why the role of this department must change. We are now in a position to provide this positive leadership. And we intend to do so.

As was indicated in the Speech from the Throne, this Legislature has been asked to approve a change in name for this department. The decision to designate it The Department of Tourism and Information was taken to give added emphasis to the new scope and vitality of the department. The entire programme of reorganizing and strengthening this department was undertaken to provide it with the means to continue to assert its leadership in the tourist industry.

This reorganization, based on a study by the organizations and methods branch of The Department of the Provincial Treasurer is now virtually complete, Mr. Chairman. This was started just about a year ago. We are finish-

ing up an overhaul of the work methods of the department and have instituted a self-help plan which will enable us to train, more fully, our own staff. In short, we are now ready to assume our new role, to launch a strong attack on the problems of the tourist industry, and to develop a programme of planning, co-ordination, education and promotion.

Basically speaking, the department's new outlook is contained in four broad areas: first, promotion and advertising; second, supplying of detailed information to individuals and counselling of tourists and potential tourists; third, planning, regulation and guidance; and fourth, research.

I would now like to take a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, to deal separately with our plans for each of these broad areas. The field of promotion and advertising is one probably most apparent to the general public. I would suggest it is one of the major keys of our new programme, in that it embraces not only promotion of the province's attractions but also the education of the public. And, without a public awareness of the vital need of Ontario for an expanding tourist industry, the rest of our programme would, of course, be futile.

In the field of advertising, we already have taken the important step of placing our planning on a 15-month basis. We hope in the near future to be able to extend this planning as far as two years in advance, leaving, of course, working room for day-to-day contingencies which may arise.

This long-range advertising planning, in addition to giving the department a chance to set an orderly pattern of development, will also give us an opportunity to co-operate even further with the private sector of the tourist industry.

We will be in a position, for instance, to supply these long-term plans to the regional councils and other bodies in the industry, so they can work with the department on a co-ordinated and efficient advertising campaign in the potential markets. This is a system which has been adopted successfully by other jurisdictions. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. members have noted, in particular, the impact that is generated for the state of Florida by the linking of its general advertising in newspapers and magazines with individual hotels and resorts.

We know a similar success will accrue to Ontario under this plan. Direct advertising has a great many benefits. But even greater returns, in terms of the expenditures involved, can come from the field of publicity.

Here, too, the reorganization of the department has opened the door for a concentrated new effort. In the past, because of a lack of efficient and qualified staff, we have been unable adequately to follow up the extremely good relations this department has had with the press and travel writers in Canada, the United States, and indeed, in Europe. With the expanded role of our publicity branch, the department now will be able to do much more in the way of stories, photographic coverage and general publicity.

In the allied field of tourist information and counselling, the department is adopting a vigorous new attitude. Already begun is a complete overhaul of our tourist publications. I firmly believe that the general aspects of tourist promotion are handled more than adequately by paid advertising and publicity, and that the publication of certain literature of a similar general nature is, to a great extent, duplication.

Our new policy has assigned the department's information branch what I might call the role of direct sales. In other words, the role of the branch's literature will be to provide specific information designed to meet the needs of individual tourists.

As one example of this, I would like to cite the publication, "Ski Scope" which I think is the finest publication of its nature in North America and is one of those in the group placed on hon. members' desks this afternoon. Much more emphasis is to be placed on the field of travel counselling. It is our plan to be able to provide detailed information and aid to anyone requiring it. This service will be, in effect, personalized to provide individual attention to individual problems.

The regulatory branch of the department, and the one responsible for overall planning assistance and co-ordination of many private sectors of the industry, is the tourist industry development branch. Its duties are far more extensive than simply enforcing the provisions of the Acts concerning this department's activities. We have, in conjunction with the civil service commission, undertaken a programme to increase the already high standards of our field workers in this branch, in line with a shift in the emphasis of their work, placing more stress on the duties of counselling, educating and promoting.

By no means does this mean that we will not insist on high standards for tourist facilities in the province. But I am convinced that the best way to ensure these standards is not to act as policemen, but to produce concrete

evidence that a good operator can get a better return on his investment than a poor operator.

Another important aspect of this branch's operations is connected with regional tourist councils—a field which I may say, Mr. Chairman, is one in which a great deal of work yet remains to be done. As the hon. members know, this department previously has adopted a programme of providing grants to regional tourist councils to assist them in advertising, promotion and development programmes. The thinking behind this is simple and sound. We feel that it is the department's duty to promote Ontario as a whole, and that the various regions are best equipped to develop and promote the attractions of their own immediate areas. Last year, 22 such grants were given out—that is 22 of a potential of 31—but a disappointingly few of the areas qualified for the full amount of the grants.

We feel this is partially due to the inability of the regional councils to obtain clerical or administrative services to assist in promoting activities within the region. We realize such services are necessary and a change has been made in the legislation so that a portion of the grants will be payable to a maximum of \$500 for such administrative costs.

One of our major achievements in the past year has been the establishment of a travel research branch in the department, the first of its kind in any jurisdiction in Canada. We are proud that Ontario has once again led the way. Reduced to the simplest terms, the duties of this branch will be to discover the exact nature of the tourist market, to find means of exploiting this market through new programmes, and to measure the success of these programmes after they have been instituted. It will take the guesswork out of our planning and allow us to present a fully co-ordinated plan of leadership to the industry.

We plan to tackle the immense problems resulting from the lack of consistent statistical data in many phases of the tourist industry. This year we will be undertaking revised community and regional studies in Atikokan, Elliot Lake and the Muskoka region. We will conduct inventories to determine what we have in the way of recreational and tourist resources and what should be done to further develop them.

We plan to survey our convention facilities and be in a position to supply information to the tourist and convention operators and to our municipalities, and to organizations and individuals who are involved in convention

planning. Working in co-operation with a proposed advisory body of tourist operators, tourist association executives and other tourist experts, we are going to investigate the possibility of collecting information directly from the operators themselves. We are planning to introduce a pilot survey of domestic travel patterns in Metro Toronto in 1964 to give us the first information we have had on travel patterns and expenditures. If this survey is successful, I hope to come back and ask for additional funds to carry out an Ontario travel survey in the future.

Just before leaving the subject of research, I would like to say that we in the department have been disappointed at the lack of action at the federal level in this field. We feel that if we hope to have a successful centennial year, we must have the information now or in the immediate future, not in 1967.

I have just mentioned the year 1967 for a very special reason. We feel that 1967 is a natural target year for all our present planning. Not only will the World's Fair at Montreal attract tens of thousands of people from the U.S. and overseas, but Canadians themselves will have the added stimulus of the centenary year to encourage them to travel about Canada. Thus, inter-provincial travel must become an even more important part of our planning. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, already senior officials of the department and I have met with my counterpart in Quebec and his senior officials under the auspices of the tourist industry committee of the Ontario Economic Council. A conference on tourist communications was held in Quebec City. Participating, in addition to officials of these departments, were executives from the communications media of both Ontario and Quebec. In addition, I am looking forward to meeting officials in other parts of Canada, particularly Manitoba.

It may be of interest, Mr. Chairman, to note that the Canadian Tourist Association also plans to do a significant amount of work in this field in the coming years. I have discussed this matter with the president of that organization and I again state here in this House that my department will co-operate to the fullest to do everything possible to stimulate interprovincial tourism.

As a first step in this programme, the department already has begun publication of some of its literature in the French language to better acquaint the large French-speaking audience of Quebec with our attractions. We are also working in certain other languages in conjunction with the ethnic press.

Recently, in an article in the *Indianapolis Star*, the writer described a motor vacation trip through Ontario last summer. Of great surprise to him were the opinions of several motel operators who told him that a large part of Ontario's domestic travel boom was created by the thousands of new Canadians who have located in our province. This came as no surprise to the people of my department, sir. We have long known that these new residents, consumed with a desire to see more of our huge and magnificent province—the province in which they have chosen to live—have contributed greatly to the tourist industry of Ontario.

In past years, as hon. members are aware, this department has carried out, as best it could within its financial limits, a policy of advertising in the ethnic newspapers of Ontario. This year, we decided on a general expansion of this programme.

Again, working in co-operation with the tourist industry committee, meetings were held with editors of the ethnic press. So successful were these meetings that the editors asked for—and, of course, received—permission to set up among themselves a committee to advise the department on ways and means of stimulating travel among their readers. Through this programme we hope also to be able to attract many more travellers from Europe and the U.S. Here, once again, a programme is under way to print some of our publications in the various languages to provide information both to these new Canadians and to residents and friends of other lands.

In describing the new duties and plans of this department, a short while ago, I deliberately omitted one extremely important branch—the historical branch. I did so because I wanted to emphasize quite separately, the very large part it has to play in the development of the Ontario tourist industry.

Since becoming Minister of this department, I have constantly stressed the importance of developing special local attractions, then publicizing them to the utmost. One reason for doing so has been the knowledge, gained from our research, that the second greatest tourist lure in Ontario is that of our historic attractions. At a later point in the presentation of these estimates, hon. members will hear from the vice-chairman of the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, about the highly successful year again enjoyed at Upper Canada Village, Fort Henry and the commission parks and campsites. I am certain this situation holds true at the many other fine historical sites throughout Ontario.

This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, this House will be asked to approve the spending of \$100,000 to launch a new project which I feel will be one of the finest historical restoration programmes in the history of this province. This summer, working in conjunction with the University of Western Ontario, we will commence the reconstruction of Fort Ste. Marie, near Midland, the first European settlement west of what is now Quebec City. Since the early 1940s, archaeological investigations of the site have been carried out by Mr. Kenneth Kidd of the Royal Ontario Museum and Dr. Wilfrid Jury of the University of Western Ontario.

From the extensive evidence uncovered by this work, as well as from the many references in contemporary Jesuit accounts, an accurate reconstruction can now be carried out. Visitors will then have visual evidence of one of the most significant historic sites in North America. Ste. Marie I is the first step of what is to be known as the Huronia project, Mr. Chairman.

When completed, this project will include the naval and military establishments at Penetanguishene, the museum at the site of the island where the schooner "Nancy" was sunk in the mouth of the Nottawasaga River in 1814, and other projects still being studied.

It is hoped that the Ste. Marie I project, which is estimated to cost just a shade over \$1 million, will be completed by 1967. However, I would like to stress here that it is a separate project, and is not connected directly with this province's centenary programme. I do not think I need stress at this time the historical importance of Ste. Marie I. As headquarters for the Jesuit mission in what is now Ontario, it existed in the years 1639 to 1649 as the furthest outpost of European civilization in North America at that time.

Before leaving this topic, I would like to pay a brief tribute to the members of the Ontario Archaeological and Historic Sites Board, which reports to my department. Recently the chairman of this board, the highly respected Mr. William Cranston, was named as chairman of the Ontario Economic Council. Happily for us and for the board, he decided not to sever his connection with the board and has agreed to stay on as co-chairman, sharing the heavy work load with Professor Maurice Careless of the University of Toronto. Under their joint leadership, the board will carry on its studies and programmes, one of which already has seen the erection of 349 historical site markers at major points of historical interest throughout Ontario.

Indeed, last November, the first such marker to be placed outside Ontario was unveiled at Wolford Chapel in Devon, England, marking the final resting place of John Graves Simcoe, first Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada.

During the coming year, our provincial archives will place an increased emphasis on solving the problems connected with the disposal of the non-current, or seldom used, records of government agencies. A detailed inventory of each department's record holdings will be started, and plans again made for an improved programme of records management.

This programme is designed to prevent expensive operational space from being occupied by dormant records, at the same time ensuring that those of historical and administrative value are permanently preserved. The possibility of erecting or acquiring a central records depository will be considered. Seldom used but still essential records could be stored there without occupying primary space. At the same time, records possessing no further administrative use could be examined for historical significance, then either destroyed or transferred to the archives proper.

I should also like to mention briefly the work of our theatres branch. Throughout the years, the inspectors of this branch have worked quietly and efficiently to improve and maintain the standards of motion picture theatres throughout the province. The results of their work can be seen in the many fine new cinemas opened recently.

I should also like to pay tribute to the branch's board of film censors. Censorship will never be a popular necessity, but I do not think you will find another board of censors anywhere which shows the taste and discretion of that of the province of Ontario.

Twice this afternoon, I have mentioned projects undertaken by this department in co-operation with the tourist industry committee of the Ontario Economic Council. As I believe is well known, this committee travelled extensively throughout Ontario studying every facet of the tourist industry. To date, I have received several most helpful preliminary reports from this committee and some of these suggestions already have become department policy. Recently I was informed by the committee chairman, Mr. Cranston, that the final report is being prepared.

I am looking forward, sir, to what I am certain will be a comprehensive, enlightening and helpful study of the industry.

It is impossible in this short space of time

to cover all details of the plans and programmes of this department. I felt, however, that rather than listen to a recital of facts and figures on what already has happened, the hon. members of this House would prefer to hear what we are planning and are determined to do in the immediate future.

To summarize, I would like to say that our immediate objectives are: One—to provide strong leadership to the tourist industry of Ontario and to reassert this province's leadership in that field; two—to launch a major public educational programme at every conceivable level; three—to work in close liaison with other departments in the whole field of recreation and development; four—to develop and operate a departmental structure designed to give assistance to the private sector of the industry; five—to establish concrete objectives and goals as targets for the industry as a whole. The latter, the establishment of solid aims and objectives, is particularly important.

Recently a U.S. survey showed that the rate of growth of travel during the past six years in the U.S. has approximated seven per cent per year. If this rate continues, and it is at this rate in Ontario, it will mean that travel for all purposes will double every ten years.

I would suggest, sir, that this more than anything demonstrates the remarkable growth potential in Canada and, in particular, in Ontario. There is absolutely no reason to doubt that the same type of growth has taken place in Canada as in the United States. In fact, I believe that the rate of growth experienced by Canadians has exceeded that of our friends in the United States.

Faced by this really fantastic potential, I believe we in Ontario must set a goal for ourselves in terms of tourist spending. We know that last year this totalled \$1.4 billion. I would now like to suggest, sir, that we look to the target year of 1967 and to a projected revenue of \$750 million from foreign and interprovincial tourism alone. Because we know that this represents approximately one quarter of total tourist spending, our overall goal in 1967 should be \$3 billion, in total direct tourist expenditures.

I have no doubt that, through the concerted efforts of my department and the co-operation of the people of Ontario, the figure will be achieved, and possibly even surpassed.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that through these few remarks I have been able to give a clearer picture of the importance of the travel industry to the economy of Ontario, and some idea of our plans for the forthcoming years. It is vital that we, as the government of

Ontario, do everything in our power to provide a cohesive leadership to this industry so that it might achieve its vast potential.

In closing, sir, I would like to thank the hon. members of this House for their patience and attention in the presentation of this report. And I trust that I shall have the support of all the hon. members in voting for the sums requested.

On vote 2101:

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, in rising to take part in the debate on the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information, I would first of all like to compliment the hon. Minister on his forthright approach to many of the problems which have beset this industry during his short tenure of office. I was most interested in hearing his verbal report today.

I am sure that his new approach, and the new approach of his department, are being made in the awareness that we must improve our tourist facilities; and our efforts must be intensified to direct people to our fair province.

Certainly it is my duty and the duty of the Opposition, to criticize aspects of the programmes which have gone on and are unsatisfactory; and many of the programmes for tourist development which are currently under way and need improvement. However, I do not wish these criticisms to be interpreted as a criticism of the new hon. Minister of this department—I refer to the cliché of the House. In due course of time, and in the fullness thereof, I am sure that he will come under personal criticism as to the manner in which he operates his department.

In my presentation on this department, I shall try generally to cover as many areas as possible directly concerned with the tourist industry. But I shall leave out any references to the role that this department plays as censor to the movies which are shown in our Ontario theatres.

The Department of Tourism and Information is intrinsically bound to several departments of our government—Lands and Forests, Highways, Economics, Health, Water Resources, plus various commissions and associations and authorities. And all the related efforts of these departments must be channelled into a broad programme if our tourist industry is going to continue to develop.

I shall try to develop my speech in context to this relationship with each succeeding department, as well as to those areas that are exclusively under the jurisdiction of this

department. Today our visitor industry is described as a \$1.5 billion industry and is one of the largest earners of foreign currency for both our province and country. Thus a continued expansion of this industry is vital to the economic stability and growth of our province. It is for this reason we, as responsible citizens of our province, must lend our every effort to aid in this development.

I would like to refer briefly to a phrase attributed, I believe to Mr. T. C. Clarke, who is now the director of the development branch of this department and I quote:

There are moments when I wonder whether any other industry of this magnitude could survive, much less prosper with so casual an outlook.

Today the hon. Minister mentioned good luck. I think that has played a part in our development also.

Certainly our province is confronted with much direct competition from all parts of the world—travel now, pay later to any country of the world. All these foreign countries, too, are looking for and attracting visitors, not only from us but from our major market, the United States.

I was very pleased when this government set up in 1962 the tourist industry committee through the economic council, to delve into this problem of how to help this floundering industry in our province. I had the privilege of helping draft three presentations to this committee and I would like to compliment the government on the selection of personnel to this committee. I believe one of the gentlemen was named today. I would hope that under the direction of our new hon. Minister, many of the recommendations of this committee will be put into practice, as he has suggested. And this is the first step in renewing the vigour of our tourist industry.

Returning to the economic aspects of this industry, I understand it returns approximately 15 cents from every earned dollar back to our government, and is certainly one department of our government that exceeds all others in net return to the economy, compared to money spent on the department. Even if all the money spent in tourist promotion by individuals and communities throughout our province were added to this total, we would still have a very healthy balance sheet.

During the past years, our border areas have developed as natural resort areas—or bedding areas as they are called—and have attracted countless visitors and summer residents. But many of these areas, through the passing of time, are now run down, and no

longer offer the kind or type of accommodation that many of our visitors now desire. Possibly this still holds true in Muskoka and Haliburton areas, where the natural beauty, the natural facilities, have been attracting tourists. But as new areas in our province are being opened up, with modern facilities being erected, the areas that originally developed our province's tourist industry are being bypassed and are getting into poor economic shape.

I have pointed out the excellent return that this industry has made to the economy of our province. But we cannot afford just to open up new areas of development in the north, with which I am in full agreement. We must make every effort to extend our tourist season by creating or improving our visitor and convention facilities within a few hours' drive of our southern borders. Extending our season is the least expensive way of increasing our dollar volume in the tourist industry, as it requires very little additional capital.

I am sure that if you in this House had read accounts of the submissions to the tourist industry committee, you would have noted that there are very few resort hotels with planned programmes for the activities of guests along the southern borders of our province. I would call upon this government to help save these areas which have developed our tourist industry, by extending through some agency of the provincial government, great amounts of credit for the redevelopment of this accommodation industry in these blighted areas, and for the development of this industry as a whole throughout our province.

In the words of the submission to the economic council on tourism by the southwestern chambers of commerce:

We must provide the attractions or harness existing ones so that they will appeal to the tourists.

There certainly is very little point in spending large amounts of advertising on "Visit Ontario" if we do not first provide proper accommodation, and second, provide the attractions and amusements the visitors wish.

Now the former Minister of the department, on page 575 of last year's *Hansard*, stated that it was the job of this department only to promote Ontario, not to build establishments. Certainly, I agree that the province should not enter into direct competition with private enterprise in this field. However, the province does have a responsibility to develop attractions of historic and general interest in various parts of our province, as I was pleased to hear the new hon. Minister mention today.

I would hope that these things would be done, keeping in mind that our own people should visit all parts of our own province and that traffic patterns will flow in all directions and not just northward as is the case on most summer weekends.

I realize that the department has no accurate track of the number of visitors coming from other provinces or from the United States, visiting by way of neighbouring provinces, but certainly this travelling and the travelling within our own province is worth stimulating, as the hon. Minister stated earlier today. It is only by creating major attractions in all parts of our province that this will come about. We must endeavour to hold these visitors to our province in any given area, just a little longer, and thus add to the gross tourist revenue.

It is essential that people going into this industry are well trained in understanding what are the needs of the tourists, and then go ahead and plan with sufficient financial backing. I think this aspect is most important, along with providing a wide variety of attractions and services with alternatives that meet every desire, especially as our people seek wider diversion, with greater selectivity, during our lives of increasing leisure.

This, I charge, is the responsibility of this province: to increase the numbers of pupils attending our courses in hotel and restaurant management and cooking schools, to help develop an atmosphere in each area of our province that is contiguous to the immediate area, and most important, to create an agency, whereby those qualified to expand this development in our province, can borrow the money to create these attractions and facilities.

Turning from this broad aspect of economic development of our tourist industry, I would just briefly like to reiterate comments that have been heard from time to time from various officials, and earlier this year were made by the hon. Minister of this department. I, too, have made such statements and I think they all agree that they only apply to a small segment of this tourist industry. The statement is:

Operators of tourist establishments are not outside international rates of exchange. Do not overcharge our visitors and be sure to give them the exchange on their money. The difference in the rate of exchange is one of our main attractions to visitors at this time.

There is simply one point about overcharging that I would like to make again, and again this possibly applies to only a small segment

of the industry. Often hotel and motels will adjust room rates, within a matter of minutes, to levels of whatever the traffic will bear.

This does not encourage visitors to return to these establishments. In this province we do have an Innkeepers Act, a Licensing Act, and I would recommend to this government that amendments should be made to the Act—so that in every hotel and motel room rates for that room will be listed—whether they show different rates for in season and off season, but so long as they are posted. In this manner, our visitors will not be gouged by unreasonably high rates on holiday weekends or during the summer period; and at the same time, our hotels and motels will be less likely to have price wars during the off season.

Printed rates for the various seasons of the year, related to the services offered, and accommodation by our hotels and motels, will win stability for this section of our visitors' industry.

I would just like to take a moment to read an item from the *Toronto Daily Star* of the first part of this year. It is entitled:

TOURISTS NOT FOR FLEEING

Earlier in this century if American summer visitors came up here to look at us, fish our waters and rent our cottages, we put them up somehow, took their money and thought it rather funny they bothered to come for something we thought was very ordinary. Well, times have changed. Canadian revenue from tourists last year amounted to \$600 million.

We want tourists, yet now our lake waters are becoming polluted and unattractive. The fish are scarce. Going to Canada is no longer an adventure to Americans, who can just as readily take off for Morocco or Fiji.

Our want of tourists is not matched by our willingness to provide well for their wants. In too many cases we still act like louts or cheats towards them.

Accommodation and service have improved but much that we still offer is tawdry by good European and American standards. Food in some resort areas can be unbelievably junky. Their restaurants are insipid copy-cats of American, with their Kentucky fried chicken, New England clam chowder and Idaho potatoes.

This weekend, James Auld, Ontario Minister of Travel and Publicity, bravely chided hotel and motel operators about some bumpkin practices, for instance, short-changing Americans on the exchange

rate; juggling room rates daily as high as the road traffic will bear. That sort of thing should cease and high standards of accommodation, cleanliness and service should be imposed through licensing of all who cater to tourists.

A deeper problem is facing the industry. The pollution of lakes and rivers by motor oils from boats, rubbish from cottages, septic tanks or lack of them, and of course through increasing population. From the Rideau system, through the Kawartha to Muskoka, this has become a serious defect.

Fish cannot survive in gasoline and people do not want to swim through scum. It is a problem the new Department of Energy and Resources Management should tackle with energy and sound regulation.

Turning briefly to another aspect of tourism, there is the matter of highways and the roles they play in the development of this industry. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is not present.

Certainly we all agree that we want broad, first-class highways leading to our existing and potential tourist areas. However, there is one serious aspect of these new super-highways which again must be drawn to the attention of this government. This is the fact that these new roads are now bypassing any of the previously developed tourist areas of this province.

I had previously mentioned the economic problems. However, our highways department can help alleviate this condition through a proper signing programme of both major and secondary roads in our province. There are indications that this programme is being started in areas of our province, and I would hope that this trend will continue to all parts of our province.

Along Highway 401, assisted by the fuel companies operating service centres, the government in co-operation with regional tourist councils, with which I will deal shortly, has attempted to provide a programme of tourist information centres to direct travellers, not only to other parts of our province, but more directly into the immediate areas of these service centres. Possibly it is unfair to criticize at this time the success, or more truly the lack of success, of this programme to date, as it was in operation for only a short period of time last year.

However, this has placed a great financial burden on the participating regional tourist councils of the province, a burden which possibly should have been shouldered by the province itself. The philosophy of this programme is excellent, not only to direct our

visitors to other parts of the province, but to get the visiting traffic off the highways into the adjacent areas and thus hold these visitors longer in our province.

However, I will be very surprised if, in the practical application of this programme, it is successful, either from this standpoint or from an economic viewpoint. I will watch with great interest, next summer, the activities and success of these facilities.

Worthy, too, of mention in the area of highways, is the suggested programme of naming our scenic and historic routes rather than merely calling them by number. I believe this was suggested in the House last year by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

As a further thought in developing our tourist industry, I would like to draw to the attention of this House, a system of signing which is used on the turnpikes to the south of us where, at their interchanges for communities, they indicate the total number of rooms of accommodation available in the area. Possibly this is a worthwhile suggestion, and these facts could be incorporated on a trial basis on the strip maps of Highway 401 and its numbered interchanges.

In mentioning highway strip maps, these same maps could apply to the variously named scenic and historic routes. I was most impressed by these strip maps in the province of New Brunswick and found them most useful and interesting. They not only indicated the mileage between the communities but they also show the points of interest and scenic importance, and gave a concisely written description. I would hope that this department would give this suggestion some consideration in the near future.

I would now like to turn briefly to The Department of Lands and Forests and point out some of its functions in relation to our tourist industry. Certainly we are all aware that if it were not for lakes, forests, rivers and the natural beauty of our province, and the wonderful hunting and fishing that we enjoy, in all probability we would not have a tourist industry. There are several areas in respect to Lands and Forests about which I would like to deal.

First is the problem regarding provincial parks, and I would like to state that these are major attractions to our province. Many operators feel they have gone into direct subsidized competition with private enterprise, especially in relation to camping facilities. Possibly this is true in some instances, and this department should keep in mind to guard against this. In the broad outlook, the parks have done much to foster the tourist industry.

There is also the problem of commercialization at the entrance of these parks, and I would hope that in the future the kind and content of these establishments can be controlled by proper zoning regulations in order that the scenic beauty of these parks is not spoiled.

Further to the comments which were indicated in the committee meeting yesterday, regarding zoning in the opening up of new lakes in our province, and having designated commercial and resort areas, I think this is very worthwhile.

Coming from the most southerly part of this province, I have often felt like criticizing The Department of Lands and Forests for obtaining countless acres in the north for provincial parks and none or very few in the southern part of our province. We, in the southern parts of the province, located within a few hours' drive of the great bulk of the population of both Ontario and the United States, have long been crying for more provincial parks to help stimulate our decaying tourist industry. Indications are now present that this government is at long last heeding these requests and that no longer will our shorelines be bought up by individuals squeezing out the general public. This southern area is the area where provincial parks can be most successful financially to the government, and of practical leisure-time benefit to the great masses of our own population and as a stimulus to the visitor industry of these areas. More provincial parks in southern Ontario could aid in the tremendous stimulation of the tourist industry of this province.

The second area in which The Department of Lands and Forests is involved, as well as The Department of Public Works, in relation to The Department of Tourism and Information, is in the area of development of small craft harbours or marinas in our province. I am aware of the survey of existing and potential marina installation sites that The Department of Lands and Forests conducted this past year and the limited amount of work that is carried out by the provincial Department of Public Works. I would like to point out to this House that we have been missing a large portion of this segment of the tourist business in this province because of our inadequate and infrequent marina facilities.

At one time in the Lake Huron area we were the leaders in this field. In the area of Ohio from Cleveland all along the lakeshore and rivers to Port Huron, Michigan, is the second largest concentration of power boats

in the world. These craft are only a few hours' cruising time from many points in Ontario and many of the owners are looking for new ports of call and facilities for extended visits. I would suggest to this government that if we are to capture these marine visitors to our province we must provide the marinas, dockage, parks, and overnight facilities at strategic locations along the shores of our Great Lakes and in our other waterways and lakes within the province.

I would further suggest that this development could be financed at nominal cost to this government by the retention of taxes now being rebated to users of marine fuels. I believe that this system has been used in the state of Michigan and other jurisdictions, and the funds so provided have accounted for the rapid development of their many fine marina installations. The influx of these marine visitors to our province would be a new group of visitors that we have hardly received in the past and a new and greater source of tourist revenue for our province.

The third area of The Department of Lands and Forests with which I would like to deal in relationship to our tourist industry, is in the matter of regulations concerning hunting and fishing in our province. As mentioned previously, the fine hunting and fishing in our province is a prime factor in the development of the tourist industry of our province. However, with the urban sprawl, pollution of the lakes and rivers, and removal of undercover and marsh lands, especially in southern Ontario, fishing in the lakes and streams has become poor and our waters have become too polluted even for safe bathing in many areas, and our natural game has disappeared. Certainly pollution of our waters is a major deterrent to keeping or redeveloping our tourist industry in many parts of our province. I only hope that the work that our water resources commission has undertaken will be completed quickly and effectively.

In regard to hunting in our province, which could be a fantastic aid to the tourist industry by extending our season well into the fall—if only we had sufficient game for our own hunters as well as for visitors—a new programme of strict predator control would be one of the greatest assets to our visitor industry. Is it not economic sense for us to eliminate predators to our game as much as possible? Let this game flourish and increase and then sell our own hunters and many visitors licences to hunt off this abundance of game and get back to the natural balance. This type of programme is very aptly pointed out in the small state of Michigan. There, because I believe there are no wolves, more

deer are shot in a few counties in one season than in the whole of this great province of Ontario. These hunters are part and parcel of the tourist industry of our province.

The same situation holds true in regard to game birds in our southern counties. Hunting for geese, ducks and pheasants once drew thousands of visitors to this area to the economic benefit of the farmer, the merchant and the whole area. Planned predator control and the redevelopment of woodlots and marshes must be undertaken if this segment of our tourist industry is to be retained. The Department of Lands and Forests plays a very important role in relation to The Department of Tourism and Information.

Two last suggestions in this area of my thoughts. I would hope that this department would include promotion of our several national parks as a supplement to the promotion of our own provincial parks. One final comment is in regard to the announcement earlier this session that The Department of Tourism and Information is opening offices in several key locations in the United States, which locations I believe are mostly more than one day's travel from our borders. I would suggest that these offices be equipped with non-resident hunting and fishing licences, as a form of insurance that these people will come on to Ontario and not be lured by attractive areas in their own country.

Certainly I expect some of our licence issuers will object to this proposal but I do feel that many visitors do wish almost a package deal. They do not want to chase around for hours on end during their visit to our province trying to buy a fishing or hunting licence. This fact I can document as I can show you an advertisement in a United States telephone directory advertising Ontario fishing and hunting licences. I arranged and purchased one of these through an American source this year.

I would suggest that a policy of issuing these licences be tried at these new Ontario government travel offices in these cities that are located more than a day's drive from our border, and just see what the results would be in encouraging more visitors to our province.

One last department that plays a very important role in the development and the retention of our tourist industry is our Department of Health. Previously I have mentioned the fact of pollution of our waters, which is an aspect of the health of our people and that of our visitors. But there is one overriding health factor which must be taken into consideration in our overall programme of de-

velopment of the tourist industry. We must improve our standards for serving our visitors, especially in the cleanliness of our food and accommodation and service station facilities.

The Department of Tourism does have inspectors visiting hotels, motels, parks and campsites. The Department of Labour inspectors call on certain restaurants and service stations on behalf of the staffs. The industrial hygiene branch, which handles public health administration of The Department of Health, crisscrosses some of these same facilities.

In some areas, county or local health units do an effective job of inspection, but in many cases the conditions under which food is prepared and served and the condition of washrooms in both restaurants and service centres are of such a nature that I am sure that farmers would be loath to keep pigs in them. Fortunately these places are a small minority, but they are the places which give our whole province a poor image. Cleanliness in our public places is the least expensive and best advertisement our restaurants and service centres can have. I am certain that our travelling public seek and want service centres and restaurants, sir, which provide clean and sanitary facilities. I am sure, too, that the promotion of our province would be much simpler if the standards of these facilities were raised.

I would suggest that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) and the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity sit down together and discuss this problem, and give some study to the possibility of establishing licence grades for establishments based on the sanitary facilities of their kitchens and rest rooms. This system is employed in North Carolina and other jurisdictions; as a traveller, I have appreciated seeing these licences at the entrances to the various establishments so that I could determine at a glance what the facilities were in these strange establishments.

I would point out that I have stated nothing concerning the licensing in regard to the quality of food or the type of service, only the sanitary condition of the premises. Our best advertising in this province is to have clean facilities, to make our communities attractive, and to impress upon our visitors that they are welcome—and thus leave with them the desire to return another time.

In last year's *Hansard* on page 648, the then Minister of this department, Mr. Bryan Cathcart, pointed out that this department does require the full co-operation of other departments in this government. I hope I

have brought forth this fact to the attention of the new hon. Minister, to the Ministers of other departments involved, and to the House as a whole.

However, before summing up my thoughts, there are a few areas within the jurisdiction of this department which should be criticized and offered suggestions. One is in regard to the programme for historic sites and museums. I feel, as do many other interested citizens, that this department does not go far enough, possibly because of lack of funds. Although certain historic sites are recognized by plaques, there should be an operative programme developed at these sites as quickly as possible. We cannot hold visitors in our province simply by erecting one of our very excellent historic sites' markers; but where possible, if buildings are still in existence, we should utilize them as museums or craft shops and have conducted tours. One has only to drive to Virginia, and any of the other jurisdictions in the United States, to see this type of programme being practised.

As the hon. Minister pointed out, the second most common reason why people travel is because of historic interest. Ontario abounds in history, and if we could develop these sites into an interesting and informative programme we could extend the duration of our tourist season and again attract a large new group of visitors to our province.

Many of our historic buildings have fallen into disrepair. Others have been torn down to make way for modern construction. I would call upon this department of the provincial government to initiate a programme to acquire these buildings and operate them as provincial historic sites.

One other area within the jurisdiction of this department which I feel deserves some criticism is that of the programme of regional tourist councils which was developed by an amendment to the Act in 1961. I could spend a great deal of the time of this House discussing the weaknesses of this programme of matching grants to regional tourist councils, but I shall take only a few moments to point out the most glaring faults of this programme as I see them.

First, in the matter of designated regions; several areas in our province, notably Norfolk county, Essex county, Muskoka and Haliburton areas, and others which have long been in the tourist promotion business, were entreated to take in larger areas in order that they could receive the \$5,000 grant annually from the province, under certain stipulations. I would point this out specifi-

cally in the matter of Essex county, which has conducted a programme of tourist promotion for over 25 years, spending well over \$150,000 in this period of time. Essex county, in order to qualify, had to join with Kent county, which never has had a county programme of tourist promotion. This area, as were other areas, was designated by the hon. Minister, through his powers, but I ask: What did he do in his own riding? He created a tourist area for the city of Sarnia and the county of Lambton alone. Most other areas of the province had to accept three or four counties to make up a regional tourist council, of which there are approximately 30 in this province. This spreads the \$5,000 very thin.

The method of financing these organizations is one of the greatest juggling acts ever seen in this province—and I hate to use the word, but I think there has been more falsification of spending and raising monies to qualify for these grants than most of us can comprehend.

I would ask the hon. Minister: How many of these regional councils were able to qualify for the full grant on April 1, 1963, and how many have qualified to date this year? I would ask: How many of these councils are functioning effectively, especially in areas which did not have a previous active organization?

One other factor which deserves criticism is the lack of advance planning for programmes for these councils. Some councils took what I consider the right approach to carefully determine a plan for the development of attractions for their own regions, and spend their fund wisely on these projects. Other areas simply blew their initial \$5,000 grants in printing brochures on their areas with little effort to develop attractions, and with little or no thought as to the distribution of these folders.

The department approved these expenditures, but I feel they should have given concrete suggestions in leadership as to how this money should have been spent. I would suggest that The Department of Tourism and Publicity re-examine this programme very carefully, and set up standards of procedure so that our taxpayers' money is not just handed out indiscriminately.

Certainly I am in agreement with regional planning and thinking; for in any given area we have individual businesses and local tourist committees promoting their own interests, and we have county groups working for their immediate area. Then, overriding these, between the county groups and the department, are the regional groups. But

I would ask the hon. Minister of this department: Are the regional tourist groups the major authority below his department in tourist promotion, or are the regional development associations going to usurp these powers and create another overriding body involved in tourist promotion?

These regional development associations comprise areas almost similar to those of region tourist councils which are in line to receive grants up to \$15,000 annually. I would like to quote from the latest edition of the *Co-ordinator*, the publication of the Regional Development Association: I will read briefly as follows: The item is titled:

TOURISM

Now is the time of year to start working on your next year's tourist literature. With this in mind we pass on a few ideas and queries given us for regional tourist promotion.

I hope that is just complementing the programme and not going to take over.

I would again ask the hon. Minister: Just which is the authoritative body in tourist promotion? My personal opinion is that these regional development agencies are bureaucracies seeking activities in every field in order to preserve their own existence. The original or avowed purpose of these was to encourage industry on a regional basis. This failed. Now, among other activities, they are butting into the tourist field. I would like the record set straight.

We cannot have duplication of programmes, and duplication of spending of public funds. I do hope that will be discussed further in The Department of Economics and Development.

In conclusion to my remarks I would like to restate remarks made by a new Minister. There is no such thing as automatic spending in the tourist industry. In this province we must have fair goals or objectives based on sound economic lines if our tourist industry is to survive and expand.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I would first like to congratulate the hon. Minister on the new position he has. I do notice though, by the estimates, that apart from the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, he is going to have very little more money to spend than the former Minister had. If we are going to build the tourist industry in Ontario the way we feel that it must be built, I do not think that the department with all its discussions—I noticed the other day down in committee it was showing us all the new plans and what it is

going to do—is going to be able to do that on less than \$3 million, and this estimate here today is certainly less than \$3 million. If it is really going to do the job that has to be done, it has got to have enough money there to do it.

Maybe the truest words that the hon. Minister spoke today were when he said, in talking about the tourist industry, that it was more good luck than good management, and I feel rightly so.

When we discuss the tourist industry of Ontario, generally we think of northern Ontario. This is where we feel that tourism is. But I would like to take a look at some of the other items in the tourist industry; I have some new proposals here at which I hope the hon. Minister will look, bearing in mind that I do not think the department should go into the tourist industry as far as building cottages and motels. But I do feel it has a real promotion job to do to put this type of accommodation where it is needed for the travelling public.

I would like to take a serious look at where the travelling public is in Ontario. We will discover it is in one area and that is the "golden horseshoe". Let us just take a look at the "golden horseshoe", as far as recreation is concerned. We start at Oshawa and go right around to the Falls, and the first place that we get any type of recreation is when we get to Niagara Falls. I can remember, going back 20 or 30 years ago, when we used to take a trip to the Falls. We used to go along the old Lakeshore Road, we would take old No. 8 highway down to Niagara Falls, and this was a scenic route at that time and you enjoyed that trip. We don't have that type of trip any more. If one goes along the old Lakeshore Road now there is nothing but potholes; take No. 8 highway down to the Falls, again there is nothing but potholes.

I was interested, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister of Highways, the other day, said they were going to try to save an area down in eastern Ontario as a scenic route. This is one of the main things that we have to try to do in this part of Ontario—try to save some of the scenic routes that we had in the past. The travelling public today, travels Highway 401, and it is not a scenic route of any type no matter where you go along it until you get near the Quebec border.

I am wondering if the hon. Minister would take a serious look at going back to some of the things that were done in the past—and that is spelling out the scenic routes that we

have along Highway 401. I am not thinking of the literature that has been put out, but I am thinking of nice, up-to-date little signs on the highways so that the people driving along will be able to see them, and will know there are certain places where they can pull off and take trips. I am thinking of things like the Caledon Hills—20 or 30 miles off that highway, where they could spend the day and see some of southern Ontario. The average person driving through now really does not realize there is any scenic area in southern Ontario because his main job is to go through on the highway.

I think also that the hon. Minister has a job to do in trying to convince industry that it must give the type of accommodation the tourist needs, and I am thinking again of Highway 401 and the amount of travel that is on there with the trailers we have today. Where, along that route, are you able to pull off with your trailer, able to hook it up, and spend the night in accommodation that you have with the set-up of your trailer? In the States there is a lot of this. The routes are set out, so that trailers can go in for the evening, rather than the occupants having to take a motel.

It must be realized that the tourist industry in Ontario is handicapped on the basis that our season is definitely short, therefore a lot of our motels perhaps have to charge more money in the summer than the same type of motel farther down in the States. We have to take a serious look at trying to convince these hotel and motel people and the tourist industry in the southern part of Ontario to try to get more into winter sports so that these hotel operators can carry on the year round.

Again in the "golden horseshoe" I would say that within a 50-mile radius there is an opportunity of all types of winter sports. The department is going to have to help promote these, convince the people in these areas that if they can do the job and put in the type of winter sports needed, they can get the tourist trade up here.

I also feel, Mr. Chairman, that there is another area which I think this department should look at. Down at the Sportsmen's Show they have souvenirs made in Canada. This is very good, but I am just wondering if they have ever taken a look at industrial tours. I am thinking of this on the basis of cities more than the small town. Take a city the size of Hamilton—it would be possible to arrange industrial tours, say, with the chamber of commerce there. This could be arranged not in July and August when we have our big

tourist trade, but maybe earlier in the spring or later in the fall.

The average industry is only too happy to have people tour its plant. I know in Hamilton that Stelco, Procter and Gamble, and the electrical industry are quite willing to have tours at any time. I am wondering if it would be possible to convince the chamber of commerce to take a look at doing a job of having, say, two or three days in the spring or in the fall, set aside for industrial tours in that city and have the city put on a real programme to draw people into that area.

This is something that would certainly help the tourist industry a lot. It would bring money into areas and the main thing in the tourist industry is to get money into Ontario. It would bring money into areas where it is not coming at the present time. The average city, other than Toronto, where we have our Canadian National Exhibition, gets very little business out of the tourist trade any more. As I say, we have a wonderful highway system around Hamilton, but you could drive around the whole of Hamilton on our highways and you would not see a sign suggesting "Come in and visit our Rock garden" or "Come in and see the scenery we have in this area." It is the same with the Niagara peninsula. The days of the enjoyment of that are pretty well gone. We have to take a serious look at building the industry in southern Ontario as well as northern Ontario.

We have in our provincial parks a lot of nice campsites. These are being very well used, although the industry as a whole, is, I understand, putting quite a drive on to have the park sites raised up a little. But I do feel that this is another need and I hope the hon. Minister can convince the industry that it has to start to build more of the little summer homes again. The average family, when it gets the two weeks' holiday, likes to get away for a couple of weeks and rent a tourist cabin and supply its own meals, etc. This type of accommodation is getting scarce. You can get all the accommodation you want at \$16 and \$18 a day, but the average family cannot afford that. Another thing that this department can do along with industry; I think perhaps they can convince industry to do this: We have to bear in mind, in the tourist industry, that we still have to make a lot of our money from the citizens of Ontario, and in most industrial plants now they have a two-week shutdown. In the Hamilton area and in the Toronto area, most of them are somewhere between July 15 and August 15—in that four-week period there. At that time you can look in the papers and never see a

cottage for rent; but you will be able to get cottages for rent in the first two weeks of July and the last two weeks of August. I am wondering if this department could not sit down with industry and try to convince them to spread their holidays over those two months, rather just over the four weeks. With children in mind, the holidays have to be pretty well within the eight weeks; but I think you would rather see our tourist industry have at least eight weeks of real business than just the four they have now.

I was interested in all the publications I had put on my desk today. I have two here I would like to discuss; and in discussing them I would like to say that the other Ministers in this department have spoken a lot about publicity they have had from the States, from the editors from down there who toured Ontario. They always remark what a wonderful job they felt they had done in going back to the States and promoting the tourist industry of Ontario.

I was interested in reading a piece in *Life* magazine, which was published last April. It is talking about the trans-Canada highway, and in it, it was spelling out the different provinces. It starts out with the eastern provinces and it names Newfoundland, Quebec and the Maritime provinces. Then it moves to the prairies and the first province in the prairies is Ontario. I do not know what type of publicity job we are doing in the States, but when a writer in a magazine like *Life* magazine does not know more about Ontario I feel perhaps we are not doing as good a job as we should.

I have here a magazine which I think all hon. members got. It is called *Steel Flash*, and is put out by the Steel Company of Canada. I would say that this will be read by a lot more people, the year round, than all of this other stuff will. I was quite interested in the centre-page spread. They are talking about the Quebec winter carnival being a top tourist attraction, which is very good. I am not arguing that it is not good. But I am wondering, along with industry, if we could not convince industry in their monthly publications—these are publications which most industries put out anyway—to promote our tourist trade a little more than is being done at the present time. It is not very often you see an article like this in one of these trade magazines. I think that that in itself could do a tremendous job.

In closing, there is one other question I would like to ask the hon. Minister. I understand his department is the one which issues licences to the tourists establishments. I am

wondering if he has had to revoke any licences because of discrimination, or if he has had any complaints on discrimination because of colour, race, and so on, where licences have not been revoked?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I just answer a couple of things very briefly before we get into the detailed votes. If the hon. member for Hamilton East will bear with me, I will try to have, this afternoon, information for him on licences rescinded, although to my knowledge I do not recall any having been suspended or cancelled due to any discrimination as far as customers are concerned. But I will check that; and if I am incorrect, I will give him the information shortly.

The hon. member for Essex South, Mr. Chairman, commented on a number of things—one matter having to do with credit, which is tied in with the seasonal aspect of what we have always considered the tourist business, July and August. Of course, there is federal legislation for small business loans and so on; and then, provincially, there is the Ontario Development Agency. The agency is presently dealing with some applications. I believe they have given one guarantee. But one of the things which my colleague, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), has told me and which the agency people have told our people in the development branch, is that one of the problems the resort operators have had has been an accounting one.

I might put it another way. There have been a number of resort operators who have gone to the Ontario Development Agency; the agency in turn, as usual, has sent its people out to look at the operation and look at the books. After giving the operator a little assistance, a little advice in bookkeeping and in management, a great many of these operators have been able, with proper up-to-date records, to go to normal financing agencies, such as their banks, and get funds.

On the problem of the seasonal end of it, the hon. member mentioned about extending the season. This, of course, is one of our primary objectives; and as the hon. members will see this summer, Mr. Chairman, our main emphasis in advertising will be on spring and fall. By and large, very few places have had problems of accommodation in July and August. But in extending much past that, a great many of the resorts—and this applies particularly to the very large ones, most of which are quite old—find the cost of winterizing is quite substantial. Last fall it was fairly simple because we had a pretty mild

fall, but to winterize for just a month or two, between insulation and heating and so on, can be quite a substantial cost.

We are hopeful that because of promotion which we are doing, and which the industry is doing, and the new facilities which are springing up in certain areas of the province for winter sports, there will be an improvement—that operators will see that people are coming in the winter time and will then be in a position to add the extra facilities and winterization. This, again, will be cumulative, and could be like a snowball; and we will be able to have pretty close to a year-round season.

The hon. member for Essex South mentioned about the posting of room rates. As he is probably aware, at the present time The Tourist Establishments Act, as well as The Innkeepers Act, both of which affect accommodation to some extent, require posting a maximum rate. Where we find the difficulty, of course, is that we have no authority, and I do not see how we could have, effectively, any authority to set the maximum rate. The operators, the few of them who do this and whose rates go up and down like yo-yos, depending on the time of the day and the traffic, post a maximum rate which they probably only charge once a week. The rest of the time they have a lower rate and then, when the time seems ripe, they get the unwary traveller.

We are looking at this. As a matter of fact, the officials of the department have been studying this for some time. It has been studied in other jurisdictions, because this is not a problem which only applies in our own province. Everybody would agree that an operator must be flexible in his own rates. What makes people mad is paying one rate if you check in at noon, and another rate of you have to check in at seven o'clock at night, or a rate on Tuesday different from Wednesday.

Just to speak briefly about the regional tourist councils, we are still not of the opinion they are all working perfectly as yet, as I mentioned in my previous remarks; but we do feel they are coming along and that, by and large, they are doing the job which they were set up to do.

This matter of jurisdiction between the regional councils and the development associations is a difficult one in certain areas, and I realize this. I know what, perhaps, my hon. friend may have in the back of his mind, which he perhaps did not mention today. We are starting a programme of what we hope will be joint meetings, between the area

development associations and the regional tourist councils within each area, to try to work out a sort of a dividing line in tourist promotional activities. The tourist councils, of course, are only concerned in tourism; the development associations are in the whole field of commerce and development. Some of the latter, since their inception, have spent a good deal of their time on tourist promotion; others have spent very little, and have spent their time on industrial promotion. What we hope to do is to be able to work out dividing lines in these areas, with their agreement and co-operation, so there will not be duplication. They can then do a more effective job, jointly, in the spheres in which they can be most effective.

We do include information and promotion on the national parks in Ontario in our publications, and Highways do as well.

I will not now go into a couple of the matters which my hon. friend mentioned, which I think they would want us to look into and study. I am not in a position to say anything about them at the moment, but I can say that all the things which my hon. friend has mentioned will get pretty thorough consideration in the department, and with the other departments involved.

Again in connection with the grants to the regional tourist councils, I would hope my hon. friend would agree that it would be a mistake if we made our formula too rigid—as to what this money should be spent on within the association. By and large, we feel that the associations should be, and I think will be, with assistance from our own people in the department and other experts from the industry, in the best position to decide what they should use their money for.

The only restriction we have now, really, is that they must not use this for salaries for full-time personnel. We have, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, made one slight concession in this regard, as a result of concern amongst the councils. We do allow a small amount as a matching grant for administrative services where they need secretarial assistance and mimeographing—that sort of thing.

When we get to the development vote, if my hon. friend would bear with me until then, I will give him the figures on how many of the associations received a full grant, and how many only a portion.

There were a couple of suggestions from my hon. friend from Hamilton East which I appreciate, and we will follow up. The question of editorial material in industrial publications, stories on vacation areas and so on, is

one we will be following up. Some publications—as a matter of fact, it seems to me in the *Imperial Oil Review* there was a rather interesting Ontario travel story a while ago. I think the publications, by and large, are anxious to have this material, but we just have not been in a position to produce it for them—although, with the reorganization of the department, and the staff who are joining the department, I think we will be in a better position.

I might just tell the hon. members at the moment that we are very pleased that we have been able to attract the travel editor of the *Toronto Daily Star*. Alec Henderson will be starting with the department on April 2; one of the things which he and the people in his branch will be working on is the production of this kind of material for this kind of publication, as well as for the newspapers and so on.

I might just say that this matter of letting motorists who are travelling on Highway 401, and some of the other major highways of the province, know where the recreational areas are, is one which is being handled, I think reasonably well at the moment, by The Department of Highways' roads-to-recreation map. Certainly signs on the highway indicating recreational areas would be an improvement, and The Department of Highways has expanded its sign programme in this kind of thing in the last year or so. We are meeting with the Highways people on this from time to time.

We hope to be able to continue to improve this recreational signing programme although, as the hon. members will realize again, when you get into the matter of highway signs it can be a fairly broad problem; a question of precedence as to where you draw the line as to what is a recreational area and so on. It is not an easy problem to solve completely.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have commented on some of the matters which were brought up by my two hon. friends. Perhaps we could proceed with the detailed votes?

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the votes, could I seek clarification from the hon. Minister on a couple of items?

In regard to extending the season, I am not particularly referring to the winter season; as the hon. member for Hamilton East pointed out, our peak season is two, four, possibly six weeks during the summer months, whereas in my particular locality in another two weeks we will be blossoming forth. The great multitude of people in this province, if there

was a major attraction in this area, could come down and see vegetation in the ground, which cannot be seen anywhere for at least another 1,000 miles to the south. We do have a certain element coming in; the migration of the birds is drawing people in, early in the season, from New York state and so forth. The same thing holds true in the latter part of the season. It could broaden out into April and May, having facilities for those areas.

The other point is that the hon. Minister mentioned the Ontario Development Agency having received one applicant. I would just think this points up my thoughts that we need more training of people going into this industry; therefore they would be qualified to obtain these grants.

In regard to the posting of rates in motels, I think this should be looked into because I know of a number of motels which do not have rates posted in the interior of each room.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If my hon. friend will let us know where they are, we can deal with it very rapidly.

On the matter of the season, with reference to the hon. member for Hamilton East, I do not know this of my own knowledge but I am told—because I have inquired about the same thing myself—that one of the problems of this two-week period in the middle of July and the middle of August—actually the last week in July and the first week in August—has been that in those plants where approaches have been made by either tourist associations or by the department officially, or unofficially, in many cases the answer has been that, after a survey of the employees, this is the period they all want. I do not know how far one might go to change this, but I would think that the only effective way would be by promoting the other times of the year, and having interesting things to do or see—so that the majority of the workers in a plant would be amenable to going on holiday, one year, the last two weeks in June or the first two weeks in July.

July and August, of course, with those who have school-age children are pretty well the only months they can go.

In connection with regional grants, in 1962-63 ten of the 32 regional tourist councils received the full grant, and 12 a partial grant. In 1963-64 to date—of course, we do not have the final figures—14 have received a full grant and 12 a partial grant. The remainder have received nothing. Whether this is because they have had no expenditure or whether they just have not applied yet, I cannot say.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, some days ago the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts) referred to the centennial year and also the bridge at Sault Ste. Marie. He said we could expect a great influx of tourists from now on and certainly during that 1967 year. I was, unfortunately, not able to be here during the estimates of The Department of Highways—I had to stay in my riding because of the great tragedy we had there last weekend. But looking in the proposed work I find the original trans-Canada highway is still in the same position it was before; there is no work from Mattawa west or east to Pembroke. Last year there was a great amount of criticism. The Upper Ottawa Valley Association pointed out that some of the oil companies were telling their people not to travel that route, so I suggest that you urge the hon. Minister of Highways that if he wants to have the tourists come down that way even in 1967 he had better do something about it.

It also would be appreciated if the hon. Minister would urge the hon. Prime Minister of this province and the Cabinet to do something about the archaic liquor laws of our province. I have certain reservations myself about local option but I certainly think that in order to increase the tourist industry there has to be some change. I was glad to notice at the meeting—again I was unable to be there—when the tourist operators were here, that they spoke of off-package sales at licensed premises, and then the sale of wines and such on Sunday, and things of that nature.

However, in order to bring in the tourists, particularly the American tourists and the tourists from the great province of Quebec who have not got the archaic liquor laws that we have here in the province of Ontario, we should do something about it. I noticed in the press a statement that it was unlikely that there would be any change in the Act presented to this session. Since there is time, as we will be back after Easter, I urge the hon. Minister to see if he can induce the hon. Prime Minister of this province to begin now to change that situation because we are all interested in tourist promotion. I want to assure these people down south that not only have we a wonderful tourist country in the spring and summer time, but also in the winter, so there is no problem about our area.

Repeating again, highways play a wonderful part in the development of tourism and so does the added attraction of spirits, so will the hon. Minister urge the members of the Cabinet and the hon. Prime Minister

to change these outdated laws if possible this session?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask from a constitutional point of view whether we may legally vote \$4,585,000 to a department that does not yet exist. According to the estimates, sir, these monies are being voted to The Department of Tourism and Information. Are we getting ourselves into any difficulty from which we cannot extricate ourselves? I would fear that after we vote this \$4.5 million that some citizen of the province may sue the hon. Minister to pay it back personally.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I might mention to my hon. friend from Sudbury that I do not prepare the estimates in the printed form but I do not think he need worry. The Minister, if he finds that someone is likely to sue him, is likely to come in and ask for some sort of a change.

Mr. Chairman: It is my understanding, sir, that these estimates are for the year commencing April 1, 1964, so that probably by that time the department will be known under the name of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Mr. Sopha: It may be the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and I have not made up our minds whether each of us personally is going to vote for this bill yet.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, to what extent is there co-operation between this department and other departments of government?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, since I have been Minister, we have worked jointly with a number of other departments. We have not had occasion to work with all of them but the co-operation which we have had has been excellent.

Mr. Newman: Then I would assume the hon. Minister has spoken to The Department of Highways, to the hon. Minister in charge of that department, and he must have convinced him to complete Highway 401. I asked this of the previous Minister four times and he said there would be the utmost co-operation. Certainly there is no evidence of that co-operation.

The next department is The Department of Transport. We had discussed for years the idea of a slogan on licence plates. Last year the hon. Minister was firmly convinced that one should be included and it is recorded in *Hansard* that he thought that in 1965 we

would have a slogan. There is probably no better and no cheaper way of publicizing the province than by means of a licence plate, and a colourful licence plate.

In the debates on the estimates of The Department of Transport, the hon. Minister answered in the negative and said that the purpose of the licence plate was solely so that it could be readily identified. He was not interested at all in any kind of slogan.

He mentioned the fact that the numbers would be too small and there would not be room on the plate. Yet our neighbours to the north, to the west and to the south of us in the state of Michigan have increased the lettering on their plate; the slogan has been changed from Water Wonderland to Water Winter Wonderland. They evidently find room. They are not disturbed that the numbers will not be able to be read. The number of cars that travel in that state is far greater than the number in the province of Ontario.

I know that the hon. Minister is convinced that we need the slogan on the licence plates but my sole purpose in mentioning this is so that he, in his discussions with members of the Treasury board, could convince them that in the very near future we should have some type of slogan on the plate and that the plate be much more colourful and more representative of the province of Ontario.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment for a moment, if I might, on the discussion of a licence-plate slogan. I do not want to give the impression here that I am for or against them. But I would like to say this, that many of the states in the United States use slogans. We have, from New York, the Empire State; from Kentucky, I believe we have the Blue Grass State; from Florida we have the Sunshine State. I would not care, Mr. Chairman, what slogan Florida put on its plate; I know that is the land of sunshine. It would not matter what slogan the state of New York put on its plate; you know that is the state of the Empire State Building and the centre of commerce in the United States. The Kentucky people, regardless of the slogan on their plate, are known for their land of horses and blue grass.

I would say that most people in the nine provinces of Canada other than Ontario and most people in the United States have an impression of this province. Regardless of the slogan we put on our plate it will not change their impression of this province. The Department of Tourism and Information and other departments of our government are

constantly making the North American continent and the rest of the world aware of our province, the advantages we have here and the many things that attract people to Ontario and create our society and our appearance to the rest of the world. I think if we were to put something on the licence plate, it would not change the opinion of anybody and their opinions would be the same of this province, so that I feel, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: Would you go for a hippopotamus?

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): No, nor a picture of you.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, before we continue this discussion of slogans on licence plates, that the hon. members in the Opposition give it a lot more thought.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Ask the hon. Minister; he was for it last year.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, I was not answering for the hon. Minister.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I am most surprised to hear the comment of the hon. member because the chambers of commerce, the joint chambers of the province of Ontario, have been recommending this now for well over 15 years.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, if I might say, this is one matter I have not discussed with the hon. Minister of Transport yet—that is the present Minister (Mr. Haskett)—but I will be glad to discuss it with him.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister could have discussed it with himself last year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, we know how jealous The Department of Highways is about the signing which appears on their property, and I would draw the attention of the House to the signs which the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity evidently has received permission to put up. As you drive along you are informed that you are now entering the south-central-north tourist area, or some other such useful piece of information, and I would ask the hon. Minister to comment on the use of those signs. I would further suggest that at least there should be, on those signs, a reference to where the nearest tourist information post might be.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The signs to which my hon. friend from Brant referred are ones

which designate the edges of the various 32 tourist regions and are put there if the region so requests it, and if the two adjoining regions, as sometimes they have not, can agree where the boundary is. This is an informative sign similar to, for instance, the historic sites signs The Department of Highways put up. Since they are not commercial in any way, in directing people to any specific resort in an area, they are within the regulations of The Department of Highways. Does that answer my hon. friend's question?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, the hon. Minister refers to them as informative signs and they are in a sense—if that is the sort of information one might be interested in—but I do not feel that these signs say anything to tourists of any value at all. If the signs are going to be put up, perhaps the department or the association which authorizes the signs should use a little imagination and put something on them which would be of some use.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, they tie in with this and other publications, but this one particularly, which indicates the 32 vacation regions in the province and gives information about what is in them.

Mr. Nixon: The tourist information centres are indicated on those maps as well?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh, yes.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I see. I would also like to ask the hon. Minister about the report of his department which we received in our mail this morning: Is this in its final form?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. It will be printed when it has a sessional paper number, and it will be distributed in booklet form, properly printed.

Mr. Nixon: I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I was quite pleased to get it in this form. It is quite readable and would have served the purpose for our discussions here today, if we had had an opportunity to read it. I often feel that the elaborate presentation of the report of the department, and there are getting to be a large number of them in the government now, is quite a serious drain on the taxpayer. So often these reports are stashed away after being referred to briefly, or consigned to the wastebasket. I should think the report, in its form at the present time, is most adequate, and I would recommend that the hon. Minister take no further step to improve it.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, while we are on this matter of signs, my hon.

friend from Hamilton East raised the question of designations along the highway which might indicate certain tourist areas. We had some of the problems in connection therewith outlined by the hon. Minister, and I think that what he said made some degree of good sense.

I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister to a problem of which he must be aware. The other day I asked the hon. Minister of Highways regarding the location of the new Highway 401 east of Gananoque. He pointed out that the present road did not make good sense from the point of view of a limited access highway. Also he pointed out, at that time, that the road along the St. Lawrence Valley was one of the few roads in southern Ontario with this kind of scenic beauty, and therefore that it should be preserved.

I had some contact with an organization which has been formed in connection with the Seaway Valley. I have in my hands some of their literature, and some of their representations to The Department of Highways, but this does concern the hon. Minister today because it has to do with this whole matter of tourists and the designation of the Seaway Valley.

The request has been made that, at the east and west end of the Seaway Valley, signs should be installed large enough and significant enough to invite the tourist to use the scenic route which the hon. Minister of Highways indicated was so important the other day. On the Seaway Valley, if I may quote from a letter from Mr. R. Eadie the executive secretary, Seaway Valley travel committee, "Relevant thoughts on Highway 401", he says:

The Seaway Valley regional tourist council or, as it is locally known, the Seaway Valley travel council, has for many months past been endeavouring to obtain permission for the erection of a 16 foot by 40 foot sign west of the junction of Highway 2, inviting motorists to take the scenic route along Highway 2 which passes through our communities. Properly directed to Highway 2, the tourist continues the scenic route, he enjoys from the Ivy Lea Bridge, or Gananoque. He is brought in contact with the many attractions the valley has to offer and, consequently, may spend from two to three days at least in the area, leaving an estimated \$60 to \$90, instead of nothing.

That is, if directed into this valley where there are good accommodations and great scenic beauty.

The letter goes on:

If the tourist services industry in this valley is to continue to improve its standards, if we expect to influence private investment and new facilities and especially new attractions, we must—it says in the report—lead the tourist off the highway and into the byways to see the attraction.

We concede the principle that our Ontario highways should not be cluttered with billboards; we quite understand that. To open them to all kinds of commercial advertising would be a grave mistake. But we contend that our request for two signs at least, one at each end of the Seaway Valley, approximately 80 miles apart, perhaps more than that, advertising the area as a package tourist mecca, are not in the normal commercial category, deserve special consideration, and would not necessarily be interpreted as relaxing restrictions on commercial billboards.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, with all respect to the hon. member for Yorkview, and he is very able in all his presentations, I would suggest in your interest, Mr. Chairman, that this is not following the vote. We are talking on 2101; and to get this vote through the House I think we should stick to the vote we are talking about and suggest we hear his remarks later.

Mr. Young: I might say, Mr. Chairman, in reply to that point of order, that I was waiting until a later vote in order to raise this matter; but since it was raised by the hon. member for Brant I concluded, because you had allowed it, that it was the proper place to raise it. So I forthwith went ahead.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would rule that in the first vote, vote 2101, because the Minister's salary is included therein, this vote is considered to include matters of policy and so there is more latitude in that first vote than any other vote. Perhaps too much latitude has been allowed in that particular vote, and discussion came in concerning the policy in regard to the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, which perhaps should be discussed under another vote, so I would suggest that you conclude your remarks but make them brief.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, very quickly, I simply want to say that there seems to be some sense to this point of view which has been presented by the group promoting the Seaway Valley. I know that the hon. Minis-

ter is very interested in this particular region for obvious reasons, and I would think that some sort of arrangement might be worked out with The Department of Highways so that this kind of sign could be erected. It would not be a general sign but only used on rare and specific occasions to direct tourists to these specific areas of great scenic beauty where they might very well spend some days. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister has any advice in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I think technically we are perhaps not in order in discussing highway signs or highway regulations in this present estimate.

As the hon. member knows, I am now speaking as the member for Leeds rather than the Minister, because the member for Leeds is very interested in the problem my hon. friend has mentioned. We have been discussing this sign problem both at the ministerial level and among the officials of the two departments. Some changes have been made which I think will certainly be of assistance to the tourist industry. Whether we will ever resolve all the problems having to do with highway signs to everybody's satisfaction I do not know, but I think that we are making progress and I hope we are going to make some further progress.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on vote 2101: One year ago the hon. Prime Minister appointed a committee to look into the economic ills of the Windsor area. The committee submitted its final report on November 15, and I understand in the report one of the recommendations is that the community that asked for the report be considered very highly as a tourist area. Has the hon. Minister's department seen that report? Has it studied the report? Has it any suggestions to make concerning that report?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would say simply that up until now it has never been the policy for this department to promote any specific area of the province to the exclusion of others. In other words, the department's job primarily is to promote all of Ontario. Through the regional councils which we set up in 1961 and the assistance given to them financially, this is considered to be their job. I would think as far as the Windsor region is concerned—and it has in the Essex-Kent region, particularly the Essex county association which is a very old one in terms of tourist promotion, a very effective agency in that group—it would be able to do a particularly good job in this field.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister still did not answer the question. You know, the Windsor area is apparently going to have to depend on tourism and conventions in an attempt to overcome some of the economic defects that it suffers from. Has the hon. Minister seen the report himself?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed that the particular recommendation that my hon. friend mentions has not been studied by our department, as yet.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Vote 2101 agreed to.

On vote 2102:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on vote 2102, I wonder if the hon. Minister might give us an up-to-date picture of the reorganization of his department which received considerable publicity last year. What is the new division of branches? Who are the new heads, and how many of the former heads are back with the department and in what capacities?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South was not at the tourist committee meeting a week ago when we went over the organization.

Reporting to the Minister directly are the archaeological and historic sites board, the theatres branch, and of course the deputy Minister and the Ontario - St. Lawrence Development Commission, as far as policy is concerned. Reporting to the Minister through the deputy Minister are the new travel research branch, and the director is Mr. D. R. Richmond; the archives division or the department of public records and archives, from which as my hon. friend knows the Archivist of Ontario reports to the Minister but the administrative part of the department of public records and archives is part of The Department of Travel and Publicity at the moment; the tourist industry development branch, and I just might say that the director of that, Mr. T. C. Clarke, has been taking his own advice—he is not with us this afternoon because he, I think, is marching up and down a room outside a maternity ward, so I hope there will not be too many questions about his branch this afternoon.

The advertising branch, the directorship of which is vacant at the moment although there are competitions going on in this field; the tourist promotion and information branch, again for which there is an in-service competition and about which we understand a de-

cision should reach us next week from the civil service commission; the publicity branch is directed by Mr. C. McDonald, and the administrative services branch, Mr. E. H. Johnston.

Mr. MacDonald: How many former branch heads are still with the department, and in what capacities?

Hon. Mr. Auld: All former branch heads are presently with the department. The former branch heads are in the same level of position that they were in previously as far as salary, but their branches were changed in the reorganization and their positions as heads of the new branches were not confirmed. In other words, they remained with the branch but there is a new senior position which has not yet been filled in these two cases. There are three—Mr. Hogarth, Mr. McHattie and Mr. Venn—who are all still with the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Finally, Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I have always been a bit mystified as to the exact relationship of the provincial archivist. Has not the provincial archivist traditionally been virtually in the position of a deputy Minister *vis-à-vis* the Minister, and does this still continue?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, the deputy provincial archivist is appointed by order-in-council as a deputy Minister would be. The department of public records and archives as far as I know, and I am far from an expert on this, has never had a deputy Minister. The senior civil servant has been the Archivist of Ontario, who is at the present time Mr. McOuat. He succeeded Dr. Spragge, I think the change was effective August 1963.

Vote 2102 agreed to.

On vote 2103:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on this vote 2103, first I would like to commend the hon. Minister on his department obtaining the services of Mr. Colin McDonald—I have had direct contact over the years with Mr. McDonald—and the hon. Minister's submission of the sum of \$48,500 here in publicity grants for editors, writers and visitors from the States. I think this is a fine peace of promotion, Mr. Minister, but in support of my hon. colleague, insofar as the outmoded liquor laws in this province are concerned, it is a standing joke among the 50 or 60 visiting editors to this country.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Why do they keep coming back then?

Mr. Sargent: You can pay their way back, first class, and they are all wonderful gentlemen and we are glad to have them. But it is a bit of hypocrisy on the part of the government to have, as the hon. Minister knows, 4,000 or 5,000 motel resorts in this great province of ours, all trying to stay in business with the freak laws the government continues to countenance. I think it behooves this department to take positive action on the part of these people who are trying to stay in business and give the Americans what they want when you bring them to this country. We have flogged this point many times before and I imagine the hon. Prime Minister is too good a politician to make a statement for the next few years, but I suggest to you that we are all laughing at you with the Americans, and wondering why you have not got the sense to do what you think is right.

Mr. Minister, on these beautiful submissions you have presented to us at X thousands of dollars of cost, I commend you for the quality of the work. In all seriousness, I think that there is a lot of duplication and a lot of fat here for the agencies and whoever you place this material with, but you will notice that all the contents of these, Mr. Chairman, are built around our beaches, our water resources, our beautiful lakes and our holiday resorts.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We are on 2103 and I believe you were referring to publications, which are in 2104. Order, please!

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on this item to do with the editors' tour, which the hon. member just mentioned. Really, I cannot join in the laughter he talked about there. It has been my pleasure to meet with these editors for a great number of years, I guess as long as they have been coming over here. I have met them all, I have been with them and I have yet—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear.

Mr. Cowling: Just a minute, we are talking on 2103. Sit down, relax.

Interjections by hon. members.

Some hon. members: We cannot hear you.

Mr. Cowling: Is this on? Shall I say that all over again, Mr. Chairman?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: They are on the wavelength? Okay. I thought I would just straighten out the new hon. member Mr. Chairman, that these editors from the States are not laugh-

ing at the Ontario liquor laws. As a matter of fact, they are overwhelmed with the hospitality provided by the hon. Minister and his department, and by the province of Ontario. I wanted to make that perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman. I have talked with dozens of these editors who have been on the tours, and never once have I heard anyone say anything about our liquor laws in the province of Ontario. They have nothing but the greatest compliments to make.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Speaking to a point of order, or perhaps I should speak to the vote I was on?

Mr. Cowling: Wait a minute! No, no, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: What is your point of order?

Mr. Sargent: The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. member is so wrong. It is a standing joke—

Mr. Chairman: This is not a point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the only point of order is they wanted bourbon instead of the rye here.

Mr. Chairman: Order! These are not the liquor estimates. Order! Order!

The member, if he will complete his remarks, should be certain he is referring to the newspaper editors—not the liquor question. Liquor, as related to these editors, and so on, may be one part of it, but I would suggest we keep to the subject of the estimates as shown in vote 2103.

Mr. Cowling: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will certainly abide by your ruling.

I was dealing with 2103, item 5—Ontario tours for editors, writers, and photographers, and special promotion.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): What has that got to do with liquor?

Mr. Cowling: Well, not anything, except that we did enjoy a sociable drink with the editors when they were here. I guess that is how it came up.

I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that these people are thrilled with the tours. I think the department is to be congratulated for these tours. I think the result of their newspaper work, on their return to their respective areas, telling about the wonders

of our great province here, brings thousands of additional tourists into the province. It is something I want to compliment the hon. Minister for; and as far as the sideplay by the hon. members is concerned, it really does not mean anything; because these people know what they want, they know a good thing when they see one, and they are just waiting to come back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for High Park—which vote are we on, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2103.

Mr. Sargent: All right. I am speaking to the brochure on publicity, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: That is not covered on 2103. Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I submit I have a right to speak on this vote.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2104 includes publications. We are on vote 2103, which does not include publications.

Vote 2103 carried?

Mr. Sargent: You cannot do that.

Mr. Chairman: You are not speaking on 2103.

Mr. Sargent: I was trying to make the hon. Minister get things moving and I want to speak on this.

Mr. Chairman: It is on 2104 you were trying to speak, instead of 2103.

Mr. Sargent: 2103.

Mr. Chairman: I have explained—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am very new in this House and I would like to see some order in the House when I am on my feet.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! When you are on your feet you can speak to the order the same as anyone else.

Vote 2104 includes the publications and on vote 2104 you can speak on publications. We are now speaking on 2103. Unless someone speaks to 2103, we will declare it carried. I am not saying you cannot speak on publications on 2104, which is the proper vote for that subject.

Mr. Troy: I am speaking on 2103, Mr. Chairman. I am speaking on the Ontario tours of editors.

Mr. Chairman: Good.

Mr. Troy: While the hon. member for Grey North mentioned the liquor laws, and the hon. member for High Park spoke about them, the editors did not have to worry because there were receptions for them everywhere. Those were not the ones to which the hon. member for Grey North referred.

In regard to the Ontario tours, sir, I suggest that in the department, when they are arranging their tours they always include the riding of Nipissing. I had the pleasure of being with them last year, and I saw them here in Toronto—they had been in a great number of places, in Ottawa, in the St. Lawrence Parks Commission, in the city of Toronto and all; and all of them remarked how they enjoyed the area of northern Ontario. It was so different from their own homeland and their own home states.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that, when his department is arranging its tours, it includes the district of Nipissing and its primeval beauty. I know, too, as was pointed out by the hon. member for High Park that in their own newspapers they paint the glories of Canada, because I have heard many times the editor of the San Marcos paper in Texas tell of how he just went into rhapsodies over the beauty of Ontario.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Did the hon. member ever investigate the Texas liquor laws?

Mr. Troy: Well, they must be big.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Vote 2103 agreed to.

Some hon. members: No, no!

Mr. Chairman: If the member is referring to publications again, he will do that in 2104.

On vote 2104:

An hon. member: We have no closures here.

Mr. Chairman: I gave the member the opportunity but he would not keep in order, so 2103 is now carried and we are on 2104.

An hon. member: Oh, no, you cannot do that.

Mr. F. B. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Your exaggerated remarks, even assuming that they had a basis in fact, were only directed against one hon. member. You cannot rule a vote carried because, in your judgment, one hon. member does not subscribe

to your theory of what is the practical disposition of this case. Surely there is something wrong—

Mr. Chairman: I would agree, sir, but on the other hand the other members were simply rising to support the one member who was out of order. They were not proceeding with the question itself. The member was rising in defence of the member for Grey North. If the member for Windsor-Walker-ville wishes to speak on 2103, he has the opportunity.

On vote 2103:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, has the department analyzed the results of the editors' tours, because in looking over the statistics as presented to us by the hon. Minister, apparently the only states with any substantial numbers of tourists who take advantage of our tourist reception centres are Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania—our bordering states? None of the others have any substantial number of tourists coming in.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): What about Minnesota?

Mr. Newman: Not at all, not in the least. I am taking the statistics as presented by the hon. Minister himself. Minnesota is away down the line. Leading the list is Michigan, coming second is New York, third is Ohio, fourth is Pennsylvania and fifth is Illinois, and Minnesota is away down there about twelfth.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is not very far down out of 48 states, is it?

An hon. member: It all depends on how far you want to go down.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. All we can do is report what happened. I do not really know how I can explain to the hon. member why the people who came in, came from the places they did. The report simply indicates that these are the states from which the largest number of people who came in for travel information, came.

Mr. Newman: I would say to the hon. Minister I would like his advertising to be concentrated in, and his editors to come from, the areas that are most advantageous to us. Apparently the five states that I have mentioned provided more tourists than did any of the other states, and possibly the hon. Minister should be concentrating his efforts in those states.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think, Mr. Chairman, if I might put it this way, that the largest tourist population that we have is within roughly a day's drive of our border points. This is about 45 million or 50 million people in the United States. We expect that the largest number of visitors will come from there since 98 per cent of all visitors come by automobile. We direct our major efforts in advertising promotion to those areas, both by newspaper, which is fairly simple, and by magazine which is a little more difficult. Not all magazines that we feel we should use in the United States have regional editions, and it is obviously very costly to advertise on a nation-wide basis when your major market is only a portion of it.

As far as the U.S. editors' tours are concerned, however, we have editors from all states, although the majority come from the bordering areas. One editor may come from a paper in Texas, but there are probably five who come from papers in each of Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania and New York, and perhaps some of the New England states.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, on vote 2103, in connection with the U.S. editors' tour, I believe these editors are all editors of weekly papers. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. I do not have the breakdown in front of me of those who have been in the tour in recent years. While I think perhaps the majority may be from weekly or bi-weekly, there are daily editors as well.

Mr. Paterson: The point I would like to make is that while they are here in Ontario, we host them in a first-class manner. But in the placing of the hon. Minister's advertising which comes up under the next item, it all goes into the dailies and periodicals and not into the weekly papers.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is not quite correct, Mr. Chairman. The newspaper advertising in the U.S. area is confined to dailies simply because we are advised—and I think this is correct—you get better coverage for your advertising dollar. On the other hand, we supply editorial material and we get excellent support from the editors of both the dailies and the weeklies and bi-weeklies whether we advertise in them or not.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2103 agreed to.

On vote 2104:

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, on 2104, I wanted to make some remarks. I think I am

in order on this vote. One thing about us fellows from Grey county is that we are going to have our say—we hope. We hope that we can be in order but whether we are or not, we are going to try. But on this vote I am sure that what I have in mind comes quite within the vote 2104.

In that vote, the hon. Minister is asking for almost \$1 million for advertising. This, I am sure he will agree, is the strong right arm that he employs—and properly so—to lure tourists into Ontario from the United States and from other provinces and from wherever we might gain tourists.

When you start advertising in the magazines and in the papers of the United States, I am sure the hon. Minister will agree with me that it is not clear sailing. You are up against pretty stiff competition, not only from other provinces in Canada but from other states in the union. There are a lot of jurisdictions that are out after the tourist dollar these days. We who would like to enjoy the privileges of being in a tourist camp in northern Ontario, have to make up our minds as to where we want to go basically on the sort of advertising that we see in the papers and in the magazines.

For a moment, if I might, I would like to be a United States citizen and to assume that in some way I have acquired—I have not any idea how I could do it, but assume that I have acquired—sufficient capital so that I feel my family could enjoy a holiday in Ontario or in some other part of Canada. I start looking in the United States magazines and newspapers to see what the different places have to offer. For instance, I find New Brunswick, which I think is an excellent advertisement. I am sure my hon. friend has seen it. On the baggage which the incoming chap is supposed to take with him you see a map of the province of New Brunswick and you see outstanding scenes that are depicted in good colour relating the life in New Brunswick and the things that the tourist can expect to find if he comes to that province.

When I look through the magazine further, I find that from the province of Quebec is what I think is an excellent advertisement in anyone's opinion. There is excellent colouring, and the language that describes the scenes that are depicted is moderate but enthusiastic. You can tell that they want you to come but they do not use slapstick methods. They use the well-accepted standards of telling the people of the United States that they are welcome in Quebec and it is a very dignified approach, it seems to me.

One then sees Alberta, which shows the

valley of the Ten Peaks and the Banff National Park, with the caption that "You must see it to believe it." That, I would say again, is an advertisement that would attract the tourists from the United States to come to the province of Alberta. What they say about the province is written very well. It is written very conservatively, if you want to use that term for a moment; it is written with the idea in mind that they who want to travel from the United States to some place in Canada would be likely to choose Alberta because of the picture and because of the language employed to describe that picture.

I am sure that the hon. Minister will agree that in the United States itself we have very active competition for the tourist dollar. The state I have in my mind of course, as the hon. Minister will recognize, is the state of Colorado. Now there is an excellent advertisement that describes for the mind's eye the things that can be seen in Colorado, if you go there to spend your tourist dollar.

Remember, I am still a citizen of the United States wanting to find a place to spend my holidays. I have a sort of idea that I would like to come to Ontario, so I look through the magazines until I find advertising that describes what is available in the province of Ontario and I find three advertisements that I want to discuss for a moment.

Here we have one where the man is paddling in an anaemic and bilious-looking canoe. The colouring on the canoe is indescribable. Really, I do not know how far they can get off from a natural colour. Two-thirds of the canoe has a sort of dirty red colour and the last third, if it ever was coloured, has now been washed off and so the canoe is really a bilious canoe. There is no question about that.

Go into the landscape that is behind the canoe and this would really capture the attention of anyone who wanted to find a place to go to spend his vacation. Here you have that pale blue background. I suppose it is supposed to be the Tory background, I do not know. If you look at it carefully you will see that there is no skyline at all—there is no sky, there is nothing but water. You know, Columbus had a hard time years ago. Columbus set out and all he could see for days was water, but he did have the sky above it and eventually he found land. This poor chap is indeed in worse circumstances than Columbus was. There is no sky. There is no evidence of land. He is a forlorn figure on this sea of blue and I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you and I being practical people

would hesitate to come to Ontario just because we saw that in a United States magazine. I think we would be almost afraid to come if we saw that in the picture section of the magazine. Under the picture is the caption. This, too, is good. It says: "Ontario is very big." That surely is improvisation that will be readily gobbled up by the people who want to come to Ontario. "Ontario is very big." Then in smaller letters under that, it says: "Bigger than Texas even."

So help me, Mary. We are not advertising Texas surely. The only distinction in this advertisement that meets the eye of the would-be chap coming into Ontario for a rest and a holiday is that in the comparison between Ontario and Texas. It is decreed by an Ontario writer that Ontario has the edge, just the edge, but in so setting out the fact that we are bigger than Texas, we are advertising Texas. And then it goes on to read—you know, the fellow who comes as a tourist not only looks at the picture but he reads how the picture is described—and this one starts off: "How about that?" That means bigger than Texas. "How about that?" Canadians making noises like Texans.

That will draw the people into this country, I am sure, by the thousands. But it goes on. There is one place here that I wanted to read. They tell us about the lakes in Ontario. I thought this stood out as an example of our desire and our ability to draw people unto us for a holiday and for leisure time. It says of the lakes:

They come in all shapes and sizes. Some are rocky and deep, others are shallow and sandy and dandy for the kids.

The point I want to make, of course, is that they come in all shapes and sizes. That will be a revelation not only to the would-be tourist, but to every person in this House, every member of this Legislature. We had the idea, I am sure, that every lake was the same size and the same shape, and to suggest to the American people that we have lakes that are different in size, different in depth—my, that should draw them to this country.

I have two or three more things to say that will be equally interesting. The second one is this one. You know this one, Mr. Chairman? This is the picture of a tree on the edge of the yellow sea. The water is yellow, a dirty yellow, but yellow nevertheless, and the tree is clinging perilously to the slopes of that yellow sea and one can visualize in his mind, I am sure, that all but this tree have gone. There had been others in the past that had been weaker and had fallen by the wayside but this one clings tenaciously to

life—so tenaciously that it is bent almost double into the yellow sea. Just the one left and it cannot survive.

A United States tourist looking at this picture, I think, would say to himself, "If we want to enjoy shade beneath this tree, we had better hurry because its life is not only in danger, but its days are numbered, and so we had better hurry if we want to get there." That is the second one.

The most important one, and the one I want to deal with for a moment, is the third one. In this one, all colour is gone; nothing but a gray mist. You cannot see a thing but a boat, if you look closely, and a chap fishing. He is out in the great unknown. I hope he makes port. I hope he gets back to shore, but there is no indication in the picture that there is any shore. But here is the thing that I want to bring to the attention of the House. We say this, from your department, Mr. Minister, in the third paragraph of the descriptive words that follow underneath this picture:

We are a neighbourly bunch up here and we would dearly like to have you fish with us this year. Why not fill in the coupon that we have included? We will send you back all the details that you will need to plan the damndest fishing trip you ever had.

Imagine, I do not know whether that is parliamentary even in this House, Mr. Chairman, but that is what it says. "We will send you back all the details that you will need to plan the damndest fishing trip you ever had." Now they tell me that an examination of the dictionary would indicate that the damndest fishing you ever had means that you do not get any good fishing at all—there is none. But I do not think that is the thought that is meant to be conveyed by this.

On the bottom of this, underneath the crest of Ontario, is the thing that the chap sends in when he is interested in coming to the province of Ontario. I mean he has been persuaded by that. Yes, he has seen it, he has been conquered, and he says we will go to Ontario. And so he fills in this thing at the bottom. This, Mr. Prime Minister, if you have never heard this, will impress you.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I am listening. I have not heard this before.

Mr. Oliver: It says this: "Dear Gang." Gang! That is the hon. Minister and his cohorts. "Dear Gang."

An hon. member: The happy gang.

Mr. Oliver: "We have found you out and we are coming. Dear gang! Saw your ad fellows, and I am intrigued. How about sending me along your fishing information? I am anxious to plan the damndest fishing trip that I ever had." Then as a postscript, it says: "I am very big on Ontario." What in the world that means I would not know. He has never been there presumably, but from a distance he says he is very big on Ontario. But he says, "I am anxious to plan the damndest fishing trip I have ever had."

Seriously, and I say this seriously, Mr. Chairman, I have never known advertising to go out—supposed to be from the department here in Toronto—to the United States to lure people into this great province, that was so devoid of a real appeal as these ads that I have just discussed this afternoon. I suggest to the hon. Minister this, and I say it most seriously, that I suppose we will get tourists this year, but I would say without reservation that if we get them, it will be in spite of these ads rather than because of them.

I want to know from the hon. Minister as we proceed in this, some of the facts. I want to give full credit to those who are responsible for these creations that I have discussed these last few moments, and I want the hon. Minister to tell me what agency placed this advertising. I want to know what official has the responsibility of dealing with the agency and with approving finally all the media, copy and art work before it is released for publication. I want to know what has been the cost of these ads to the people of the province of Ontario. I want to know also, did the department supply the photographs that are in these pictures? I almost hope that my hon. friend says no. But if they did not supply the photographs then how much did the agency charge for the photographs as an extra charge?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I must say that my hon. friend took a long time to get around to what he wanted to ask about, but I would just tell him this, that the ad must be effective because it is the first time I recall in nine years that anybody discussed the advertising programme, and one of the purposes, of course, of advertising, is to attract the attention of people.

My hon. friend carried on for some few moments about ads in other jurisdictions. I am not familiar with all of them, but from looking at them here, it is pretty hard to tell which one is which. I would suggest to him that perhaps while I am not familiar with the exact ad from which he was reading—and I would appreciate it if he would send them

over here—those who are looking in travel magazines certainly would have had their attention drawn by the ads to which he referred, if I might say so, disparagingly.

I cannot give my hon. friend all the information asked for. The two agencies which I presume prepared these ads would be James Lovick and McConnell Eastman. I could not say the cost of them until we obtain from the agency the cost of the space rates in these media. The official responsible would be the acting director of the branch at the time, I would presume, but I want to check that before I give it to my hon. friend officially.

I am curious to see the other ad. The photographs, I am informed, were not taken by my department, but I would be interested in seeing the other ad he has because I think he will find if he looks at them again that they all look pretty much the same.

Quite aside from any comments he might have, I must say I enjoyed the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I had rather an idea when he started as to what he was leading up to and it was rather interesting to see how long it would take before he got there. I must say I do not see much difference between Colorado and Alberta, or the others. I thank my hon. friend for sending these over. As I say, I rather think that ours stand out and the response we have had this afternoon is excellent proof of this.

As I started to say, I think the early indications of the response we are going to have from this programme show that we are going to have more inquiries than we have had heretofore, and in the final analysis I think this is the proof of any programme, Mr. Chairman.

I will get for my hon. friend the actual details of the questions he asks; I apologize for not having them at the moment but the official who might have them here, as I say, is involved in a rather important errand this afternoon. We will try to have this tomorrow.

Mr. Oliver: Did the hon. Minister say these pictures were from his own department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, I am informed they are not.

Mr. Oliver: They are not?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Oliver: That is a help anyway.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, we are speaking, I understand, to vote 2104. We have a joint budget there of several million dollars

for consideration. In most large business concerns, as the hon. Minister knows, large agencies are asked to bid or to show cause why they should get the contract. In other words, big agencies put on highly competitive programmes to sell Lever Brothers or Imperial Oil on the right to handle their contract. I would suggest in this budget here, where the agency receiving this contract would get in effect \$170,000 net per year to produce such falderol as the hon. leader of the Opposition has shown today, that it is an insult to our intelligence to ask the taxpayers to go for this, because as the hon. Minister agreed in his reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, could I just interrupt my hon. friend—did he say \$170,000?

Mr. Sargent: I figured 15 and two, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was just wondering how he could reach that figure because the media advertising total is \$490,000.

Mr. Sargent: Joint publication and advertising, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The publications are not done through an agency, Mr. Chairman. Most of the publications produced by the department are done directly by the department through the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Sargent: Then, we are talking about \$70,000. I doubt if there are many publication ads not prepared through an agency. I cannot understand, if this true, and we are kind of mixed up here in my general instructions, what they are asking for an ad for The Department of Highways in the current issue for February, 1964, of *Civic Administration*. Here is the ad. I want to ask the hon. Minister if he paid for this ad? Did his department pay for the ad? The DHO did not pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, without seeing the ad itself, I could not say, but if it is an ad which has The Department of Highways name on it—

Mr. Sargent: It certainly has.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and was placed by The Department of Highways, it would be out of its budget.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that allotting this contract, and I would not suggest it was allotted with any political thought

in mind to an agency, is like giving them a blank cheque for a performance like this today. In this regard, the Chairman will probably correct me, but we have in our presentations here, great areas of water. In submitting this—Mr. Chairman, you will rule on this, please—if you tell people through a publication that we have all these beautiful beaches in Ontario and we have an emergency situation insofar as our water levels are concerned—if the Chairman will not allow me to discuss it under this section, what section in Tourism and Information would he suggest I discuss it under? Until the Chairman rules me out of order I will continue on the need for someone to take a hand—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I did not rule you out of order in discussing publications on vote 2104 where you are now privileged to discuss them, but I did rule you out of order in discussing them on 2103.

Mr. Sargent: That gives me a very wide field and I thank you for allowing me to continue. It is a serious situation, Mr. Chairman, that the beaches in Lake Huron and Georgian Bay—

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): We looked after them earlier today.

Mr. Sargent: I must apologize, I was not in the House if they were, Mr. Chairman. But I think it is a focal point in tourism to have our beaches in the state that they could be in. I will close this off briefly by saying to the hon. Minister that this is a problem confronting tourists. We are negating the industrial aspect of this, Mr. Minister, the fact that our lake levels are down to the lowest they have been in 100 years. I think that someone in this province, whether it is your department, Mr. Minister, or the policy of the government, will have to say to Ottawa that this problem must be corrected.

I will go further than that, it goes back to the water resources, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart). It would seem to be logical that lower lake levels also mean a great lowering of the entire water table of underground rivers, streams and reservoirs that currently service our farms and communities. Last summer the drought was felt badly in many southwestern Ontario areas, as you know. You put through special legislation for it.

But these pictures show water at a high level, Mr. Chairman, and taking this thing to its final conclusion, when we see these ads that the hon. leader of the Opposition has submitted to you, for drawing people here,

I think it is stretching it very far. It is a bit of misrepresentation to show these beautiful lakes when we do not have facilities to get to them in thousands. I submit that all joking aside, someone in this province, and I suggest to the hon. Minister it might be a good starting point in his department, is going to have to say to Ottawa, that it must close these drains in Sarnia and put up dams that will put our water levels back to what they should be, because it is affecting shipping. In Collingwood they cannot launch their boats. In Owen Sound, the ships cannot get into our harbour, because of the low lake level. You have been very patient, Mr. Chairman, but someone will have to make a stand and I suggest to the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister that they take a stand immediately to direct Ottawa to give us some sort of help in this regard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2104 agreed to.

On vote 2105:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have a series of points on 2105. Shall we continue until 6 o'clock?

Mr. Chairman, I would wish the departments, when they put out any of their publications, that they have them proofread a little more carefully than they do. I can specifically refer to four different errors on three different publications and one of them could be most embarrassing.

For example, in the publication, *Coming Events in Ontario*, it lists under January to November, 1964: June 29 to July 2, the International Freedom Festival in Windsor. It could not be international if it did not include July 4. This is a slight on our American friends because this is a joint effort on the part of Windsor and Detroit-Canada and the U.S.—and it is a July 1-July 4 affair.

Another in there is September 5 and 7, Windsor-Detroit Firefighters' Field Day. There is no Detroit at all involved in this. It is the Windsor Firefighters' Field Day, and Agricultural Fair. Then there are several others that have come in the *Travel News*. I will not bother reading them at all, but someone in that department should be a little more careful. I have five different errors in here. It should be proofread by someone.

Now I wanted to get onto a different phase of—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I might just comment on my hon. friend's question about errors.

Unfortunately, errors do creep in because these things are done by people, but the coming events information which the department publishes is published by and large, and I think almost entirely, based on the information sent in to us by various groups, chambers of commerce, organizations, fraternal organizations and so on.

There are two complaints which we receive. One is that sometimes the information is inaccurate. I cannot tell my hon. friend at the moment about the two items which he mentioned, whether that is our error or the error of those sending in the information, but we certainly try, and I think with success, to be accurate.

The other point of course is that occasionally information is late reaching us and we are unable to publish it. Consequently, we are in the process of changing our system a bit so that instead of going ahead about six or seven months in the publications, we will perhaps have three a year instead of one or two, and have a later closing date for the receipt of information to try to keep the information more current and as full as possible.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on that same point too, I think that the events for a whole year are a little too much to list. I think if it came through for just a month, it would be far more satisfactory, and then if there was some mistake you could correct it in a following issue.

The next point is concerning tourist promotion. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister to consider the use of a caravan or a trailer fully equipped with a motion picture projector and anything that would be necessary to visibly portray Ontario, and to take this trailer, or trailers if necessary, throughout the bordering states in the U.S. in an effort to sell this province. Today we have to go to the people rather than have them come to us, and I think if we had such a trailer parked, let us say, for one day in Cleveland in one of the parks, the following day we could follow through and go into, probably Toledo, and the day after that we might go into South Bend. By covering states that are fairly close to the U.S. border, we could substantially increase the number of tourists that would be attracted into Ontario.

On the second suggestion, I would like the department to consider a greater use of border cities. I will refer to Niagara Falls, New York, Buffalo and Detroit. Conventions are held in these larger municipalities and if The Department of Tourism and Information

would only see to it that one of its staff officers attended these conventions, or had a display booth at the conventions, you could attract a sizeable number of tourists. I know the hon. Minister this year did co-operate on one such venture with Detroit at the Cobo Hall and I have heard numerous very complimentary comments concerning that. I think if it was good once, it would probably be good if emulated more than one time.

I can understand that this may be little costly and as a result the hon. Minister may have to draw back and not expand the programme to the extent that he would like to. But I think the idea of taking advantage of conventions that are held in these larger centres, especially when they are border towns, has some merit. Likewise, the use of a trailer or a caravan that could park in any one of the parks in the large U.S. centres and in the evening show motion pictures to the residents, portraying just exactly what this province Ontario has to offer them.

It is very, very surprising to go simply 200 miles south of Windsor into Cincinnati and find the people there know absolutely nothing—I should not say “nothing,” but very little concerning what we have north of their border. I would sincerely hope that the hon. Minister will keep these two suggestions in mind and attempt, after some fashion, to implement them. I think they are worthwhile.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly. I am informed that the matter of a trailer, suggested by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, has been discussed in the department previously. I have not had an opportunity to find out why the decision was reached. I can undertake to tell him that we will look into this again.

As far as supplying attendants at conventions is concerned, as the hon. members I think are aware, the department exhibits and displays at the major sportsmen's shows, which we have found to be very effective. And whenever possible, and when we have the staff available, we are happy to have them go to places in the U.S. and take part, either as representative of Ontario where Ontario people are attending, or on behalf of the tourist industry to promote the province. I can assure him that when we are able to expand, and as we are able to expand this programme, we will.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, one other item on this. I would suggest that the department should put, or have published in newspapers, weekend tours which could be taken by an individual. Maybe they do. But I

look back at my own area; within 12 hours' drive of my community, 90 million people reside; within five hours' drive there are 50 million who could be enticed; within one hour's drive there are four million people who could be encouraged to cross that border. If weekend tours were published in the local newspapers—it might have to be an American newspaper—you could encourage those tourists to come in and, say, spend a Saturday and a Sunday making a circle tour—through Windsor, down as far as Niagara Falls maybe, crossing the border there, and circling back by way of the American side; or maybe going only as far as London, up into Sarnia and back home.

For another suggestion, too, I would recommend greater advertising concerning hostels, because not everyone has the financial wherewithal to travel by car. We would be benefiting our younger people, and educating them at the same time, if we gave a little more publicity to encourage hostel travelling by the younger generation.

The third is that the department should probably assist communities in new types of ventures. I am specifically referring to the smelt fishing season in the Lake Erie area. When the smelt do run it is nothing unusual to see 10,000 fishermen lined up, one next to the other—they are practically shoulder to shoulder all along the beaches at Point Pelée. It is a sight which, unless you see it, you will not believe at all. It is a thing which could be made into a fairly substantial and interesting tourist attraction, for not only the Ontario residents, but also for the individual across the border.

For the last suggestion, I think our ads should stress that the American dollar is \$1.08 in Canada, that the American travelling here now has an eight per cent advantage over the Canadian.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, we will be glad to look at the hon. member's suggestions. In connection with the last one, this is being done, and will be in subsequent ads. One of the problems though, as far as both newspapers and magazines are concerned, particularly magazines, is the long lead time between the time copy has to be submitted and the publication is on the newsstands.

In the past, the mention of the exchange rate was not made in these media. We are, in effect, taking a calculated risk in case somebody decides to change this rate. We would then be having ads appearing which were inaccurate. But we decided that this was worthwhile because it is a very great attraction.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister make some comment on the weekend tours?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We now publish booklets and pamphlets giving suggested tours for both weekend, week, and two-week periods. One of the things we propose to be doing through the publicity branch, in other words, with editorial support, is the provision of more articles on suggested motor trips, both weekend and longer, to the daily and weekly papers in the surrounding areas, something along the lines that the *Toronto Telegram* has done very successfully in recent years—you know, in the fall, suggested tours to see the colours; and in the spring, to see the buds in the Niagara peninsula; and around Ottawa the tulips, and so on. This kind of material is supplied to media from our publicity branch with, perhaps, photographs and cut-lines and so on.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, I mean a little more than actually what you have suggested. The *Detroit Free Press* carries a tour which you can take every weekend. You may leave the city of Detroit, and maybe go up to Port Huron, cross at Sarnia and then come back to Windsor. The following week you might go up to the Straits of Mackinac and back. They have one each week. I do not think it is a paid ad; I think the nature editors put them in on their own. But I would say that they are supplied by the travel and publicity department of the state of Michigan. I think a thing like this does have a lot of merit, especially as far as attracting our American tourists over is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I was not quite clear. That is what we plan to be able to do. I do not know if it will be every week or not, it will depend on staff and other commitments, but this kind of material will be prepared in the publicity branch and distributed to the media.

Vote 2105 agreed to.

On vote 2106:

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister: Does he not think there is a great duplication of effort by the various tourists' organizations in the province of Ontario? I am thinking of my own area in particular, where there are numerous organizations in the county of Bruce. These organizations are cemented together by a Bruce county organization, and then we have the Georgian Bay Development Association, which also tries to help out with tourist in-

dustry. Then we have a regional development association, and I have heard several of the secretaries of the local organizations say that, in their opinion, there is a great overlapping of tourist organizations attempting to get business in their various localities. I have a feeling that this happens in other parts of Ontario, too, and I would be anxious to hear the hon. Minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, without going into the whole province, I think it is true that in some areas there may be more organizations involved in some facet or other of the tourist industry than perhaps is necessary.

It is rather difficult, of course, inasmuch as this department has no control over people who want to form any sort of an organization. It is rather difficult to—

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, as an example, the regional associations were started just lately. This government also started the development associations, and I agree with this but it seems to me that perhaps these regional associations are not doing any good other than financing—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, perhaps my hon. friend stepped out for a few minutes. I spoke about this a little earlier on, this afternoon. We are getting the two groups together to attempt to set out between them some sort of a division line and share responsibility. The area development associations have a much broader basis than the regional tourist councils. The area development associations are concerned with all kinds of development—particularly industrial development. The tourist councils are only concerned about the tourist industry itself, and in a smaller area.

Generally speaking, the areas have been set up to conform geographically to the same kind of attractions, or the same series of attractions and common interests. In this connection, I am sure that there have been occasions when there might have been duplications which could have, or should have, been avoided. As I mentioned earlier, we have a project, in a sense, scheduled for April in Peterborough to get the two groups together to work out, we hope, a dividing line so that they can work together and be even more effective than either group could be singly.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, what is the regional tourist council of the James Bay frontier?

Hon. Mr. Auld: What was the first part?

Mr. Troy: Who makes up the regional council of the James Bay frontier?

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner).

Mr. Troy: Does the grant go to the Ontario Northland Railway?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend is concerned about the area, it is shown in one of the folders on his desk—

Mr. Troy: No, no, I just want to know who—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Who the—

Mr. Troy: Yes, the personnel of the regional council.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I have not the names of the officers of the association with me. As I recall, the president is Mr. Peter Hughes of Cochrane. He is president of that association. If my hon. friend wants a list of all the members—

Mr. Troy: No. He is a long way away from James Bay.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Troy: Mr. Hughes is a long, long way from James Bay.

One more question, sir. Does the Nipissing regional council get any grant from—I do not notice the district of Nipissing—it is not mentioned in the public accounts. I could not find it, sir.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The council—

Mr. Troy: The regional council.

Hon. Mr. Auld: For 1963-64 it has applied for and received \$5,000.

Mr. Troy: Did it get any the year before; in 1962-63?

Hon. Mr. Auld: According to records which I have, it received the maximum grant of \$5,000 in fiscal 1961-62. It received nothing in 1962-63 and it has received the maximum in 1963-64.

Mr. Troy: Could it not apply in 1962-63?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed it did not apply.

Mr. Troy: There is something wrong with it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two points on this vote that I would like to raise. I am in your hands. It will take five minutes or so, or do you wish to call it a day?

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go to the order paper. There are some second readings and bills in committee, some bills that I would like to clear in order that they will get Royal Assent before we adjourn for Easter. We will also resume the Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, March 20, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Friday, March 20, 1964

Statement re The Police Act, Mr. Robarts	1838
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	1839
Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	1839
Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading ..	1840
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	1840
Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grants Act, 1960-1961, bill to repeal, Mr. Davis, second reading	1840
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	1840
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	1840
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	1840
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	1840
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	1840
Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	1840
Hospitals Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	1840
Gasoline Handling Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	1841
Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	1841
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading	1841
City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1841
Town of Thorold, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1841
City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1841
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, second reading	1841
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, second reading	1841
Industrial Safety Act, 1964, bill intituled, reported	1841
Industrial Standards Act, bill to amend, reported	1844
Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, bill to amend, reported	1848
Plant Diseases Act, bill to amend, reported	1848
Killarney Recreational Reserve Act, bill to amend, reported	1848
Trees Act, bill to amend, reported	1848
Crown Timber Act, bill to amend, reported	1848
Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	1849
Department of Agriculture Act, bill to amend, reported	1849
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, reported	1849
Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Eagleson, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Thompson	1851
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Thompson, agreed to	1858
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1858

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1964

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from William Tredway Public School, Scarborough; and, later on, in the west gallery, students from John G. Althouse Public School, Islington.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order which I think is of extreme importance.

I have never, in my 38 years in the Legislature, witnessed the concern and the anger the people of the province have expressed over the introduction of the police bill last night.

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment. I would remind the leader of the Opposition that we are only on motions at the present time. Perhaps the point of order raised would be better taken a little later when we get through the routine proceedings?

Mr. Oliver: You will give me the first opportunity, will you not?

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wanted to make a statement—

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order again, I was speaking to a point of order, which you asked me to delay until the proper opportunity arose in the proceedings of the House. I will bow to your ruling—

Mr. Speaker: With all deference to the leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Oliver: —but surely I can continue that point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I understand a point of order can be raised at any time, with perhaps the exception of during the routine proceedings.

Regarding a statement before the orders of the day, I should have knowledge of it. The Prime Minister has given me notice that he wants to make a statement before the orders of the day. The leader of the Opposition has not given me any notice of making a statement before the orders of the day. There is just that little difference between a point of order and a statement before the orders of the day.

Mr. Oliver: Yes, there is this very vital difference, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you will appreciate. A point of order has precedence over a statement, and on that point of order I want to continue and say this to the House—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): What is the point of order?

Mr. Oliver: It is a point of order. I am stating the point of order. Listen! You are usually more patient than you seem to be this morning.

The point of order is this: I am asking the hon. Prime Minister, as a person and as an individual and as the Prime Minister of this province, to remove from the order paper the iniquitous legislation which was introduced last night and which is an affront to the rights of every individual in this province. For decades and for centuries, Mr. Speaker, we have—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would like to raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would—

Mr. Oliver: —given as a safeguard for individuals, and in one fell swoop this legislation wipes out all these safeguards. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister withdraw this legislation from the order paper, or dissolve the House for a general election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

With all due deference to the leader of the Opposition, I do not think that he is speaking to a point of order.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): There could not be anything more important than—

Mr. Speaker: Order! If the Prime Minister wants to speak to the supposed point of order, he may do so; or he may speak to the statement that he wished to make before the orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. leader of the Opposition has accomplished his purpose, and I will not speak to what is obviously not a point of order at all. But I will make the statement I had proposed to make, and of which I gave you notice, sir, that I would make before the orders of the day.

Of course, the statement that I make concerns the provisions of the bill amending The Police Act, which was given first reading yesterday. I felt that I should speak to the House because I have been questioned by the press, and I have made statements to them which I think should be made at the earliest opportunity to the Legislature.

I told the press, Mr. Speaker, that I, personally, would not tolerate any legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes the personal rights and freedom of an individual.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! I am not going to have any more of this shouting across the floor. If the members opposite want to ask the Prime Minister a question when he is making a statement, they may rise and do so; but I do not want direct shouting across the floor, in a chorus.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will just repeat that I have already told the press that I, personally, would not tolerate any legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes the basic, fundamental, personal rights and freedoms of the individuals of this province. I also told the press that this legislation, if it does jeopardize or infringe these rights, will be changed.

I can assure the House before any further action is taken on this bill it will be completely re-examined in the light of what I have just said.

I might say, sir, that I consider that I am, in expressing this personal opinion, expressing a feeling which will be shared by all the hon. members of this Legislature, regardless of party affiliation.

I might say, in connection with crime detection and the whole matter of crime in the province, we have had various bodies looking at it in the last two or three years; and the whole problem of crime, in my opinion, has got somewhat out of perspective. However, we did not feel perhaps, in submitting the police report yesterday in full, that this was necessarily a good thing. On the other hand, we knew full well that if we were to suppress any part of it we would be criticized for so doing.

This comes about in an attempt to give us the means by which we can get at the problem of crime, its detection, its control, and its suppression in this province. This must be the paramount interest of the government. Perhaps, when this legislation was brought forward, it was directed at control of crime. If it has these side effects—of course, as I have said, they are completely repugnant to me; and I think they are completely repugnant to all of us—we will have to attempt to find another way of dealing with the problem of crime.

I believe a question has been filed here. Frankly, this legislation will go to committee and I would like to see it most thoroughly discussed there. I would like to see every facet of it examined, and I would like the public and the hon. members of this House to understand the real problem we face—the problem of controlling the criminal element in our population and, at the same time, preserving for the individual, the rights, the privileges he has by law and by custom. These are the two elements involved, and we must find a way to do both these things, to accomplish both these purposes. This legislation, I hope, will receive the very closest scrutiny and investigation, in order that we may devise the best means possible of accomplishing our aims.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, may I make an observation or two in respect of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister? I would think that is in order, even under a strict interpretation of the rules.

Mr. Speaker: I doubt if it is in order, but I will allow the member—

Mr. Oliver: Within the shadow of your doubts, may I just say a word or so? We have witnessed, this morning, quite a spectacle on the government benches. We have my hon.

friend saying, and I believe him, that he will not stand for anything which is offensive to a person in respect to his liberties before the law.

On the other side of him, yesterday, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Cass), who is absent on purpose, perhaps, this morning—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He is keeping an engagement which he has had for some time, in the Royal York Hotel. I think he will be here later on this morning.

Mr. Oliver: Well, at least, he is absent. Yesterday he introduced a bill which openly does the things with which the hon. Prime Minister says he will not be associated with. Was this bill caucused? Is this Cabinet solidarity? Do you agree on the bill? What kind of legislation are we getting from this government? I ask my hon. friend to be of one mind. His right hand does not know what his left hand is doing over there.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I am sorry, I think perhaps that before the orders of the day we have now gone far enough with this particular statement.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, with deference, you permitted the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. Prime Minister to make a statement. If the rules—

Mr. Speaker: I will permit the member to ask a question of the Prime Minister on the subject. Is that the member's wish?

Mr. MacDonald: I have no question to ask. I want to make a brief comment in keeping with the privileges that have been extended to the other two parties.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, if the hon. member would like—

Mr. Speaker: I must say that it is really not in accordance with the rules of the House, but since we have stretched the rules a little bit this morning, I will allow the member a few minutes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I shall not abuse the privilege you have given me. I just want to say two or three things.

One, the spectacle we have seen on the government side in the last day or so is a pretty unseemly one and it is obvious that the government itself, at least at this hour, recognizes it.

The second, and equally important point, is that I hope we are not going to play politics

with this issue. While I agree that it is desperately serious that the basic rights of individuals should be threatened in the fashion that they were, there is another threat that is almost as great. As the Royal commission says, there is another government in operation in this province and it is the government of organized crime. I hope that the government will pursue with continued vigour an alternative, and an acceptable proposition as, obviously, what they have presented is not acceptable.

So the initial onus is on them to come up with an acceptable proposition as to how we can cope with the frustrations that we have experienced in the last year or so, in both court and Royal commission, in trying to get at the facts.

Let us not lose sight of this almost equally important problem; because in the long run, it is a threat to the welfare of the community. I am just a little saddened by the willingness to play politics on the part of some people who a year ago were desperately disturbed with organized crime and now have forgotten about it completely.

Mr. Singer: What utter nonsense!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. Annual report of the Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology, June 1, 1962 to May 31, 1963.
2. Annual report of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission for the year ending October 31, 1963.
3. Report of the Minister of Education for the calendar year, 1963.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General) begs leave to present to the House the annual report of the Commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police from January 1, 1963 to December 31, 1963.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a short explanation of the purpose of this bill is attached in the explanatory notes. The new subsections are

to make it clear that The Public Service Act and The Public Service Superannuation Act apply to the members of the Ontario Municipal Board.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL WORKS ASSISTANCE ACT, 1963

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE RESIDENTIAL AND FARM SCHOOL TAX ASSISTANCE GRANTS ACT, 1960-61

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 86, An Act to repeal The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grants Act, 1960-61.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill No. 92, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-62

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITALS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member want to speak to the bill?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments in the nature of raising some questions that can be discussed either now or at a later time.

As I understand the general purpose of the bill, it is to reduce the so-called hospital tax, which is in effect an amusement tax, a tax on amusements. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. Provincial Treasurer is in a position to give any assurance to the House that any benefits that accrue from this reduction of taxes accrue to the consumer, to the user of the services; or will it become incorporated into a higher admission charge for the benefit of the person who is providing the services?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is very difficult to make a definite statement in this regard. In many instances the benefit will accrue to the person who pays the admission; in some others it may not. That is a frank statement.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE GASOLINE HANDLING ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Gasoline Handling Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PHARMACY ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy Resources) moves second reading of Bill No. 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park), in the absence of Mr. J. H. White (London South), moves second reading of Bill No. Pr13, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF THOROLD

Mr. Cowling, in the absence of Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland), moves second reading of Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting the town of Thorold.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. Cowling moves second reading of Bill No. Pr17, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr34, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order: committee of the whole House; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

THE INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 3, The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, before section seven is carried, I would like again to raise a protest with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) and with the government as to the apparent inadequacy of their plans for inspection.

I am not going to go over what we discussed in committee of supply, but it appears from the information given there that the government has in mind only a very modest increase in the inspection staff which will be charged with the responsibility of assuring compliance with this Act, if and when it is passed. I am going to make it plain, to the government and to the hon. Minister that they should reconsider their plans in that connection.

Section seven is really the key to the whole bill. The bill is fine, in most respects at any rate, as it stands. It looks very good; but I am submitting to the government that unless there is adequate inspection it is little more than a piece of window dressing. I think we have found that by experience with The Construction Safety Act, which as a piece of legislation, as words printed on a piece of paper, looks fine, but in actual experience has had little if any effect in reducing construction accidents.

I am submitting to the government that this bill under their present plans will be in exactly the same category. It will look fine on paper, it will be a nice piece of window dressing; but unless something more is done in exercising the powers conferred under section seven of the bill, it will be largely window dressing and will not make any significant difference in the accident situation in the province.

I would say that the old Factory Shop and Office Building Act, out of date as it was in

many respects, adequately enforced, would be far better than this new up-to-date bill inadequately enforced. I think this is the sort of situation with which we are faced.

Before this bill completes its full progress through this House, I would again appeal to the government to reconsider its plans as far as the implementation of section seven is concerned.

Sections 7 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 10:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, on section 10, has the hon. Minister taken into consideration recommendations as submitted to him by industry?

In my own local community the suggestion by one of the industries was that in section 10(1) if "any person" means an employee of the employer, we can foresee many potential abuses. If the section were to be amended to imply that "any person" was a person in responsible charge, a member of supervision or of company management, then this organization's objections would be clear. Has this been taken into consideration?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Of what organization is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. Newman: This is the Hiram Walker Limited.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: First, legislation which involves inspections, as the hon. member for Woodbine has pointed out today and on other occasions, can only be efficient if the intentions of the Act are properly carried out. Now, on the point this hon. member raises—he is speaking with reference to section 10—there are situations where the intentions of the Act can only be carried out for the protection of those in the work forces of this province, if power exists to take appropriate action on the spot. This is the first year of this bill, of this revision, and I would think that we will all have to take a look at the general intentions of this legislation and assume that there are some *bona fides* within the department itself. During our debate on the estimates, we went into this question of intention of inspectors and the need for accident prevention and so on. These matters were thoroughly debated at that time.

As I said on that occasion, and I will repeat it now, I think this has in mind the intent, and what is trying to be established. And, bearing in mind the reasonableness of it, we will require at least, certainly, this

coming year to see how this section operates. I have pointed out before, with respect to legislation which is reviewed or revamped or updated, however you might wish to describe it, that in the application of that kind of legislation with reference to its suitability—(a) its application and (b) its suitability with respect to the times in which we live—we must not approach these amendments with any great degree of adamancy until a period of at least a year has gone by to see how the section works out.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the hon. Minister. Were I on the committee on labour I would have presented this to him at the time the bill was discussed in that committee; but I thought it would be only proper to bring it up on the floor of the House now.

Sections 10 to 17, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 18:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in section 18, likewise from the same organization, their comments are that no provision is being made for appeal in the act of revocation on the part of the Minister. They feel, sir, that machinery for the right of appeal should be included. Would the hon. Minister care to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This has been discussed at committee.

Sections 18 to 21, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 22:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was two pages ahead of you when I got up before. It is section 22 to which I would like to make some reference. Unfortunately, I am not a member of the standing committee which reviewed this bill and I have to rely on hearsay as to what happened in the committee. But, as I understand it, either under this section or some related section, the question was raised in the committee as to a method of protecting an employee—who, for good and sufficient reason, refuses to work on a machine which is unsafe—in the event that he is disciplined by his employer for the refusal.

The information I have, as to the position the hon. Minister took in the committee, was that he would look into this matter. It would appear that, if he has looked into it, he has not come up with any answer to the problem; or, alternatively, he does not consider the problem is urgent enough to require any special treatment. I would suggest to him

that there is a real problem here. It will be an offence under section 22 for any person to use or operate a machine, device or thing, in or about an industrial establishment, in an unsafe manner or a manner which does not comply with the regulations. It is also an offence, or will be an offence, for a person to operate or use a machine or other device which he has reasonable cause to believe is unsafe.

I think that is a sound provision. I do not think anyone, either an employer—let me put it this way, I do not think an employer should require an employee to operate a machine he considers to be unsafe; and I do not think the employee should operate it. I also do not think an employee should operate a machine in an unsafe manner. But what if his boss tells him he must operate the machine, or he must operate it in a certain way, and if he does not, he will be fired? As far as I can see, he has no redress.

Admittedly, there is a certain problem here; an employee could refuse to operate a machine for no good reason. But if he refuses to operate a machine, and if he can show that he had good reason for refusing to operate it—or alternatively, that he had good reason for refusing to operate it in a certain way that was dangerous—then I think there should be some specific protection for him. He should have some reasonably simple remedy. Otherwise, he will find himself in the unenviable position, where he is not only endangering himself and perhaps others, but he has, I think it is, Hobson's choice that he can either break the law or be fired.

I do not know what further consideration the hon. Minister gave to this matter, but I believe it is a valid point and one on which it would be desirable to take some action.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the hon. member is, frankly, one which I think is well taken—the point that there is an area here of reasonableness, or otherwise. It is in that definitive nature of the interpretation of reasonableness that the problem will probably lie, if it does. We know that most people are reasonable and responsible people; accordingly, we are really directing our attention, in many of these matters, to the minority where the trouble areas may exist.

At the committee, this matter was raised and was discussed. I undertook at the committee to apply myself, and to give my own personal attention, to the operation of this section; because it is not our intention to give the right to a supervisor, or management side employee, to arbitrarily exercise his discre-

tion in a way that is unfair and not according to the Act. Nor, on the other hand, is it our intention in the department, and I would think in the House, to stand by and see an unreasonable interpretation applied by an employee—both examples on both sides acting in an arbitrary way.

I can see no other solution to this situation than to go ahead and direct our attention to this very problem; then, against our experience during the coming year, such amendments, in more specific form if needed, will be advanced. But, in the meantime, I will give this particular section my personal attention.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question of the hon. Minister? He is a lawyer—I realize it is not his function, in his ministerial capacity, to interpret the law but may I inquire of him what remedy—as the bill now stands, assuming it becomes law—an employee would have who, for good and sufficient reason, refused to work and was fired? I quite agree with the hon. Minister that this is ultimately a matter of reasonableness; and if an employee refuses to accept an order, then it will be incumbent upon him to demonstrate somehow or other, that he had sufficient reason for refusing to accept it.

But let us assume that he has sufficient reason, that he could demonstrate to a reasonable person that he had sufficient reason, what can he do if he is fired? Does he have to take action in court for wrongful dismissal?

As I understand such actions, the courts rarely, if ever, order reinstatement. They simply award certain damages to the worker, whereas under certain other laws where employees are wrongfully dismissed, it is specifically provided that there can be a remedy of reinstatement in employment, which is found more satisfactory. I had hoped there might be some such remedy available here too and that an employee might be able to take his case somewhere other than to court, which is a more difficult proceeding for the average worker.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I thought it was patent from the remarks and observations which I made that remedial action would be taken within the department.

Let us just look at this for a moment, Mr. Chairman. The Department of Labour exists for the benefit and for the useful assistance for and to both employees and employers. Now it is in that function and in that position I think we have to get the department established, and maintain it in that position.

In a situation like this, for instance, it

might be said: "Well, a collective bargaining agreement exists, so a grievance can be filed." I do not think that is the solution. I think that an immediate Department of Labour step should be taken, and I have not referred to the situation where no collective bargaining agreement exists.

I think that the department inspectors should be there, and on complaint move right in and say that machine is unsafe or that machine is safe, and endeavour to use their good offices in approaching or securing—how shall I say it?—a rapprochement between the parties and settle the matter.

Failing that, the department would then take some steps with respect to the machinery itself.

We are very much concerned with this matter and it is not my view that the matter should be let go. I think the remedial processes which are available to both employers and those in the working force of this province should be well established and understood as emanating from a good Department of Labour.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no point in pursuing this matter indefinitely and I think the hon. Minister's answer covers the problem up to a point.

I take it from what he said, that if an employee found himself in that situation his first remedy would be to phone The Department of Labour and lodge a complaint. They would dispatch an inspector who would look into the matter and perhaps get it settled.

But the department would have no power to order the reinstatement of the employee if in fact he was fired. If the employer turned out to be recalcitrant all they could do would be to take legal action against him for operating a dangerous machine or a machine in a dangerous way. I can see that the hon. Minister's position is that he wants to try the section out and see how it works, so I suppose we will not change his approach now. However, perhaps next year—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This might be a good time to just record some views with respect to the ultimate question of reinstatement. It is not my function as the Minister to get into the theories of the law in this debate, but just let us look at it this way, that we in the department feel there are certain ways of achieving a just result, dictated by common sense, in the interests of both parties. I replied on that in the first instance.

Now in the ultimate case, where you cannot achieve that, then we look to see if there

is an unfair labour practice, whether sufficient notice of termination of employment has been given and so on. We are now dealing with the minority, with the small group of irresponsible people, whichever side it is on, and quite frankly I do not have very much sympathy for any of those in that irresponsible segment to which the hon. member makes reference.

I am trying to give my views on this, because we have debated this matter before and I think the subject, the general area, is fundamental to the successful operation of our department.

On the question of reinstatement, however, we could debate this *ad infinitum*. If the parties are really at loggerheads, then they are in the extreme position where, if I was the workman, I would not want to work in a place where I was not wanted. You get into some areas as to the desirability of such a step, quite apart from it being a right.

These are matters of which I make mention and to which I refer because I want the hon. members to know we are cognizant of some of the problems that exist. But where a wrong has been done and the ultimate remedy is not available, the hon. members can believe that I will apply myself, and the department will apply itself, to see that the man is not done wrong by it, if there is such a phrase.

Sections 22 to 41, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 3 reported.

THE INDUSTRIAL STANDARDS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Industrial Standards Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am having a little difficulty getting orientated to this bill since it is an amending bill. I am not quite sure if I am now under the right section to raise the matter I had in mind.

Several hon. members of the Legislature no doubt have recently received representations from master plumbers or employers in the home repair division of the plumbing industry.

It would appear to me, having read the card that one of them sent to me that they are under a misapprehension; but in order that I may reply adequately to them, I would like to ask the hon. Minister about it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What section are we on now?

Mr. Bryden: On four.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, I think it probably comes under section six.

Mr. Bryden: Oh! I will wait.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Let this carry to six?

Mr. Bryden: I will assure the hon. Minister I will not raise it again under six, if he wants to deal with it now.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Let us go through the regular sequence.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, carrying on from where I was a moment ago. The objection expressed in the form letter I got is that the effect of the amendments to The Industrial Standards Act may be that wage rates that now apply in the construction phase of the industry, may be automatically applied to the repair phase of the industry as well. That is not my understanding of the law, as it previously existed or as it will now exist.

My understanding is that it is necessary to designate an industry in a zone, to have a conference in the industry in the zone, and to arrive at a schedule which is ultimately approved. This has always been the case and, as far as that procedure is concerned, my understanding is that it is not changed. I would like to have the hon. Minister's comments on this if possible.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the matter which is raised in this sense. I have had communications from the author and the instigator of the printed post card, who has distributed them and had them mailed to various hon. members of the House, and I am also in receipt of copies of letters from various hon. members who have received letters from this same individual—all of the letters being in the same terms. Our department has been in touch with his organization but has not been able to reach the head of the firm, through illness.

The situation is this: In our opinion, the intention of this amended bill is to give us a little more leeway than heretofore. In other words, the proposed bill will give an easier opportunity of varying, shall we say, designated industries or areas to meet the needs of 1964—specialization, or whatever it may be—therefore I cannot take into account the points which have been advanced, because I do not think the man who is involved, and his organization, understand it.

The interpretation, Mr. Chairman, of the hon. member for Woodbine is correct. This situation will be in a better position to be dealt with now, than it was under the old Act.

Sections 6 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 9:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the proposed new section 14, which will be enacted by section 9 of this bill. It is provided in sub-section one of that proposed new section, that where a magistrate finds there has been default of payment and convicts for failure to pay the prescribed wages, he may order the employer to pay the director—as an additional penalty, it is stated—the full amount of the wages found to be unpaid to the employee under the schedule. Then, and I come to the part of the sub-section in which I am interested, it is stated:

The director in his discretion may direct that the whole or a part of such wages be either forfeited to the Crown or paid to the employee or employees entitled thereto.

I am in favour of the general procedure set forth in section 14; that, if a magistrate convicts, he will order unpaid wages to be paid to the director. But it seems to me that the discretion given to the director here, as it is worded at any rate, is a little broad.

I would say that the director should, without question pay the money to the employee or employees entitled thereto. If he is unable to locate one or more of those employees, and his inability continues for a matter of two or three years, then I would think that it would be appropriate for the money to go to the Crown. It has to go somewhere, but I do not see why he should, on the face of it, have any option in the matter. This money belongs to the employees concerned and I think it should be handed over to them, unless a situation arises where the director cannot locate them, and where that inability to locate continues for a substantial period of time.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, the situation is this, and it may be taken by the hon. members of the House and the public from my statement now, as to what our intention is. It is our intention that in every *bona-fide* case, the wages to be paid direct shall go to the employee under the Act.

The hon. member for Woodbine has raised the question of an inability to locate someone. That would be one situation. But that is not the one, the real situation, which was in our

minds when this section was drafted. It involves cases where collusion exists between both the employer and the employee; and while it may seem somewhat strange for this to be a reason, I think that I will have made my point when I point out that this was the inspiring reason for the wording of the Act as it is presented.

Again, I would think, and of course it will be understood, that if collusion exists, and the employee was a wrongdoer as well the employer—and we do not want the employer to get away, or be relieved of his obligation to pay that money—then the employee is not entitled to benefit, because in the law, as it is described, he does not come before any of us with clean hands. Hence the forfeiture provision.

I think that this is a section we might very well note, for a year hence, to review, in the light of the remarks made by the hon. member and myself today.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think that a rather dangerous principle is creeping into the law at this point, in light of the explanation the hon. Minister has just given. If that factor is in the mind of the department, as well as the factor of inability to locate, then it seems to me that the director may find himself in the position of being a sort of judge of the conduct of the employee.

My experience in administration of labour legislation—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, that could not exist, because this section only applies to the directive, as I understand it, of the court.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but this is a case where only an employer is on trial in the court. The employer has been charged with the offence of failing to pay the prescribed wage. He is convicted, and then the court may issue an order that he must pay the unpaid wages to the director. The employee has not been in court at all. He has not been charged with anything under this section and yet the director could, in his discretion, decide that the employee also was culpable, and therefore would be penalized in the sense that he would not receive the wages to which, under the law, he is entitled.

I would suggest—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Do you not agree that the element involving human nature itself, and the weaknesses and strengths of individuals, runs through all legislation? This is not a new principle.

As a matter of fact, the Sergeant-at-Arms

might let the sword slip and cause some damage. Should we take his sword away from him now? Well, hardly! And this applies to the operation of life, and, indeed, our civilization.

The principle that is being objected to is not a new one. It exists in The Minimum Wage Act, for instance. It has existed for some years. So this is not a new principle. I think the key to the problem is the explanation which I have given as to the intent of the legislation.

Mr. Bryden: I do not quite grasp the analogy of the Sergeant-at-Arms. Sorry!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is the fallacies of human nature that the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, I suppose if all human beings were perfect we would not have to have a Legislature or any laws, but I am also still concerned about the kind of principles we have in our laws. The Minimum Wage Act as a whole has not been subject to review by this Legislature for a long time and I do not believe that any section that incorporates the principles enunciated here has been before this House recently—certainly not while I have been here. If it is in The Minimum Wage Act, I think it is wrong in The Minimum Wage Act, just as I think it is wrong here.

The problem of collusion, admittedly, is a problem, although in my opinion not too serious a problem. I would say that if an employee, acting entirely as a free agent, was in collusion with an employer to defeat the purposes of the law, he should be subject to penalty in the same way as the employer. I believe this is so under the Act as it now stands. But I think if he is going to be found guilty of an offence of that kind it should be by a court. But here the director has a discretion. I am not casting any reflections on any individual as director, I am just talking about the principle of the director having discretion to decide that an employee was in collusion with the employer and therefore to deprive him of the wages which would be rightfully due to him.

I may say that in my experience with the administration of labour legislation—which admittedly took place a good many years ago, but I suspect human nature is much the same now as it was then—there rarely is collusion between an employer and an employee in the true sense. An employee, in an unorganized plant at any rate, is definitely in an inferior bargaining position. He may

knowingly accept a lower wage than the law requires, but only under duress, so to speak, only because his job is at stake. He knows he will be fired if he does not accept it and so therefore he is, shall we say, bullied into a breach of the law.

I would say that an employee in that position should not be penalized by failing to get the wages for which the law calls. I do not think that the director should be in a position to make a judgment in a matter of that kind, as to whether or not he freely conspired with the employer to defeat the purpose of the Act. I think it should be assumed that he did not freely conspire, that if he did accept a lower than a lawful wage it was either through ignorance or under duress; therefore he should be entitled to receive the lawful wage unless the contrary is proved in a court of law.

I do not think that the Minister should have this discretion. I object to this principle. In a small way I would say it has—and I admit it is a small way—it has the same objectionable feature as the bill introduced into the House yesterday, which has been objected to so strenuously. It gives to a director, an administrative official, a power to adjudicate; and I do not think he should have that power.

I think he should have to pay the money over to the employee, and if he feels that it would be a grave miscarriage of justice to do it, then I think he should take action against the employee in a court, the same way as he would against the employer. Only on that basis, only on a conviction, should he have any authority to withhold from the employee money which, under the law, is payable to the employee.

The hon. Minister is taking the position, on the various pieces of legislation he is bringing in, that he wants to try them out for a while; but I would like to see him rephrase this clause right now. I am not going to move an amendment. I do not have the words anyway. If I did, I would probably move it.

I think there is a bad principle involved. There may not be any abuse for many years to come, but some time in the future some person may suffer as a result of this. I do not think we should pass laws that would permit such a possibility, even in an individual case.

There is another matter relating to section nine. This is quite a large section because it re-enacts several sections of the old Act. The portion I wish to refer to now is the proposed new section 16 of the Act which

prohibits an employer from discharging or threatening to discharge or discriminating against an employee for exercising certain rights or carrying out certain duties under the Act.

This, of course, is a sound principle. It appears in other statutes, including The Minimum Wage Act, and I have no doubt it might have been in the old legislation in some form or other. The reason I am calling attention to it is that it does not provide a satisfactory procedure for a remedy. The only procedure would be for an employee to go to court to take action in the courts for damages against the employer for wrongful dismissal, or whatever the technical terminology may be.

Mr. Chairman, it has been found time after time in the administration of labour legislation that that is not an adequate procedure. In The Labour Relations Act we worked out a totally new procedure—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: But a moment ago the hon. member was saying he did not want the speedy procedure, that he wanted things to be taken out of the director's hands and put into the court's hands. Now he is saying that the courts are not the right place.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think we should deal with each specific matter on its merits. I do not think that speed is the matter I am particularly concerned about, although that can be a problem. I think the effectiveness of the procedure in each case is what we should be concerned about.

It has been demonstrated in the administration of law relating to labour relations that for an employee to go to court to seek a remedy for wrongful dismissal when he has exercised his rights to a freedom of association has been totally ineffective; and in every jurisdiction in this country special procedures have been worked out. The same is true of the Ontario Human Rights Code. We have special procedures to protect people who may be wrongfully dismissed or otherwise discriminated against.

There is no special procedure here and I suggest to the hon. Minister that the problem is exactly the same. I would suggest that he should put into this bill the procedure as it is now in The Labour Relations Act or the human rights code. Under that procedure an employee can lodge a complaint, then the Minister can set up a commission of inquiry and the commission of inquiry can make a recommendation to him. He can then make an order, which is enforceable in the courts, on the basis of that recommendation,

and the order may, among other things, require reinstatement of the employee.

I suggest that a simple way of doing this would be simply to provide that the procedure to be followed is that which is already set forth in the human rights code; or, alternatively, just take the clauses out of the human rights code and put them in here. But I suggest to the hon. Minister that the section, as it now stands, will be a dead letter since a magistrate's court has been found totally inadequate as an instrument for dealing with this particular type of violation of the law.

Sections 9 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 5 reported.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Bill No. 6, may I move that the reprinted bill be now considered by the committee of the whole House?

Motion agreed to.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on section 2, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the feelings of two different groups—one is the Hiram Walker people and the other is Walker Metal Products—concerning section 2(b)—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This has been brought to the attention of the department and taken into account.

Mr. Newman: It was taken into consideration in the bill here?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Sections 2 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 8 reported.

THE KILLARNEY RECREATIONAL RESERVE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 30, An Act to amend The Killarney Recreational Reserve Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 30 reported.

THE TREES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Trees Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 31 reported.

THE CROWN TIMBER ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on section 2—it may not be of any great significance but I must say the explanatory note is about as cryptic and uninformative as any I would imagine. It says simply that the intent is clarified. I would like to know in what way the intent has been clarified.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, if I may, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), suggest that it must be some correction in the phraseology or the grammar. I have not The Crown Timber Act available at the moment to compare it. If we read all of paragraph 2, we are cutting out the sentence:

If the cutting of the timber in respect of which a licence is granted is not completed during the term of the licence—and putting in its place, in lieu thereof:

Where a licence has been granted under subsection 2 and the cutting of the timber authorized by the licence was not completed before the licence expired—

by striking out further in the third line, it would appear that it is to provide, you might say, an automatic renewal for a licence which has been granted for a definite term; and if the timber has not been all cut, the licence holder would have the opportunity of continuing to complete the cutting under that licence.

Sections 2 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 32 reported.

THE GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-62

House in committee on Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-62.

Sections 1 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 34 reported.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 36 reported.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Sections 1 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 38 reported.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report certain bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report nine bills without amendment and one bill with amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

The Clerk of the House: The 24th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, in my remarks made to this House on Friday, March 13, I mentioned that unless Ontario lawyers took it upon themselves to involve themselves in the legal aid plan, as presently constituted, in the same manner as those lawyers in York North, then the legal aid plan requires revision. I further indicated that, in my opinion, Ontario lawyers would not take such a stand as the York North lawyers and, as such, the whole programme must be re-examined.

I referred, at that time, to the New York

city legal aid society, and also to the English system of legal aid. Under the English system, you will recall, the government guarantees up to 85 per cent of the cost of civil legal aid and up to 100 per cent of the cost of criminal legal aid. An area committee considers the applications of each accused person and decides how much the accused can afford to contribute to his own defense. I would now like to refer to what is known as the "public defender" system.

It was first introduced in 1911 in certain United States jurisdictions, and involves the appointment of an official who acts as the counterpart, or the opposite number, of a Crown attorney or district attorney. The system is generally financed by the county or the state, and this individual and his department undertake the defence of those accused who cannot afford counsel.

Such a system is presently in operation in Cook County, Illinois. In that particular jurisdiction the public defender has a staff of some 12 lawyers, four office workers and four investigators. These people, among them, undertake the defence of indigent persons. The restrictions in that particular public defender system are: that only those charged with felonies are eligible; and the accused can only make use of the public defender system if the particular accused person has his problems with criminal legal aid rather than with civil legal aid. In other words, only those persons indicted for offences can take advantage of the public defender system.

There are four major reasons why Ontario should adopt a system similar to that presently in operation in England. First, it includes both criminal and civil legal aid. Second, it provides for the notification of every person as to his rights and the availability of legal aid to him. Third, the government pays the fee. Fourth, the court appoints the lawyers. The fact that persons are made aware of their rights is perhaps the most important aspect of the English system.

Most accused persons in Ontario find themselves before the courts for the first time, and often have not the foggiest notion of their rights or of the availability of legal aid. In certain instances, lawyers in Toronto have been known to attend at the cells in City Hall and indicate to accused persons that they can resolve their problems as long as the person approached retains that particular lawyer. Their words, in effect, are: "We will look after the magistrate, we will look after the police, we will look after everyone as long as you retain this particular person."

Further, certain other lawyers have been known to demand fees from an accused person who is eligible for legal aid. An information sheet setting out all the rights of the accused, and the availability of legal aid, would put an end to these disgusting techniques practised by certain unscrupulous lawyers right here in this city.

The civil rights of the individual would be better protected if a system similar to the English one was adopted. Some magistrates in our province are treating unrepresented accused persons in a grossly unfair manner. A good illustration of what is going on in our courts can be taken from what recently occurred in a Toronto magistrate's court.

At that time the magistrate indicated to certain persons, who were accused of an offence in violation of The Liquor Control Act, that the fines on that particular morning would be the sum of \$10, and he solicited pleas of guilty on that basis. Then, when certain of these accused persons indicated that they were not inclined to plead guilty, he indicated to them, after a conversation with the Crown attorney, that the bail would be set at the sum of \$15, in cash. So here was an accused person faced with a quandary: "What do I do? Do I plead guilty and pay \$10, or do I plead not guilty and leave \$15 here?" This has to be removed.

Many unrepresented persons plead guilty to offences, even though they are completely uncertain as to their legal rights. Police officers often mention to accused persons that it will be much easier and much less expensive to plead guilty to the charges with which they are faced.

It is only after a conviction has been registered that the accused person seems to realize the problem with which he is faced. He then goes to a lawyer, and at that stage, the only remedy is that of appeal and this constitutes even more expense.

This concludes my remarks on the legal aid system and I would now like to discuss certain other matters that deal with the protection of our civil liberties.

Different groups have been organized to protect these liberties, but even more guidance must come from lawyers themselves because they are most familiar with the statutes that guarantee and protect these rights. As was pointed out recently in an editorial in the *Toronto Daily Star*, and I quote:

The whole society, business, unions, ethnic minorities, religious groups, must provide the financial backing but the initial

must come from lawyers, from the key men in the Canadian and the Ontario Bar Associations, from professors of law, from the young and socially minded lawyers. All of these must provide the drive, the legal skills and especially the ability to recognize cases in which basic rights are in peril.

One way to ensure that civil liberties would be protected to one degree, would be that legislation should be introduced that would allow costs to a successful applicant in a criminal appeal. As the law presently stands, an appeal is often prohibitive and it is often less expensive for a convicted person to pay the fine than to retain a lawyer to undertake an appeal.

Another matter that should be looked into with a great deal of thought at this time is the matter of bail in our province. As the law presently stands, an indigent accused often finds himself languishing in jail, whereas a person who has been more successful or is fortunate enough to have friends to raise the bail, finds himself free. We have on occasion had accused persons in different jails in our province for weeks and even months. When they do appear before the courts, and often are ultimately acquitted, they find themselves free.

But free to go back to what? Oftentimes they have no job to which to go back. They have no funds because they have not been able to work in the meantime. They often have no home. Whereas as I indicated previously, the person with some degree of wealth who can raise bail is faced with none of these problems.

It has become obvious to most lawyers in Toronto that certain of our cohorts have chosen to prey on desperate accused persons who are unable to raise sufficient cash bail. These individuals provide the bail at usurious rates and legislation must be introduced that will stop this scurrilous practice.

Another aspect of bail that might be changed, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, is in the situation where bail is required when a person is accused of a driving offence or a minor offence. As it is presently adopted, in Metropolitan Toronto at any rate, a person is taken into custody by the police officer in charge. Bail is generally set at the sum of \$200 cash. The accused person is allowed the one phone call to which the police officer entitles him. He makes his call, and perhaps if the wife or relative of the accused is not home, he finds himself languishing in jail.

On a weekend it is even worse, because if the accused cannot raise the bail, then he

must stay overnight, often for two nights, in that particular jail; namely, the Don jail that is the subject of every grand jury report that I can remember in York county.

This Don jail situation must be changed to the degree that a person can go to jail and be treated with respect, because accused persons are not convicted persons. This is something that must be remembered by our society and by our government.

There is no reason, to my way of thinking Mr. Speaker, that an accused person, for a certain driving offence and lesser offences, cannot be sent home, in a cab perhaps, after the alleged offence and have the opportunity to spend the night in his own home and openly be summoned for the offence. I know that this is common practice in certain other areas, but Metropolitan Toronto chooses to ignore it.

I would suggest that our government move to ensure that, if possible, if it can be worked out, that the accused person should be allowed the right to be summoned for a minor offence when the availability is there under the statutes.

I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, that some of the suggestions I have made will receive the same response as certain comments I made in my participation in the Throne Speech debate on inter-faith adoption. I have been advised by The Department of Public Welfare that the department is quite content to leave all matters pertaining to the adoption of the children in the hands of the children's aid society.

The Metropolitan Toronto Children's Aid Society recently announced that they would not object to inter-faith adoptions or to adoptions by agnostics. It would be gratifying, Mr. Speaker, if every other society in this province were to follow this forward step taken by Metro Toronto. But certain society directors have already indicated that they are dissatisfied with the Metropolitan Toronto proposal and feel disinclined to adopt it.

In order to ensure that adopting parents will not be discriminated against because of their religious beliefs, I feel that once and for all the department should send a directive to each of the societies pointing out that religion and race are not the dominant factors in adoption, but that the welfare of the child is of paramount importance.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter addressed to the editor of the *Globe and Mail* which was published recently. It was from Mr. Benjamin Schlesinger, PhD., Assistant Professor, School of Social Work,

University of Toronto. It is as follows and I quote:

It is very heartening that the Metropolitan Toronto Children's Aid Society has changed its policy to allow atheists and Jewish applicants to adopt children in need of a home. We must all congratulate the board executives and social workers of this agency which is the largest private child welfare agency in North America. It is about time that our community realizes that what is at stake in adoptions, is the welfare of the child and not theological arguments and outdated regulations which have deprived many of our Canadian children of a warm, sympathetic and kind home.

I might just interject at this point, it will be of utmost importance and I am sure it will impress itself on my hon. friends to the right, and I quote again:

The province of Ontario is in the forefront of child welfare programmes in North America. In 1962 we had 14,401 children in care of 55 children's aid societies of our province. We spent \$8,222,419 for direct care of these children. In the same year 5,103 children were adopted, of whom 3,971 were placed by our children's aid societies. The illegitimacy rate in our province is about 5,800 births per year.

We all hope that this important decision made by courageous and forward looking citizens of our community will be followed by all the other 54 societies in our province, including the societies which primarily deal with Catholic families and children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today on the subject of a bill introduced and read for the first time in the House of Commons on Tuesday, March 17, which bill is entitled and I quote: "An Act to establish a comprehensive programme of old age pensions in Canada payable to contributors and survivors."

I am moved to speak, sir, not because of technicalities but because, as a Canadian citizen, I am deeply concerned with and disturbed by many aspects of this proposed legislation.

Not the least of these is that the federal government purports to call this bill the Canada pension plan, knowing full well that it is not a Canada plan, not a national plan, Quebec having given notice that it will not participate in the federal plan but will undertake a pension scheme of its own.

I say that this is of importance not only to the hon. members of the House of Commons, but also to the hon. members of this House, for it brings us all to the point where we, as members of the Legislature of the province of Ontario, must face the question as to whether this province should participate in the pension plan proposed by the federal government or whether Ontario should have a plan of its own.

It seems to me that this problem must now be met head on by this House and by the people of Ontario. It is obvious from a statement made by the Rt. hon. Mr. Pearson and his associates that the federal government intends to put its pension Act into effect at the earliest possible moment. It intends to bring this into effect even though the province of Quebec has stated clearly that it will not participate in the scheme. It intends to proceed with this bill even though it has done little more than pay lip service to the various provincial governments in ascertaining and giving effect to their views or their questions raised on the matters of administration, operation and other major problems arising out of their Act.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in considering the question of what is best for the people of Ontario in the matter of pension plans, there are certain issues which must be considered. The first of these issues is the matter of the right of Ontario, as opposed to the right of the federal government, to enact old age pension laws under The British North America Act.

In order for Ontario to go along with the federal Act, the federal plan, and I do not call it the Canada pension plan for, as I have said, it is not a Canada pension plan so long as Quebec does not participate. In order for Ontario to participate in the federal plan, it will be necessary for this province to give up all its rights to enact laws relating to pensions, the right to retain the capital monies paid into the pension fund, and the right of all the people of the province of Ontario to have the maximum benefit from the ability to control and invest these monies within the province of Ontario.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I have it at the end from the hon. member, Mr. Speaker?

In the end it will be necessary for Ontario to decide whether it should give up these constitutional rights, which the Fathers of Confederation very wisely determined should be left in the hands of the provinces. This

question must be answered by this Legislature, not by the Parliament of Canada. I suggest to all of us that this responsibility is ours alone.

The second issue which must be considered is this: What are the comparative economic results for the people of Ontario if Quebec stays out of the federal plan and Ontario stays in? The result, sir, would be that the Quebec government will retain, for its own purposes, 100 per cent of the pension monies paid to it by the people of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I understand that in 30 years' time the Quebec government will thus have accumulated some \$8 billion, all of which would be invested by Quebec within the province of Quebec. This vast sum of money will be available to that province for the development of services such as hospitals, roads, schools and all those things which are constantly demanded in this House and which we, in this province, cannot hope to deal with without adequate and sufficient funds.

We have seen Quebec's position, but what of Ontario under the federal plan? We in this province have been offered by Ottawa, on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, only 50 per cent of the monies which would accumulate in their hands out of Ontario. In other words, on a comparative basis, the money available to Ontario for investment in its own future and in its own services, so urgently needed, would be one-half of that available to the people of the province of Quebec. Have we in this House, sir, any right to put the people of the province of Ontario in such an inequitable position? I say to this House, and I say to the government of Ontario, that we do not.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province want, and are entitled to, a comprehensive programme of old age pensions payable to contributors and survivors. Furthermore, I am convinced that the people of Ontario are going to have such a plan whether it is the creation of the federal government or the work of us in this House. Let there be no mistake, sir, about my belief in this regard.

It is also my view that the government of Ontario, with its experience and background in the administration of funds and commissions, with its closeness to the people of this province, and with the great trust which the people of Ontario have in it, is in a position to provide for our people a programme of old age pensions which can be far superior to the proposed federal plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised certain questions and issues which, it seems to me, are

important in determining whether Ontario should take the same position as Quebec—that is, opt out and operate its own plan—or whether it should go into the federal plan. In my view, sir, if Quebec stays out we must stay out. If Quebec goes in Ontario should go in.

I take this position for the following reasons. The first, sir, is that, with Quebec opting out and thereby able to retain and invest for its own purposes all the capital monies paid into its pension treasury, the people of Ontario would be at a drastic economic disadvantage in comparison to the people of Quebec. That is to say, the people of Ontario would be less than the economic equals of the residents of the province of Quebec, at a time when economic equality seems to be the goal, and a very proper one, of the province of Quebec.

Second, sir, in comparison to the federal plan, Ontario can provide at least equal, if not better, pension and survivor benefits.

Third, in comparison to a federal plan, an Ontario pension scheme could be better administered, for the simple reason that the vast experience of our own government, which is so much closer to the people, is such that the administration and operation of the scheme would, in fact, be substantially better.

Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Bryden: That is not what this government has done.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am presenting my own speech, I would say to the hon. member who has interrupted. Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to continue?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: I propose to continue in any case.

The final reason why I consider that if Quebec stays out the Ontario government must produce and operate its own pension scheme is this, and it is perhaps the most significant reason of all: We have heard a great many speeches by Mr. Pearson in connection with Canadian unity, in connection with co-operative federalism, and in connection with biculturalism, bilingualism and Confederation.

Mr. Pearson's words on the subject of unity have always been very moving, and I believe he means what he says. However, sir, it is most disturbing to me, and I am sure it is most disturbing to all other

Canadians concerned with the living problem of keeping Canada together, that this legislation now put forward by the federal government, which is its first major social legislation, is an Act which will do more to destroy Confederation, will do more to further the cause of separatism, will do more to split Canada, than any other event which has occurred since 1867.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Oh, poppycock!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Even Diefenbaker does not agree with that.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am making my own speech, I may say to the hon. members in Opposition.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): I like it.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not care about speeches in other Houses. I am making it to the hon. members of this House, and to no one else in this country.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Singer: Let the press take note.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: The result of the proposed action of the federal government, if carried out, is clear. It will violate the principle that the essence of social security—and I think some of my hon. friends opposite will agree with this—on a national basis, is an equality of burden and an equality of benefit for all citizens. This federal Act will produce two kinds of Canadians. There will be the residents of the province of Quebec who, being outside the Canada pension plan, will enjoy different pension benefits and different burdens to a resident in any other part of Canada. On the other hand, there will be the Canadians who reside in all the rest of Canada.

This Act of the federal government will create the Quebec-Canadian and the other Canadian. It will cause an enormous economic cleavage and, in my opinion, sir, will be an irreversible step in the economic partitioning of our relation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this kind of partition is exactly what the Fathers of Confederation intended to prevent. I believe that Ontario, and indeed every province in Canada, must seriously question whether it will go into the Canada pension plan without Quebec. If the government at Ottawa can convince the government of the province of Quebec that it should come into the Canada pension plan—and I stress, Mr. Speaker, that

it is the obligation of the federal government alone to bring in Quebec—and if all other provinces are prepared to come in, then it will become in fact a Canada pension plan. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the people of Ontario, and indeed in the interests of the people of Canada, and the unity of this nation, I urge the government of Ontario to institute its own plan; and most significantly, sir, its own plan and a new plan establishing a comprehensive programme of old age pensions providing benefits thereunder at least equal to those provided by the proposed federal Act.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, like every hon. member I would like to congratulate you on your position and on the impartiality which you show.

I would say, sir, that as I think of your position I think of the centuries of struggle that have taken place in order that we can have the freedom of Parliament today. I think, sir, of the men who believe strongly in the rights of the individual.

I go back, sir, to such struggle, about which indeed every child in Ontario knows—the fight in order that in our British system we could have such things as the Magna Carta; the great struggle of men strong with conviction, in order to provide this cornerstone which now is handed down to us. I think of such a fight in order to get The Habeas Corpus Act. Again, sir, a struggle that generations of men put up so that today we can stand free in this Legislature and free in our British society.

Then, sir, as I look at you, in your position, symbolizing this freedom, I cannot help but think of the shame that took place yesterday when these cornerstones of freedom were utterly disregarded by the man in our society, in our province, who is supposed to stand at the head of our legal system, to symbolize the deep conviction which should be the freedom of our society. I think of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Cass) presenting a bill to this House which has ignored six of the fundamental freedoms that are the right of every citizen of Canada.

He has ignored the right not to incriminate oneself. He has ignored the right to have public hearings when one's freedom is in jeopardy. Some may make light of it, but I assure you, when we look at the heritage of our people, I assure you that there are those of us who have fought not only in battle for this, and we all will fight in this House to preserve that freedom for the people of Ontario.

The hon. Attorney General has ignored the

right to privacy; he has ignored the right to counsel; he has ignored the right of freedom of speech and expression; he has ignored the right of any individual to refrain from making a statement to the police, if that is his desire. All these things have been ignored by the man who stands as the head of our law enforcement department.

An hon. member: Not only ignored them but trampled on them.

Mr. Thompson: Then he himself has recognized what he has done. He has said that the legislation which he was proposing would be drastic, dangerous and terrible legislation in an English common law country. The *Globe and Mail*, a paper which usually might have some sympathy for the cause of this government, has an editorial on its front page in which it refers to this bill as a "Bill of Wrongs" and it suggests that this proposed bill—and I would like to read some words from this—it refers to hon. Mr. Cass saying of the legislation: "It is drastic and dangerous and it is terrible legislation in an English common law country."

Then the *Globe and Mail* goes on and I quote:

These are the precise reasons why the legislation should never have been introduced.

These are the precise reasons why it should never have been contemplated. These are the precise reasons why it must immediately be withdrawn.

This legislation could make Ontario a police state. It would give the Ontario Police Commission powers comparable with those of the OGPU or the Gestapo.

Where did this legislation emanate? We understand it came from the Cabinet. It came from the men who are elected in free elections; and they would turn this country, by such legislation, into a police state.

I, sir, speak as my hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) did this morning. We speak with the strongest conviction; that we will fight this legislation. We do not see this, as the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) said "as some political battle"; we see this as a battle for the sanctity of the people, a battle that we have to fight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. As I listen to what the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, a man who has told us that he stands for principles—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: I always felt they were for the principles of freedom; but when he turns around, sir, and suggests that you throw the baby out with the bath water, because that is what he infers—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I am talking of today because it is today we are facing this problem, and I would say—

An hon. member: That is right!

Mr. Thompson: I would say that we heard the peep of a mouse from him when we are endangered. We in this province are endangered with the taking away of six fundamental rights.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Thompson: And from a man who says he stands for freedom, I say again we heard a peep.

Let me get back to this, sir. This took a Cabinet decision in order to have this legislation passed for first reading in the House. If I could come back to the principle of our British system, Cabinets must stand in solidarity and therefore every man in the front benches is as guilty as the hon. Attorney General. I would say, as I read the paper, that I understand that the hon. Attorney General has said the government intends to have the amendment adopted at the current session of the Legislature.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Did the hon. member not hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) this morning?

Mr. Thompson: This is what I am coming to, if the hon. member will be patient.

Mr. Eagleson: It is about time.

Mr. Thompson: We saw conflict in Cabinet solidarity. A decision was made, a bill was presented to the Cabinet. Have we heard any remarks from the hon. Attorney General to retract his statement that he is going to have these amendments passed in this session? No, sir, we have not.

Do hon. members notice what the hon. Prime Minister said in his remarks that he personally—he personally—was against any infringement of the rights of the individual? I

suggest he should think of himself not only personally but publicly.

He has the office of Prime Minister of Ontario and he stands with his Cabinet, and his Cabinet passed a bill and brought it before the House for first reading. What kind of chaotic government have we in Ontario when you have the hon. Attorney General bringing in a bill for first reading and you hear no more from him, and then you have the hon. Prime Minister standing up and apologizing for the dangerous aspects of this bill?

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would like to inform the member that we are speaking on the Budget. I do not want to be unduly restrictive but he is pretty well confining himself to a bill which has just been placed on the order paper. I admit you can have a wide latitude, during the Budget debate, on these matters, but I would hope that he would also speak on budgetary matters and have this discussion on the bill when it comes before the House.

Mr. Thompson: I am just going to move into that, sir. At the moment I am talking on principles of good legislation, and if it pinches certain feet, then it pinches them.

I am talking about one of our great traditions, which is the solidarity of Cabinet. And I am suggesting that if there is a decision by one Minister, then all the Cabinet stands behind it. And if you have the leader of a government refuting the remarks of one of his Cabinet, then I suggest that he has the fullest obligation to suggest that that Minister of the Cabinet must resign.

I would also suggest to you, sir, that, in our system, the man who holds a public office for the enforcement of law throughout our province should have imbued within him a deep sacred belief in the rights of the individual. This is the thing he should be fighting for. I suggest, sir, if such a man brings in legislation, or proposes legislation—I am not referring to any in particular—which is abhorrent to the very principles of our democracy, then such a man is not fit to hold that high office.

With that, sir, I will move on to other remarks I wish to make with respect to the dangers of arbitrary government. Before doing so, I would like to say that I have felt that this Legislature, over the past week, has been refreshed by the contributions of hon. members of this House. I would naturally refer to my own colleagues but I am making a point of referring to the hon. members on the government side.

In the past we have listened to an almost obsequious murmur from hon. government members, but now we are finding that they are standing up—and I can think of many of them; I have enjoyed reading *Hansard*—and infusing new ideas. Indeed, some of them are standing up at the risk, as they suggest, of being in great disfavour with the government, and stating what they feel are personal principles. I think, for example, of the way the hon. member, who just stood up, spoke of legal rights and the need for legal rights. I think, perhaps, he could have enlarged on that further, in view of conditions which shadow our Legislature today.

What I am interested in, at this point, is to look at another crisis—and I presume I can talk on this crisis as well, because it seems to me that one of the situations we have, with respect to the government of Ontario, is that things seem to have to develop to a crisis before we get action from government. I think, for example, of the situation of crime, and I am coming back—without referring to any particular bill—to the situation of crime in Ontario. I am thinking that there was almost a “John the Baptist” voice crying in the wilderness, crying out to alert the people that there was something very serious, a cancer, in the growth of our society. That voice, sir, was the voice of our previous leader, John Wintermeyer. And it took courage, which he showed on many occasions—he showed it by not only making certain statements in the House but walking outside the House to make them.

I say that John Wintermeyer has done a great service for the people of this province, in alerting the people to a situation warranting considerable apprehension. I say it must be apprehension, if we read the report which was presented to us yesterday. It must be apprehension, if we find that the government is contemplating drastic action. I certainly hope they will not go through with the kind of action they are suggesting, but they are contemplating such action. Yet we heard previously, sir, that an Attorney General, when this was broached, blushed it off. So now we have a situation of the government having to do something drastic about this.

So I come to another example of crisis. I come to the example of the lack of hospitals and the lack of staff. Once again we find another Cabinet Minister sloughing off the very real crisis we have about the health of our people, suggesting to us that there really is not a lack of hospital beds, giving us figures which we find are twisted. We even have doctors suggesting that he must have

either twisted them or been hoodwinked in the approach he took to present, or cover up the very drastic need there is in this province.

In Metropolitan Toronto, there is a shortage of 2,360 active treatment beds. This was established last July by a highly qualified committee for a survey of hospital needs in Metro Toronto.

How did the hon. Minister of Health act on this information? He ignored it. He shrugged it off. He told the House, sir, that there was a surplus of beds in Ontario; and when you are complacent in thinking there is a surplus of beds, you are not going to take drastic action to meet an emergency.

I would suggest that either the hon. Minister was hoodwinked or else, sir, he was not giving out the facts and wanted us to be hoodwinked. Today we hear, as we have heard from the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, that the hon. Minister of Health uses this argument. He suggests that it is political to criticize him. When my hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) stood up trying to fight for the fundamental rights of the people of this province, we heard from the hon. leader of the new party that he was being political. Well, if that is political, I am proud that it was political.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Let me return to the fact of hospital beds. In the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* of last week, Dr. T. P. Morley asks:

Was Ontario Minister Dr. Matthew Dymond hoodwinked by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission over the hospital bed situation, or was he less than frank with the provincial Legislature when he said some time ago that he knew of only 60 beds in Metro idle for the lack of nurses?

I quote Dr. Morley because some people may suggest that only politicians are raising this issue. It is not so.

The point is that the doctors are the people who are very aware of how serious this problem is. I would say, sir, that if it comes down to the point that if a Minister of Health is asked by competent men in their field if he has been less than frank, or whether he has been hoodwinked, then I suggest that if he has either of those attributes he cannot inspire much confidence in his ministry.

What is the hon. Minister doing about this? We have heard two statements from him. One of them is almost pathetic in its

irony. I looked through *Hansard* to see remarks that the hon. Minister had made recently through this crisis, when we wanted to hear a call from him, to show that action was going to be taken. One of the statements he made was an aside which was quoted in *Hansard* during the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions. I quote: "Give me a room in Millwood. Give me a room in Millwood."

Well, sir, the last thing that I would want is that the hon. Minister should be sent to Millwood, but if Millwood is where we are going to get action from him, then by all means send him there.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Millbrook!

Mr. Thompson: Millbrook! I beg your pardon. It is one of the security places.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: May I come to this point, sir, that has been shouted to me? I am glad that the hon. member is so attentive and wants to get the facts from me.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest this, if hon. members were to read The British North America Act—and I am sure that some hon. members have not, but I will be generous enough to say that some may have—but if they have, they will find that the health of this province is the responsibility of the provincial government.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: May I also point out that when you have an agency of the Minister of Health going around and collecting money—raising money, raising the fee—in order to provide hospital services, surely it is then the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Health to see those services are provided.

I look to the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), a businessman, and I am quite convinced that in his long practice in business with his locks, if I pay for a lock, I will get one. He would not stand up before us now and say: "You could pay me for a lock, but you might not get it." Yet, on the other hand, sir, that is what the government is permitting the hon. Minister of Health to do. He is taking money from us and we are not assured that we will get the services.

I would suggest, sir, that if that was to happen with my hon. friend that he would be in danger of going to jail for operating under false pretences. So perhaps the appre-

hensions the good doctor had about Millbrook are not too far fetched.

In this situation, sir, I would like to come to the point of staff. It is easy to be critical, for example, of the ineptitude and the lethargy on the part of the hon. Minister of Health, but we have got to realize that not only is there a crisis of hospitals, there is also a crisis of staff.

What kind of aggressive action did we see on the part of the hon. Minister of Health with respect to a shortage of beds? We know that one of the reasons for a shortage of staff has been the working conditions in the hospitals. Did we see the hon. Minister of Health as a protagonist in the betterment of working conditions which would encourage more nurses to come? No, sir, we did not. We saw the hon. Minister of Health quoting that there should not be shift differentials with respect to nurses' pay because it was unprofessional.

When it was suggested to him that across the province the doctors had a basis of shift differential, what was his answer? His answer, during all of this crisis, has been one of either sullen or embarrassed silence.

We suggest, sir, that because it has had to come from us, from medical men, from the public, the suggested solutions have had to come from people other than doctors. And the suggested solutions have included: the use of the veterans' hospitals, the use of nurses' residences and so on; and we have all read about these solutions brought up by people who recognize the desperate straits we are in. They are bringing up solutions about the need for nurses. Again we can read on this. They are suggesting more training schools should be attached to hospitals. They want to look at the nurses' training. They want to employ nurses' aides. They want to recruit married nurses.

This is coming from others. These suggestions are coming from other than the source from which they should come—the man responsible for the health of this province; from him we have silence. It is because of this, sir, that once again a crisis is developing in this province; and only when there is outraged outcry from citizens do we get some kind of action, or we hope we will get some action. It is because of this, sir, that we have suggested that, apart from using emergency measures, in order to tackle this problem of a hospital crisis and bed crisis, there should be a Royal commission to examine why this ineptitude and lethargy and indifference on the part of the hon. Minister of Health was permitted. And to suggest,

sir, through a Royal commission, that we may have guideposts in order that such a situation will not be allowed to happen again in this province.

Mr. Thompson moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with

the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare, followed by the completion of the estimates of Travel and Publicity; and the next estimates to be dealt with will be Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, March 23, 1964

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Monday, March 23, 1964

Debate on motion by Mr. Robarts that second reading of Bill No. 99 be discharged and referred to standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills for consideration, examination and report	1861
Recess, 6 o'clock	1890

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1964

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Hill Park Secondary School, Hamilton and St. Vincent de Paul Separate School, Toronto; in the west gallery, students from Victoria Park Public School and Branksome Hall, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the order of the day for second reading of Bill No. 99 be discharged and that the bill be referred forthwith to the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills for consideration and examination and report.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I want to make a statement concerning Bill No. 99 and why I wish to have it dealt with in this fashion.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I have your guidance—

Mr. Speaker: The point of order of the member must be in respect to some statement that has been made up to the present time that is out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when the bill is to be withdrawn the rules call for a notice of another bill to be entered forthwith.

Mr. Speaker: I might correct the member: as I understood the motion, it was the order for second reading on the order paper to be withdrawn and not the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention that every public bill shall be read twice in the House before committal or amendment? If the hon. Prime Minister is going to go, in my submission, beyond the

rules of the House and get up and make a statement today, I submit it can be done only with the general consent of the House and with provision of an opportunity for Opposition leaders to at least speak to it.

Second, before a bill can be referred to a committee it must have been given second reading. If it is withdrawn, it is not a bill. The rules of the House require that an alternative bill will be submitted in its place. May states that clearly on page 525 of the 17th edition.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, this is simply a motion respecting the conduct of the business of the House by the leader of the House. It is within his competence to make a motion regarding a certain order on the order paper. He is not ordering that the bill be withdrawn from the order paper, but that it be referred to a standing committee, which in my opinion is quite legitimate and I so rule.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, may I call your attention to rule No. 60 which was read very quickly by my hon. leader. Rule No. 60 of this House as published on page 114 of Lewis' *Parliamentary Procedure*—

Mr. Speaker: Yes! Well, may I just interrupt to let the member know that I am quite familiar with that rule but that it has often been the practice of this House to refer a bill to a standing committee, or even to a select committee, without it having second reading; that it can be done in the ordinary conduct of the business of the House; and that a bill has often been referred from third reading back to the committee of the whole House by means of a like motion.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): On a point of order, it has to be on unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I am sorry, I am not of the opinion that it requires the unanimous consent of the House. This motion, as I understand it, is being made to take the order for second reading off the order paper and refer the

bill to the standing committee. Any member of the House may speak to this motion after the Prime Minister has completed his remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: Frankly, that was the point I was seeking clarification on—

Mr. Speaker: I am not saying that any member has not the right to speak to the motion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am merely speaking to the motion I have made.

I want also to make some comments concerning the report of the Ontario Police Commission on organized crime which was tabled in this House on Thursday last, but my remarks will be directed primarily to the motion I have made, which is that this bill should be referred to a standing committee.

I would say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that as leader of the government I accept full and complete responsibility for this bill and for its introduction into this Legislature. I also accept full responsibility for the tabling of the report, as it was tabled, with no deletions, without censorship and in exactly the same form and terms as it was submitted by His Honour Judge Macdonald, the chairman, Magistrate Thomas J. Graham and General H. A. Sparling, the members of the commission.

The commission, Mr. Speaker, was given the assignment to investigate crime in the province. In effect what it was asked to do was to continue the investigation that was made by Mr. Justice Roach sitting as a Royal commission in 1962 and 1963. I felt it was necessary for the entire report to be made public in order that the people of this province might know all the facts, in order that they might appreciate the many difficulties which face the law enforcement agencies of the province and in order that they might appreciate the extent of the operations of our police in the very enormous task of controlling and stamping out crime in the province.

We must accept the possibility that the publication of this report could create some immediate difficulties for the law enforcement agencies. On the other hand, we must not forget that its publication serves as notice to those who would attempt to establish criminal activities in the province that this government intends to make Ontario an unhealthy place for them. In other words, the mere publication of the report serves as a method of preventing the development and spread of crime in the province and serves notice on those with criminal intent that we will not tolerate their activities.

In accepting responsibility for Bill No. 99 as leader of this government, I say that it was introduced after it had been very carefully drafted by the law officers of the Crown who were of the opinion that it did not interfere with the fundamental rights of the people of Ontario. Let me say immediately that the government is not wedded to this piece of legislation. Section 39 was drawn and introduced as a result of the 11th recommendation contained on page 124 in the report of the Ontario Police Commission, the report to which I have referred, and I will quote this recommendation:

That section 48 of The Police Act be amended to clarify the powers of the Ontario Police Commission so as to permit hearings *in camera* as well as in public, and to make it an offence without permission of the commission to communicate the name of a witness or information given to the commission by any witness in private session; and to confer on the commission, whether in private or public session, the powers of a superior court to punish for contempt; and that following such clarification, this commission interrogate persons believed to be in possession of information respecting criminal operations, which information could be of assistance in determining the state of law and order in the province, and the need for special legislative, government or police action.

It is thus possible for hon. members to see that the report itself, with its exhaustive investigation into the existence and possible future development of crime in the province, together with this bill, form a unit in which is contained the problem which must be met and a possible means of meeting that problem. In other words, the report and the bill must be considered together, and in themselves they form a unit.

On Friday last, after many comments had been made concerning the possible effect of this legislation on the rights and privileges of our people and of the individuals in the province, I made a statement in the House in which I said I would not tolerate any legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes the personal rights or freedoms of the individual. I further said if the effect of this legislation was to so interfere or to so jeopardize, the legislation would be changed. I further stated that before any further legislative action was taken in regard to this bill, it would be re-examined.

I have had an opportunity to carry out my undertaking which I gave to this House and to the people of this province. I have had

further consultations with the law officers of the Crown and they have reaffirmed to me that at the time this legislation was drawn it was their opinion that it did not prohibit the right to counsel, that it did not interfere with the individual's rights to Habeas Corpus, certiorari and the other prerogative writs, that it did not interfere with the individual's rights under Magna Carta and under the Canadian Bill of Rights, nor did it deprive any person of the protection given every individual by The Evidence Acts of Ontario and Canada. After re-examination and further discussion the law officers of the Crown have informed me that they are still of the same opinion and that the fundamental rights of the citizens of this province would not be interfered with by this legislation.

Several hon. members: Nonsense, withdraw!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Now, if these opinions had been expressed at the time the bill was introduced, the apprehension and disquiet which arose in people's minds before the bill had actually been examined, would have been avoided. In any event, I want to make eminently clear, as I have said before, that the government did not at the time this bill was introduced, nor does it now, consider this bill to be the final piece of legislation nor the complete answer to the problems that we are attempting to solve. Grave doubts have been raised in my mind by the comments I have read concerning this bill, not the least of which is the extension of certain powers of committal to a commission. In order that we may have all these matters in clear perspective, in order that there may be no misunderstanding in the mind of any man or woman in this province, in order that the full implications of the report, of the problems it lays bare and of the legislation and what it purports to achieve, in order that all these matters may be placed face up on the table so that the most thorough and complete study may be given to them, I am making this motion that this bill be sent to the standing committee of the Legislature which deals with legal bills.

When this bill and the report are before the committee I will ask that the members of the police commission, who completed the study and wrote the report and made the recommendations, appear before this committee to explain why they made the recommendations leading to the bill, as well as the other recommendations which are contained in the report. I will ask the law officers of the Crown who drew up this legislation, and who have given me the assurances which I have already mentioned, to appear before the

committee, to discuss the drawing and drafting of the bill and all the background of its preparation.

The meeting of the committee will be held, with due notice to the public, in order that those who hold the opinion that this legislation does in fact infringe upon the rights and privileges of our citizens might appear, make their opinions known and have them examined and discussed. This will permit the hon. members of this Legislature to hear all these varying points of view, and to ask such questions as they may wish of those who are responsible for drawing up the bill and of those who have made the recommendations and know the problems the bill is designed to solve. I would hope that from these studies in the committee we may obtain the answers which will allow the police commission to be firm in dealing with crime, its organization, and its possible spread into our province; and to obtain answers which, first and foremost, would be in accord with the great concepts, traditions and principles of British justice and the inalienable rights of the individual, which this government and every hon. member of this House will always protect and uphold.

Mr. Speaker, from my own personal point of view, I think I have made it very clear that if there is a conflict between the rights of the individual and the necessity for powers to deal with the criminal elements in our society, then the rights of the individual must be supreme, even if it means that in so doing we give to the criminal elements in our society an advantage which we would rather they did not have.

I would say also that there are many misconceptions concerning this proposed legislation. While the terms "police state" and "police state" legislation have been used, I think it should be pointed out that this legislation gives no additional powers whatsoever to the police of this province. Rather, what it purports to do is to give certain powers to three men sitting as the Ontario Police Commission, and then only when they are in the course of making a report to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Cass) in connection with three limited matters, namely: The extent, the investigation or control of crime; the enforcement of law; or the function of the commission under The Police Act.

I doubt if anyone is more opposed to the thought of a police state than I am. Indeed, I take responsibility for refusing to give the control of the Ontario Provincial Police to a commission because I thought that would remove the ultimate responsibility for the actions of the provincial police from the

Legislature, where they must report through a Minister of the Crown, sir. Some have different views in this regard, and these are matters of great public and personal importance with which we are dealing.

I am moving that the proposed amendments to The Police Act be referred to the legislative committee dealing with legal bills, with no restriction and with no holds barred. May I make it clear, once again, that the government is prepared and always has been prepared to amend, to change, to withdraw the bill or any portion thereof? The bill has been put forward in the belief that it did not infringe or violate basic individual liberties and privileges, but if it does it must be changed.

I would point out, too, that in the studies to be made by the committee dealing with this bill the position of the police commission and the law enforcement agencies of the province must be given every consideration. The members of the commission feel, and I think it is reflected in the report and I think it is justified, that the Ontario Police Commission has been given a task to do, and that it is inadequately armed with powers to deal with forces which are highly organized and which have, at their disposal, all the facilities of communication and transportation in a modern world; and all these facilities can be used in a completely unprincipled fashion.

However, I repeat that there is nothing in this legislation—no clause, no sentence, no word—to which we are committed. We are prepared to change, to conform to the wishes of the hon. members of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the problems which I mention have been raised by an investigation of activities of organized and syndicated crime. We cannot and we will not overlook this problem. It presents us, as legislators, with the two opposing points of view which I have mentioned. I do not think that it is beyond our capacity as representatives of the people to equate these points of view and to come up with a solution which, while giving the Ontario Police Commission the powers it needs to carry out its duties, nevertheless is a solution which ensures the preservation of the right of the individual to live in a society free from lawlessness, free from organized vice—and a solution which ensures the preservation of all the traditional, deep-rooted British rights which safeguard our liberty and safeguard our freedom, and the liberty and freedom of all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Before the debate proceeds, I just wanted to read the motion so the members could hear it.

A motion by hon. Mr. Robarts, seconded by hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) that the order of the day for second reading of Bill No. 99 be discharged, and that the bill be referred forthwith to the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills for consideration, examination and report. In order to keep this debate in order, I might advise the members that it is the motion which is before the House now, not the bill. We are speaking on the merits of this motion being referred to the standing committee on legal, labour and municipal bills. So that the members may keep the debate in proper perspective, and on the right subject, I thought I should mention that. Anyone who wishes to debate the motion may do so.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish your inadvertent remark had been applicable to the present situation because I can say, quite frankly to the House, that technically I think the hon. Prime Minister's motion is in order. That is why I did not rise to oppose it. Technically, I think my hon. friend has the right, as leader of the government, to move the motion he has moved. That does not say for one moment that I think that motion should be moved. I think it should not have been moved. The place to discuss the principle of this bill is on the floor of this House.

The hon. Prime Minister and the government are shelving their proper responsibility in this, as they have done in other aspects of this whole problem, by referring it to a committee before the principle of the bill is discussed in this Legislature.

It may be that my hon. friend is in order technically, but morally he is completely out of order. He is afraid, and I charge him with it, to entrust the principle of the bill to the discussion of the hon. members in this House, afraid not only of the Opposition members, Mr. Speaker, but afraid of his own members, and he seeks this rule technically to get it into a committee of the House where it may be remodelled as he suggests. If there is going to be any remodelling of this bill it should be right here, not in any committee of the House. My hon. friend knows that. The procedure down through the years has been to refer these bills to committee after second reading, after the principle has been endorsed by the members of the Legislature.

Why does my hon. friend move from that well-established position this afternoon? He moves from it, as I have said, because he knows full well that the principle of the bill as he has outlined it and as it is contained in Bill

No. 99 would not meet with the approval of the hon. members of this Legislature in its present form. My hon. friend is afraid to take his chances before the proper tribunal, before a hundred and some members who are elected by the people of this province to say yes or no to this sort of legislation.

My hon. friend took a rather curious turn this afternoon, and having in mind the event of this last week it is not unusual that he should take one more turn that could be termed a little circuitous at least. We have in the province of Ontario, or had up until now—I do not see the hon. Attorney General in the House—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, if you please. I must draw to the attention of the people in the galleries that it is against the rules of the House to make any applause whatsoever during any debate and if they persist in such a method, I am afraid I shall have to order the galleries cleared. Will they please keep in mind that no applause can come from the galleries.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has said this afternoon that upon re-examination of the advice of the law officers of the Crown, there is really not much wrong with this bill and it does not offend the person in his rights before the courts.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not say that at all.

Mr. Oliver: He said words to that effect, I will tell him that, this afternoon.

An hon. member: He certainly did!

Mr. Oliver: He certainly did not say them before and he is not reported in the newspaper as saying that, but he said that in effect this afternoon.

The law officers of the Crown are part of the Attorney General's department. The Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, is the chief law officer of the Crown. He is the man responsible in this Legislature for the enforcement of law in this province. He is the chief law officer. Now what does my hon. friend the hon. Attorney General say—perhaps not what he said today but what he said when he introduced this bill, as reported in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. The hon. Attorney General said the police commission—now listen to this, Mr. Prime Minister—

would have the power to deprive such a person of legal counsel until he was in jail. The legislation does not provide for bail or appeal by a person imprisoned under these new powers. It provides for

an eight-day jail sentence each time a person refuses to testify.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I am sorry—

Mr. Oliver: What is the trouble now?

Mr. Speaker: I would like to point out to the leader of the Opposition that we must not discuss the principle of the bill. We are discussing the motion that is before the House.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Prime Minister talked about it for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order! But we must not discuss the principle of the bill. The bill is not before the House.

I would like to give the leader of the Opposition as much latitude as possible, but I must tell him to refrain from going into sections of the bill and discussing the principle of the bill.

Mr. Oliver: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I had not gone so far as to get into sections of the bill. I was reading what was said by the hon. member who was, up until lately at least, the Attorney General of the province of Ontario. He says in his concluding paragraph—and these are his own words:

It is drastic, it is dangerous and it is new and it is terrible legislation in an English common law country.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Attorney General did not feel that this legislation went further than my hon. friend interpreted it as going this afternoon he would not have used these kinds of words. The hon. Attorney General knew that as we understood the bill, as the public understood the bill, it was legislation that offended the liberties of people before the courts in this province—not only the law-breakers, as my hon. friend suggests. It takes in everybody. Nobody is immune under this bill. It is not just the law-breakers. If we were sure it would be restricted to those it would be a different thing. But the legislation as it is drawn makes it unsafe for anyone in this province of Ontario. That is what we are objecting to. That is a point that the hon. Prime Minister did not touch at all this afternoon.

He talks about the law officers of the Crown and the advice received from them. Has he not read in the paper where the most eminent lawyers in this province have said that this legislation is dangerous and that it tramples on the individual rights of

people before the courts? Has he not read that? Did he not read what Joseph Sedgwick, one of the most eminent lawyers and a man of his own political faith, said in the paper this morning? Did he read what Mr. Robinette said? Did he read what all the great lawyers of this province have said in respect of this legislation? Then he makes the puny effort of getting up in this House this afternoon and saying that they are wrong and he is right.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): He said no such thing.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Get a hearing ad!

Mr. Oliver: I do not need a hearing ad and I certainly do not need one to hear the hon. Minister of Mines. Anyway a person would be better to have his ears plugged so far as the hon. Minister is concerned. But I would just say this to the hon. Prime Minister, that by this circuitous route he hopes to take off the pressure that is on the government at the present time. So far as I am concerned, nothing less than a withdrawal of these pernicious sections, yea, the withdrawal of the whole bill, will satisfy me or the Opposition. I say again, if this bill was withdrawn, another one could be put in its place and we could discuss it intelligently on the basis of doing things that the hon. Prime Minister pretends he wants to do with this bill but that he has overdone. He has been over-zealous in trampling on the rights of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) that all of the words after the word "discharged" be deleted and the words "and that the bill will be withdrawn" be substituted.

It is not in my own writing and I just cannot follow it too closely. I could not have followed my own any better, I suppose.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I think there is only one thing that will meet the situation that this province is faced with at the moment and that is that this government should give unqualified withdrawal to this bill.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: And that it has not done. What the government has done, as the hon. leader of the Opposition said, may be technically in order by moving a motion. In fact, they are in violation of the normal proce-

dures of this House. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that when this government had, for example, bills that it wanted studied, such as the bill on pensions, such as the bill on health, what was its procedure? It introduced a bill, the bill went to second reading, we had a debate on principle, and then it was sent off to whatever committee the government wanted, for it to be studied.

This is what I suggest had to be done in this particular instance but the government cannot at the moment face this. So what it has done is only a qualified kind of withdrawal. What is even more dangerous, Mr. Speaker, what is even more alarming, is that the government is obviously unrepentant.

The hon. Prime Minister says, for example, that he does not believe that it is going to violate any civil liberties—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not say that.

Mr. MacDonald: He said that it was his belief, having been readvised and having had it reaffirmed by the law officers of the Crown, there was no violation of civil liberties.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: And I was advised—

Mr. MacDonald: I heard that, and I am sure that is in the statement. He inferred that he was accepting the belief of the law officers of the Crown; therefore he is unrepentant in it. He says that if it is sent out to the committee and somebody comes up with good changes, then he will consider them. It is this unrepentant aspect which is the dangerous thing at the present time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit and edification of some of the newcomers at the back, if a bill is referred to a committee of this Legislature it is not withdrawn in fact. It is a qualified withdrawal, and that is the point I am talking to. The qualified withdrawal, as I have been trying to get across to the House, is accompanied by a virtually unrepentant attitude with regard to the contents of it.

The third point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this: This bill is wholly the responsibility of this government; they cannot, in any degree, slyly or otherwise, try to shove it off as being the responsibility of, for example, the Ontario Police Commission. Just let me draw hon. members' attention to one quotation, since the hon. Prime Minister was referring to the report of the Ontario Police

Commission. On page 11 are the following words:

We consulted The Attorney General's Department as to our legal powers while conducting our inquiry *in camera* and were advised that there was considerable doubt as to these, which should best be resolved by legislation to clarify it.

In other words, some time back, indeed back as far as last September, there were news stories when the police commission was beginning this investigation, reporting that they approached this government with regard to their powers.

This government has been contemplating this bill for six months. It has been contemplating the principles, and the manner in which they can put these principles into effect, for six months. They have had this report since January 31. The press, over the weekend, indicated that they have had the bill since March 2 in its present form; and I suggest that, if this is accurate, they have had all the time needed to discuss it. Yet they have come up with a conclusion which is so insensitive to the basic principles of civil liberties—important as may be the problem of coping with crime—that they have, in the view of everybody except the government and the law officers of the Crown, violated these liberties in the kind of fashion we have just seen.

Finally—and this is more and more obvious—this government is in chaos.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: This government has lost the confidence of the province at the present time. The government has lost the confidence of the House. As a matter of fact, the government has lost the confidence of the backbenchers—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: —and that is precisely the reason why the government could not bring the principle of the bill before the House; because if they did they would have been voted down on one of their own bills—so they have taken this short-circuited fashion to be able to cope with it.

The motion being moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition—I believe there can be only one amendment at a time—is a valid amendment. It would at least achieve the basic point that there would be unqualified withdrawal, which is what I think we should have. Then, if the hon. Prime Minister would be willing, in his present plight, to accept a

little advice from this side of the House, I suggest that what we should do now is what we should have done to begin with. We should debate this report and not attempt things in a rushed fashion; the government is a victim of its own procedures by doing things in this rushed fashion and trying to have short sessions.

Debate this report. Put it as the first item on the order paper when we come back after Easter. And after it has been debated, then we can conceivably arrive at a consensus within this House and help to get the government out of the chaos it is in at the present time. Help the government, in other words, to strengthen our position in coping with organized crime, without destroying the basic liberties of the people.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the amendment moved by my leader, let me say that this, in my opinion, is not a time for dramatics, or breast-beating, or berating the government. The government has made a serious error, and I would have hoped this afternoon that the hon. Prime Minister would have come into this House and said, "We made a mistake." Had he done that, sir, had the hon. Prime Minister come into this House and said, "We made a mistake and we are sorry. We will withdraw this bill and proceed in a different way", I think he would have earned the respect of every person in the province of Ontario for such a manoeuvre.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we are met with a complete face-saving device—and it is nothing more than that. He says, "We are not going to withdraw the bill. We are going to send it down to a committee and we are going to have the police commission there and to tell you what they had in mind." We have already read in the press, over the weekend, what the police commission has in mind. Magistrate Graham, quoted on the front page of the *Toronto Telegram*, said on Saturday: "The commission, to a man, stands behind this."

Judge Macdonald was quoted the same way. It was only Major General Sparling who reserved comment.

We wonder, Mr. Speaker, to what extent these three appointees on the police commission should be expressing public opinions. Surely they should be expressing opinions to those people to whom they are responsible, the hon. Attorney General and the Cabinet; but they did not see fit to do this. We have had all sorts of opinions, including the opinion of the hon. Attorney General, as my

hon. leader read it from the newspapers; and you may remember, sir, on Thursday afternoon, the excitement and the horror which raged through the press gallery when they had had an opportunity to question the hon. Attorney General about what this bill really meant.

No amount of denying is going to gainsay the objectives of this bill. No amount of pointing to various phrases in this statement of the hon. Prime Minister is going to change one iota of what has been said.

Here on page 2, he says:

I say that it was introduced after it had been carefully drafted by the law officers of the Crown, who were of the opinion that it did not interfere with the fundamental rights of the people of Ontario.

Apparently we have all grades of law officers. We have law officers who give one set of advice to one person, and another set of advice to another person. I do not know who these law officers were, but apparently it was not the chief law officer, the hon. Attorney General.

How many law officers do we have, and how many law opinions do we have? Surely, if this government is functioning the way any normal, democratic government can and should function, it would come forward with one unified opinion? We would not have the opinion of the hon. Attorney General at variance with the opinion of the hon. Prime Minister. We would not have the opinion of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forest (Mr. Roberts) at variance with the hon. Attorney General and the hon. Prime Minister. We would not have the opinions of all these backbenchers, who have been quoted to show, and properly show, their abhorrence at this type of legislation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Singer: We have not got a government. We have chaos here. The only way, Mr. Speaker, in which face can be saved—and all of us in this House are anxious that, in our legislation, we do the right thing—the only way the best can be made out of a bad thing, is that this bill be withdrawn right now.

The hon. Prime Minister says on page 4 of this statement:

I have had further consultations with the law officers of the Crown and they have reaffirmed to me that, at the time this legislation was drawn, it was their opinion that it did not prohibit the right to counsel and it did not interfere—

and so on. Well, I ask you again, Mr. Speaker: Which set of law officers do we believe, and how can you tell the law officer with an opinion unless you have a programme?

Mr. Speaker, surely the people of Ontario are entitled to hear the government benches speak with one voice? This is not what we have today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more point in this debate, in urging all hon. members of the House to act to withdraw this bill. I have in my hand a document issued by the government and published by the Ontario Human Rights Commission, dated May-June, 1963. It says:

A Day to Remember: The signing of the Magna Carta on June 15, 1215, is regarded by free men as one of the most memorable events in human history.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I was just wondering if this pamphlet, which the member is reading from now, has anything to do with the motion before the House; as I said before, I have given quite a bit of latitude in this debate but I wish the member would stick to the motion before the House, whether you are for or against referring this bill to the standing committee.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this has a great deal to do with it, particularly when I tell you who the author of this quotation is. The author goes on to say:

When on that day the despotic King John surrendered to the demands of the barons in the great meadow at Runnymede, the lamp of liberty was lit, not just for the inhabitants of a single island, but for all the people everywhere in the world. And if down through the succeeding centuries the lamp has sometimes burnt low, its light has never been extinguished. There came into being in 1215 a fundamental principle which even a king was not permitted to violate, and whenever the state, in the words of Sir Winston Churchill, "swollen with its own authority" has attempted to ride roughshod over the rights and liberties of the people, it is to the doctrine of Magna Carta that appeal has again and again been made and never as yet without success.

This quotation goes on for several more paragraphs and it is signed, "John P. Roberts, Prime Minister of Ontario."

I would say simply this, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister as an honourable

man—and he is an honourable man—really believes the sentiments he has expressed there, and I think he does, then I think he should accept the honourable course here this afternoon and without any shilly-shally, without any reliance on technical rules of procedure, stand up and say, “I will withdraw this bill without any reservation.” I urge all hon. members of the House, led by the hon. Prime Minister, to support the amendment brought in by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House has to do with procedure, it has nothing to do with the substance of the bill called Bill No. 99. It seems strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that you should be so tolerant of the Opposition as to let it wander beyond the bounds, especially in the light of the experience of the hon. leader of the Opposition himself, who has been in this House longer than any other person, and should know the rules of the House and be willing to be bound by them. But not the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the procedure which is the substance of the motion advanced by the hon. Prime Minister, he has suggested that the bill itself be sent to a committee, to the committee on legal bills. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that in all of the circumstances this is a very desirable procedure. There is precedent for this, there is precedent within the years that I have been in this House myself.

Mr. MacDonald: Not before second reading!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: After first reading, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: No, sir!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, the situation is this, that second reading involves a debate on principle. The views which have been expressed here today and last Friday by some hon. members of the Opposition are based on newspaper reports and other documents which are second-hand information to them, but they have been attempting to advance them.

Mr. MacDonald: The reports were based on comments from the hon. Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am talking about the procedure. The procedure which we suggest and the government suggests is to send it to the committee on legal bills. Why? So that

the public interest can be best served at the earliest possible moment before the legal bills committee. At its sitting, witnesses from outside—these experts that the hon. leader of the Opposition has made reference to, and others and the civil servants of this government—will be heard. These are matters which will have a bearing because everything on both sides of this case has not been told so far. I am not arguing on the merits of the bill, I am talking—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I say that quite frankly, because that is not before the House. I am for having this bill referred to a committee at the earliest possible moment.

Here is the situation: The hon. leader of the Opposition, of all people in this House, should know better than to stand here and tell the hon. members of this Legislature what he did today. He knows full well that after it has been to the committee this bill will come back to this House after those witnesses have been heard and the debate on the principle of the bill will then be held. We would be in a far better position—I will go further than that—if the bill came back to this House then we would have the benefit of a first-rate public discussion and we would be able to discuss the principle in the light of the knowledge that we had gained.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members of the Opposition want to interfere with the remarks which I am endeavouring to make, that is quite acceptable to me. But I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that their interference with what I am saying about procedure, which is directly relevant to the motion before the House, reflects in direct proportion their lack of responsibility with respect to the business of this House.

I must take exception to something else, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is the proper time and place to do it. Reference has been made to the law officers of the Crown, and by inference serious criticism has been made of the law officers of the Crown.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Sedgwick was doing it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Anybody in this House who attacks the law officers of the Crown in the way that has been done today

involves an attack on the civil servants of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand completely the position taken by the hon. member for York South, because I thought he was interested in finding some way at the earliest possible time of dealing with this serious canker which is alleged to exist. The most expedient way of dealing with this problem is to get this matter before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, his position today is different from the inference he gave to this House last Friday.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, well, just wait, the hon. member will have a chance!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The position taken by the hon. member for York South is substantially different today from that which he took last Friday in this very House.

Mr. Speaker, in asking the hon. members in this House to support the motion advanced by the hon. Prime Minister, I suggest this to them, that this is the act of a responsible leader of a responsible government to get this matter moved along at the fastest possible time.

Mr. Speaker: The chair recognizes the member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition which I support. The effect of the amendment as I understand it, if carried, would be that the bill would simply be discharged from the order paper. That I believe is the proper course that we should take at this time, for reasons that I will try to outline.

Before I go into those reasons, however, I would like to call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that we are now discussing procedure with regard to one of the most important bills ever introduced into this House, and the hon. Minister who sponsored the bill and piloted it through first reading is not even present in the House. Mr. Speaker, I think there should be an explanation of his absence in all fairness to him and to everyone else concerned. If he is seriously ill, that fact should be known. I would suggest that there could be no other valid excuse for his

absence at this time other than serious illness, and I think the House and the public are entitled to know why it is that he is not here. If he is on his way out, I think that should also be announced.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would remind the member now to stick to the motion as closely as possible.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, sir, I will try to direct all of my remarks to the amendment, which I believe is what is before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the ruling you made, to the effect that the main motion is in order. I must say, with deference, that I have the greatest difficulty in understanding your ruling, in view of the clear terminology of rule No. 60 of this House, which says that no public bill may be committed or amended until after it has received two readings. This bill has received one reading. The main motion is to discharge the order for second reading and refer it to the committee. It appeared to me that, under rule No. 60, that procedure is clearly out of order. You have ruled that it is in order, sir; but I would like to suggest that it is still a most improper procedure for any government to follow, particularly in a bill as contentious as this one.

I would suggest that no bill of any consequence should be proceeded with in any way, by reference to a committee or in any other way, until it has been approved in principle in this House. That is the whole point of second reading of a bill; it is to approve it in principle. If a government does not wish a bill to be debated in principle, then it should withdraw it altogether, as the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition proposed. But to ask us to refer to committee a bill which we have had no opportunity to approve in principle, is a most unreasonable request, and one that no hon. members of this House should be asked to comply with. I will try to enumerate certain reasons why I think that is so.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, if the bill has not been approved in principle, then it is a total waste of time to refer it to a committee. The function of a committee is to consider the technical details of a bill. But let us assume that it is not approved in principle—and I hope it never will be approved in principle, certainly in its present form—then the entire work of the committee would be a complete waste of time. What is the use of asking a committee to consider the technical details of a bill until it knows, first of all, whether the House assents to the general principles of the bill?

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to you that many of the hon. members, the majority of the hon. members, of this House are not members of the committee to which it is proposed the bill should be referred. I happen, myself, to be included among that number.

I object to a bill being proceeded with and dealt with, on which I have not had any opportunity to express my views as to its principle. It is, in my opinion, an abrogation of the basic rights of the hon. members of this House that the regular procedure should be short-circuited, and that only some members will have an opportunity to discuss the bill at this stage.

My most important objection to this short-circuiting, of what I would suggest is proper procedure, is that it represents a total evasion of responsibility on the part of the government. We all know that the government has been in a state of total confusion for the last few days. I would say that the introduction of this bill was perhaps the greatest blunder of this decade, and the government has been in a state of confusion ever since.

I sat and watched an interview with the hon. Attorney General, the sponsor of the bill, on television; when he was asked certain questions, questions relating to his bill, he said that those questions should be directed to the chairman of the police commission. Well, who is introducing legislation in this House? Who is taking responsibility for it, Mr. Speaker? Is the chairman of the police commission, or some person outside this House, taking responsibility for legislation? Have we sacrificed entirely the concept of responsible government and of ministerial responsibility?

The hon. Minister and the Cabinet are responsible for this bill, and they should be prepared to answer all questions on it and justify its principle, if, indeed, they believe the principle can be justified. If they do not believe it can be justified, then they should frankly admit their mistake. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to believe that anyone can make a mistake. I think an honourable course, and one which certainly would not provoke anything but favourable comment from me, would be for the government to indicate that they have not given sufficient consideration to this bill, they have made a mistake, and therefore will accept the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

That would be an honourable course. It would be a proper course under the circumstances, and I think the government should receive credit for it; but no, they are trying

to crawl out from under responsibility altogether. We can only assume that they arrived at a policy—although some of the reports in the press lead one to wonder if they really did arrive at a policy in any meaningful sense of that term—but we can assume they arrived at a policy. They have found the policy is objectionable to a large part of the people of Ontario and now they are asking a committee to make policy for it. That can be the only significance of the referral of this bill to a committee before it has been approved in principle.

It means, purely and simply, that the government is now in a state of such utter confusion that it is unable to determine policy itself, as is its responsibility; and it hopes that somehow or other the committee, with the assistance of outside parties, will be able to get it out of the mess and come up with some sort of acceptable policy. Well, that is not acceptable. That means the end of responsible government, if we accept that sort of principle.

Let the government come in with its policies and then stand or fall on them. If it believes that this bill is justified, let it call second reading and stand or fall on the second reading. If it believes it is not justified, let it discharge the bill from the order paper and bring in such other bill as it sees fit. Then we can decide, when we see its new bill, whether or not we like it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government should be aware of one thing. I realize that with its top-heavy majority it has become quite unresponsive to public opinion; but surely it is sufficiently aware that there is widespread apprehension among the people of Ontario as to the implications of this bill? I am suggesting to the government, Mr. Speaker, that that apprehension can be allayed only by the unconditional withdrawal of the bill. As long as that bill, in any form, is before this House or is before a committee of this House, there will continue to be, quite legitimately, in my opinion, apprehension among the public.

I think it is the duty of the government to try to allay that apprehension, and there is only one way I can see that it can do that. Let it withdraw the bill; let it have a sober second thought; let it consider the whole matter; let the whole subject matter be discussed in this House, if the government sees fit; and, after further consideration, let it decide on alternative legislation it may wish to bring in.

Why do we have to have this bill driven along relentlessly, stage by stage, at this

juncture? What is the hurry? The government sat for years and did nothing about organized crime. What is the tremendous hurry now to push this ill-considered bill forward? It has had first reading; the government is afraid to bring it to second reading, so now it is trying to spirit it off to a committee; but it is still in this House. It is still a part of the subject matter of this House as long as it is in committee. When it goes through that committee stage it advances one more step toward adoption; and I do not think it should advance any steps toward adoption. It should be withdrawn.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the private members on the government side of the House that they should give serious consideration to supporting the amendment to the main motion. It has been said on a number of occasions that the private members on the government side have shown considerable energy and initiative in this House, that they have shown a disposition to criticize the government where they have considered it merited criticism. I believe that is true. I believe that they have shown quite a lot of independence in thought and action. I think there are a great many members on the other side of the House who are quite capable of independent action and I suggest to them that here, if ever there was an issue, is the time to show their independence and to vote for what they think is right. It is an open secret that many of them are unhappy with this bill.

It has been alleged in the newspapers that it went through a caucus meeting at which only ten of them were present. This I find hard to believe. I find it hard to believe that the government would put a bill of this magnitude through a caucus meeting of only ten members—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What has this got to do with the motion?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member's party could not even have a caucus of ten.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: At any rate that is what was reported in the press. I said I found it difficult to believe, but whether or not it is true, or what the truth of the matter may be, I would still suggest to the private hon. members who object in principle to this bill that the motion the hon. Prime Minister has put forward is not a satisfactory way of disposing of the bill. I would suggest to these

hon. members that they should vote for the amendment.

I realize that supporters of the government would hesitate to vote no confidence in the government, but this, after all, is a procedural matter. I would suggest to them that the question of confidence is not involved. Therefore, if they are genuinely independent as has been indicated in some quarters, let them show it. Let them vote to have this bill discharged from the order paper so that there will be an opportunity for sober consideration of the whole matter and an introduction at an appropriate time of such legislation as may be appropriate.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of issue in which all people who are concerned about civil rights and the liberty of the subject should unite and stand up and be counted in favour of the removal of this bill from the order paper. That can be accomplished if the motion proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition is adopted.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I rise—

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, I recognize the member for Parkdale and the member for Lakeshore second.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition. This bill should be withdrawn because it is evil and it is a shame on the province of Ontario. The very fact that the hon. leader of this government, despite his protestations to the contrary that he is all for liberty and will not interfere with our rights, would withdraw this bill from the Legislature, the place where the principle should be debated, where the public of Ontario can see what is going on, is all the more reason why we in the province of Ontario should be on our guard. If it had not been for the press on the day this bill was introduced, days would have gone by before we would have known what the real content of the bill was.

By taking the bill from out of this House and putting it into a committee where we are told we can talk to the law officers of the Crown, the government is taking away from us and the people of Ontario their real rights. Mr. Speaker, we are not interested in talking to the law officers of the Crown. The responsibility is with the government and the responsibility lies primarily with the hon. Prime Minister and with the hon. Attorney

General, an Attorney General who does not even come to this House today. One wonders, if the bill goes to committee, whether the hon. Attorney General will show up then to tell us what is behind it. We do not know.

What we want to do is to see and to discuss this bill here. This is the most important legislation ever introduced into this province. I say that because it virtually destroys the rights our forefathers fought for for centuries—and one thing can be said, if the British people have ever done anything, it is to create law and order. Our common law is the greatest legacy that we have ever given to civilization, and yet now we, in this shameful day, are faced with the prospect of seeing a government bring in legislation that can destroy these rights with a stroke of the pen.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we, as members of this House, speak not only for the people of the province of Ontario today but we speak for those untold thousands who for centuries have served the cause of freedom. I think that this government owes it to us and owes it to the province and to the people that have served the cause of freedom over the years, to let the principle of the bill be debated in Parliament. Once again to try to throw the blame on the civil service, to say that it was recommended to it by the officers of the Crown, is nonsense. It is abrogating its duty to civil servants and no matter how good or faithful those civil servants might be, it is the responsibility of the government.

I have sometimes wondered whether, if this type of legislation was recommended to the government by civil servants, if it is not time the government cleaned house. I say this to any Attorney General who would allow such legislation to come before this House, or go before a committee; he should not be Attorney General in a free province. He may be being offered as a sacrificial lamb, I do not know, but certainly whether the government offers the hon. Attorney General as a sacrificial lamb, it is still the duty and the responsibility of the hon. Prime Minister of this province. He is the first Minister of the Crown and nothing will ever shake that garb from him.

Mr. Speaker, whatever reputation the hon. Prime Minister has built up in the province of Ontario, it has received a blot by this legislation from which he will never recover. And we as a province have received in the press throughout the world a shame and a blot from which it is going to take us a long time to recover. To think that even the government is so ashamed of its own legis-

lation, it wishes to take it from this House to some committee, where no doubt it hopes to bury it. This legislation, which today is compared with what is done in South Africa, and which is being sent to the United Nations, has the name of the province of Ontario listed with a type of legislation which will seek to crush the rights of the individual citizen.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any decency or any wellspring of liberty in this government, it will see to it that this legislation is debated in this House, that it is not withdrawn and taken to a committee so that we can talk to the civil servants. This is not the duty of the civil servants. This is the duty of the government of Ontario. The fact that it is such a vital piece of legislation, makes it more than just a matter of procedure or technicalities. Today the people of the province of Ontario are not interested in technicalities, they are interested in killing this bill, and it should be withdrawn—

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trotter: Any technicality that is used to take it out of this House and place it before a committee, is a technicality being used to strangle the rights of the people of the province of Ontario. I was glad to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition speak the way he did for the rights of the people of Ontario.

The bill, I might say again, should be completely withdrawn. The government, despite its huge majority—and this is another reason why the people of the province of Ontario have a right to fear this government, a gnawing fear—still cannot debate the bill in this House. I say again, the government should withdraw the bill and show that it has some decency and some respect for the liberties of our forefathers and the people of the province of Ontario.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Eagleson: Mr. Speaker, we have heard certain references by the hon. members of the Opposition here today indicating that the backbenchers of the Progressive-Conservative Party perhaps were not in favour of the motion of the hon. Prime Minister. If I might speak—

Mr. Speaker: May I inform the member now that we are speaking to the amendment?

Mr. Eagleson: Yes, to the amendment, that is correct. The amendment as proposed, Mr. Speaker, is to have this bill withdrawn. I am sure that every hon. member of this House is well aware of my personal position on civil

liberties. I feel that they, at all costs, must be protected—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eagleson: Well, if the hon. members had listened on Friday they perhaps would have heard them.

An hon. member: Some of us were not here.

Mr. Eagleson: The hon. members were not here; right.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member had a chance to speak on Friday.

Mr. Eagleson: I made it clear on Friday that we must, at all costs, protect the civil liberties of the individual in our province.

An hon. member: The hon. member did not talk about Bill No. 99.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Eagleson: I feel that the amendment before this House perhaps would not protect them in a way which will show everyone in this province just what was intended by the proposed legislation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eagleson: The hon. Prime Minister, in speaking today, in his own words, indicated that the bill had been put forward in the belief that it did not infringe or violate basic individual liberties and privileges, but that if it does it must be changed. In other words, we are going to have the opportunity, if these rights are infringed, to change the bill; and it will be done at the committee stage. We have heard in the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition when he spoke today, Mr. Speaker, that this motion was in order technically. Well, surely that is sufficient! If it is technically all right, then it is all right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Eagleson: The people of the province of Ontario have put their faith in the Progressive-Conservative Party and we are not going to betray that confidence. I urge that the hon. members of my party vote against the proposed amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: Was the hon. member in the caucus when it—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition that the bill be discharged from the order paper; and I do so for several reasons.

The first one is that the bill, as originally proposed, has disrupted this province in a way I have seldom seen. Up to this point, I have never, on any issue, received as many phone calls or personal calls demanding that I oppose this bill when it come to the House. Everywhere across this province there has been indignation at what has been happening here these past few days. The press of this province has been unanimous in stating that this bill is dangerous and should be discharged from the order paper. I do not know that I have read one single editorial or one single article in the press of this province—and the press has often been the safeguard of human freedom through the ages—which has not condemned the legislation, and which has not demanded that it be withdrawn. It has also demanded other things, but it has demanded that as a basis.

Over the weekend, too, I read in the newspapers where backbencher after backbencher in this government—and some who have not been backbenchers—has been extremely unhappy with this legislation; therefore it should be withdrawn from the order paper. I know that the technicality, which has been brought forward by the hon. Prime Minister this morning, allows some of these people to “get off the hook”, and support this kind of a technicality as means to change their point of view. But, believe me, even though that technicality can be supported by these people, they still feel that this bill is iniquitous and that it should be discharged from the order paper.

I know that if it does go to committee, and I suppose the overwhelming majority of this House—the government party—will make sure that it does, I can see the people who expressed themselves over the weekend fighting the principle of this bill at the committee level. I think they will; but why they should, this afternoon, hide behind that technicality is beyond me.

The second reason why I feel that this should be discharged from the order paper, and the amendment carried, is that this government has shown itself to be insensitive, almost completely insensitive, to the feelings of the people of this province. I know they have found themselves in a desperate fix. I know that at this point they are trying desperately to find a way out, to keep Cabinet solidarity, and keep solidarity within their

ranks; but that insensitivity is there. Sometimes a government, which is top-heavy in its majority, and which has been too long in power, begins to think that its mandates, no matter what they are, are in the best interests of the people in the province. So I believe, because of this insensitivity, that this legislation should be withdrawn from the order paper.

The third reason why I think this should be done is that the legislation, as it stands, gives almost absolute power to three men on the police commission. While we may have profound respect for some, or all, of these men, it is the kind of power which no democracy—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: When the hon. member will not hear what explanation the men who wrote the report have to make he is killing democracy.

Mr. Young:—which no democracy should hand over to a small group of men to be administered. You see, they say—and I have the quote here. One of the commissioners says:

—that this will only be used against known suspects in the matter of organized crime.

But the commission itself decides who these people are going to be, who will be hauled in, perhaps in the middle of the night, and questioned with or without counsel—we are not sure, yet, whether this is the case. Then they will be jailed if they do not give the answers the commission feels it wants to get. They decide, and they alone can make up their minds, who is going to be hauled in.

This way we are destroying the freedom we are trying to save; and if human history tells us anything, it is that legislation like this, or decrees like this, which are designed to save the state, can only result in the destruction of freedom for the citizens in that state.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Young: The other matter I want to bring before the House—another reason why we should withdraw this bill and discharge it from the order paper, Mr. Speaker—is that this House has rights; and this motion, which was offered this morning, tramples upon those rights. The amendment is designed to restore those rights to this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Young: I have not had long experience in this House, but I have had some experi-

ence in parliamentary procedure. I know that, generally, it is taken for granted—except, it seems, here—that when legislation comes for second reading at that point the principle of a bill is discussed, and at that point the people, who have been elected to do a job, express their opinion as to whether they think this is good legislation or bad legislation. If the majority think it is good they send it on to the committee—

An hon. member: Amen!

Mr. Young: My hon. friend across here says, “Amen!” I am delighted to hear the response and know that he agrees. This is wonderful. We expect that he will vote with me on this legislation—that is what “Amen” means—I might read him a lecture in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Young: So I say, Mr. Speaker—and I hope that this legislation will be withdrawn—that the amendment will be carried. I say to the people who have expressed their opposition to this legislation, “Do not be caught on a technicality such as has been offered here this afternoon. Express your opposition.”

There are some great moments in history. Some of the greatest have been when men are willing to say, “I stand here on principle. I believe that the principle of this bill is wrong.” Certainly many of the people in this House believe it wrong; the time is here for people, who believe the principle of the bill is wrong, to say so, and stand on their feet and so express themselves. This is a democratic procedure on the second reading of a bill.

I recall to hon. members that event in the House of Commons in Britain, when one man got up to speak and the voice came: “Speak for England!” I say, today in this House, the challenge is here for every hon. member, who sits with his responsibility as an elected representative, to vote for Ontario and to vote for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment to the legislation.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, some of us missed the actual wording of the amendment. Would you please advise me and the House whether the amendment called for the withdrawal of the bill or the discharging of the order from the order paper?

Mr. Speaker: It calls for discharging the order and the withdrawal of the bill.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to support the amendment made by the hon. leader of the Opposition and I speak in sorrow, Mr. Speaker, because I have always considered the hon. Prime Minister and his team to be responsible people. I cannot understand for the life of me what they are doing this time, I just cannot. I look at what the hon. Prime Minister has said on page 3 of his statement today and I quote:

I made a statement in which I said I would not tolerate any legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes the personal rights and freedoms of the individual.

There is nothing that is more important, Mr. Speaker, and I really and truly felt when the hon. Prime Minister made that statement that he would realize what the man in the street is worried about—that he would have taken the honourable course out and would have withdrawn the bill. I cannot for the life of me see why, sir, with 77 members and a small Opposition such as we have today, that government is afraid to have this bill and its principles discussed on this floor today. This is the time to do it, there is no better time than the present.

Mr. Speaker, I say again I speak in sorrow today, because I feel democracy is being trampled on, the rights of this House are being disregarded.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Braithwaite: Hon. members can say what they like!

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to bring to you and to the hon. members of this House, something of the feeling of apprehension of the public. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to bear with me. I would like to bring to you some of this feeling of fear in the minds of many who have come from strange lands and who have felt that they have left this sort of thing behind them. I also speak of the people who were born Canadians, who have lived here all their lives and whose forefathers lived here and who have a great regard for freedom.

I could tell the hon. member of many of the other people who have called me personally on this, Mr. Speaker. Friday morning I got an unprecedented number of phone calls on this very bill. I told each and every one, without even having come down to Queen's Park to discuss this with my hon. colleagues—and I had no fear at all when I told them—that this party would not support this bill and that we would fight it to the end.

Mr. Speaker, we all know who the majority of the members of the committee are. We know that there is a possibility that the bill could come back to this House exactly as it went. If that happens, Mr. Speaker, I can only say as our hon. leader has said, that filibuster we might if we have to. I stand against that sort of thing, I do not like it, but as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this thing is being sent to committee on a technicality. Democracy is being throttled. If necessary, I think we will have to take every step that we can to fight to make sure that this bill is not passed.

I spoke earlier, Mr. Speaker, about the apprehension of the public and I am going to beg your indulgence. I would like to read you a couple of the communications that I received just today.

Mr. Speaker: Speak on the amendment.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am speaking on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Would the member please sit down! If the member is going to read some letters at the present time they will have to refer to this amendment that the bill be withdrawn. I just wanted to warn him that they must be of that nature before he reads them so they may not be out of order.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I would like to read some of the comments from some of these letters with reference to the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister himself when he said that he would not tolerate any legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes the personal rights and freedoms of the individual. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the comments I am going to make are directly in relation to those comments made by the hon. Prime Minister. I talk first of all about a telegram that is dated 2.24 today from a constituent of Etobicoke, where we value freedom, Mr. Speaker. It says: I ADD MY SUPPORT TO YOUR CONDEMNATION OF THE PROPOSED REPREHENSIBLE AND UNACCEPTABLE AMENDMENTS TO THE POLICE ACT.

I read you another letter, Mr. Speaker, and this is addressed to myself from a constituent:

In this morning's paper there appears a bill introduced into the House by Attorney General Frederick M. Cass, which is beyond the belief of any thinking man. I refer to the legislation that would increase the power of the police commission to that of dictatorial power similar to that enjoyed only by tyrants like Hitler and Mussolini. This would in effect endow the Attorney General with—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think the member is dealing with the principle of the bill and I must ask him not to get on the principle of the bill because the bill itself is not before the House.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, if I am not allowed to speak on these letters today, I just want to bring to the attention—

Mr. Speaker: I did not say the member could not speak on his letters. I only wanted to tell him that he must not mention letters or read letters that refer to the principle of the bill itself, because the bill is not before the House. It is the amendment at the present time, that the bill be withdrawn, that is before the House.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back to the statement that the hon. Prime Minister himself has made, where he accepts responsibility for the bill. It is page seven that I am reading from, Mr. Speaker:

From my own personal point of view, I think I have made it very clear that if there is any conflict between the rights of the individual and the necessity for powers to deal with criminal elements in our society, then the rights of the individual must be supreme, even if it means in doing so we give to the criminal elements in our society an advantage which we would rather they did not have.

And further:

May I say also that there are many misconceptions concerning this proposed possible legislation. While the terms "police state" and "police state legislation" have been used, I think it should be pointed out that this legislation gives no additional powers whatsoever to the police of this province.

My hon. leader has said the comments of formidable lawyers such as Mr. Robinette and others indicate this is not true. The hon. Prime Minister has said right here that he disagrees violently, and so do I. All that I am trying to do in reading from some of these letters, Mr. Speaker, is to attempt to bring to this House the fact that the man on the street does not agree with what the hon. Prime Minister has said. I will see if I can find another letter here which is right on the point. I quote:

Never before have I felt so strongly about a proposed bill that I have ever written to my member of Parliament but as a Christian I feel that I must raise my voice in protest against any legislation that would plunge us backward as quickly as

this piece of mockery of freedom proposed by Mr. F. M. Cass.

Here is another. I will just read a few sentences from it:

Not only is this an affront to our civil liberties and our rights as citizens, it is an insult to our intelligence. Please oppose this legislation to the best of your ability.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would say to all hon. members of this House that they should join with this party and vote in favour of the amendment. This bill should not, and I repeat, should not go to committee where a majority on the government side could put through what it likes. Many of the hon. members of this House do not sit on the private bills committee. They should have an opportunity to discuss it here and now, and I call specifically to the independent hon. members on the government side. They have a precedent. There are a few who are not afraid to stand up and speak for what they feel is right, and I call on these people to vote with this party in favour of the amendment.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. Prime Minister—he is a reasonable man—to show the public, to show the man on the street, how he feels about this by allowing the hon. members of his own party to have a free vote on this. Then let us see what would happen. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister would not allow this. His motion might fail. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have listened a long time this afternoon to those with legal training expressing their opinion on a subject of great concern to all of us. I, frankly, confess that I have not had the benefit of that legal training, but I am one who believes in those traditions long established and cherished by all within this House.

I think I might be described, Mr. Speaker, as one of those who believes in permitting those, who want to speak to something like this, to have the opportunity to do so. I feel very keenly about the benefit of public discussion and public forum; in fact, I have felt so keenly about it that, as the hon. leader of the Opposition was once wont to say, I might be known as the man who establishes committees at such a rate that I might be known as "committee-man Bill." I make that statement with the degree of levity with which the hon. leader of the Opposition directed it in my direction.

But I do not look at it in quite such a

manner of levity, because I frankly believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal to be learned, a very great deal to be obtained in the way of evidence, if this bill is to go before the legal bills committee. Those who supported the bill, in bringing it forward, in advising that action be taken to deal with the problem as they saw it, as it was outlined in the report of the police commission, should have the opportunity to appear before that committee and to so express themselves.

Those people are denied the right to come before this assembly and so speak; but they would have the right to come to the committee and so speak and address themselves. As the hon. Prime Minister has suggested this afternoon, it would provide the members of the police commission with the right to come there and express themselves in public forum, before the members of the committee, before the public, and before the press, so that they might have an interpretation placed on their findings in a way we all could understand. Then, on top of that, it seems to me that it would provide the public with the opportunity to come before that committee and, having heard all the facts, express their opinion in a calm and collected manner; and disagree, if it is their belief that they should disagree, in preserving the traditions of freedom that we enjoy in this province.

Certainly we respect it and admire it. Let us have the benefit of public forum and public discussion. To my mind the hon. Prime Minister of this province, this afternoon, has set an example for all of us to follow when he has openly suggested that the rule of the House be suspended to bring this bill before the legal bills committee before second reading, so that we can have the benefit of discussion on the report of the police commission, the benefit of the discussion of those who prepared the legislation, the benefit of the discussion of those who would oppose the legislation. Having done this, then I think we would all be in a position to have the bill come back to this House and be decided upon in a right and reasonable fashion. Surely this is reason itself? I subscribe, Mr. Speaker, to the view that the amendment should not carry and we should uphold the motion of the hon. Prime Minister.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, having listened to some of the discussion this afternoon, one would think that the hon. members of the New Democratic Party are the only ones who have a private

hold on this matter of principle. This, personally, is repulsive to me because I think that all of us in this House believe in principles and want to put our principles into action. I certainly would like to explain to this House how I think my principles fit in with the situation in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment to withdraw Bill No. 99 from the order paper. In this we have some fuzzy thinking because, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 99 contains one section which has caused a lot of controversy—section 14—it contains 21 other sections of useful legislation, legislation dealing with things like procedural provisions in connection with bargaining for policemen which are made standard with that applying to firemen; and other sections, to clear up technicalities.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to withdraw from the order paper—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I must remind the member not to get into sections of the bill. I must be fair to all sides.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I feel we are being asked to withdraw a bill which, as I have stated, contains a lot more than section 14, which is the one in controversy. I think, therefore, that I cannot vote for this amendment to withdraw this whole bill. I think the proper place for discussion of this bill is the legal bills committee. I think that the bill will have complete discussion there. I would say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I will certainly speak and work for some changes in section 14.

I believe further, Mr. Speaker, in the character of the hon. Prime Minister. We who know him know the type of man he is, and we know that the statement he has made today and I would like to read it again:

That the legislative committee dealing with legal bills should have this bill with no restrictions, with no holds barred.

And he further says:

May I make it clear once again that the government is prepared, and always has been prepared, to amend, to change, to withdraw the bill or any portion thereof. The bill was put forward in the belief that it did not infringe or violate basic individual liberties and privileges, but if it does, it must be changed.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. Prime Minister, and I believe him when he makes this statement. I believe that we will have the fullest discussion of this bill at this committee and this is why it should not be withdrawn now.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think my hon. friends realize what this means. They are being given an opportunity now, to work in co-operation with us, to right this problem, to help get at this problem of organized crime. And what a sorry spectacle is this group who claim they are the champions. They are out after organized crime and yet they do not want to come and work, in co-operation with us on this committee, to help get a section that will put teeth into The Police Act without infringing upon the individual rights of the citizens of this province. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have here today a sorry spectacle. They do not want to co-operate to stamp out organized crime in this province.

I say to them, Mr. Speaker, I say directly to them, that we should vote against this amendment. Let us have the hon. members of the Opposition either put up or shut up.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment put forward by the hon. leader of the Opposition, if that was news to the hon. members of the House.

I am a new member of this House, Mr. Speaker. I am a young member of this House. I have sat here now for almost ten weeks. I have no particular illusions about the absolute virtue of the parliamentary system, and I have no particular illusions about the absolute principles to which the hon. member latterly referred. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would not have believed it possible for a government to introduce such a bill into this Legislature on a Friday, and then for a government to defend such a bill in this Legislature on a Monday. It betrays, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: We are not talking about—

Another hon. member: We introduced it on Thursday.

Mr. MacDonald: We did not see the content until Friday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. S. Lewis: If indeed, Mr. Speaker, I made the slip and said Friday instead of Thursday and the hon. members rise to it, then it is an even sadder commentary that the extra 24 hours should not have brought them to their collective democratic senses.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I will have to remind the guests in the galleries that this is the second time they have given applause.

If there are any further demonstrations of applause or otherwise, I will order the attendants to clear the galleries in which the demonstration took place.

Mr. S. Lewis: What profoundly concerns the Opposition, I think, Mr. Speaker, is that it betrays an attitude of mind which is totally incompatible with fundamental human rights. And it goes further.

What frightens us is that the government has become addicted to anti-democratic procedures. I want to remind this House when talking about the discharging of this motion from the order paper that when the hon. Attorney General introduced the bill on Thursday he did not even have the courtesy to inform the House of the offensive sections it contained.

When the hon. Prime Minister puts forward this motion today he again circumvents one of the normal legislative processes which are the rights of members. In answer to the hon. members of the government opposite, it is acceptable government procedure that we discuss the principle of the bill first and then move it into committee, and no one surely can contest that. Let it be said, Mr. Speaker, that no one contests it particularly when it is a contentious bill and when there are principles at stake which must be discussed. What are we here for if not to debate in collectivity, the principles of such a bill.

Just as the bill flouts civil liberty, so the rights of the Opposition are flouted, and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, so the rights of certain members in the government are flouted.

I think it an unhappy fact that on this kind of motion, government hon. members have to rise, as my good friend, the hon. member for Lakeshore rose, to reaffirm his loyalty to the cause of freedom. This is not an oath-taking ceremonial. This is a matter of serious government concern. It is an unholy spectacle, indeed, to close ranks on a technicality such as has been presented, and we of the Opposition say, and say sincerely, to the government: "Gentlemen, pull yourselves together. Abandon the circuitous. Be decisive. Withdraw your bill. Present something anew that will properly deal with organized crime in Ontario and then we will support you and not until then."

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Does the member wish to speak?

Mr. Reilly: Yes. I was losing some of my enthusiasm for it, Mr. Speaker; I have been

up and down, up and down a number of times. I realize it is difficult for you to look at everybody at the same time.

I want to assure the hon. member for Etobicoke, Mr. Speaker, that whether this was dealt with in this House or whether it was dealt with in committee, there is still a majority of members of the party dealing with it regardless of where it may be.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is still for it, is he?

Mr. Reilly: I also want the hon. member for York South to know, and the hon. member for Etobicoke to know, and all the hon. members of this House, that I would resign from this House and from the Progressive-Conservative Party rather than vote for a bill like this that would interfere with the basic rights and privileges of the people. The hon. member for Etobicoke told you about receiving communications and letters. I guess there is not a member in this House who has not done so.

Mr. Braithwaite: Let them speak up.

Mr. Reilly: I was able in many instances to explain to the people to whom I spoke that under the circumstances, we were trying not to interfere with the basic rights and privileges of people. What our hon. Prime Minister has indicated today is that he had no intention of interfering with the basic rights and principles of people. It is on that basis that I would support this bill going to committee, Mr. Speaker, for several reasons—

An hon. member: Pretty weak.

Mr. Reilly: Pretty weak, then tune in my hon. friend. We are most anxious, Mr. Speaker, to hear what the Ontario Police Commission and its officials have to say about organized crime right here in Metropolitan Toronto and throughout the province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: They have said it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reilly: Yes, they have said it and I have read their report this weekend, but the public of Ontario has not read it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I am going to ask the members to give every member a fair hearing. I have endeavoured to see that all the members who have spoken so far had one. We have had a

very good debate and I wish the members to co-operate so that every member will have a fair hearing and not be interrupted when he is making his remarks.

Mr. Reilly: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out that there was a public indignation, and it was experienced by many hon. members of this House, perhaps by all hon. members. The reason in many instances was because the people did not understand what we as a government were trying to do.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): We are not all dumb!

Mr. Reilly: What is more, there were reports which appeared in the newspapers.

As one of our members said, there are several sections of the bill that I am sure every hon. member of this House would be willing to adopt once they were discussed; there are some sections of the bill on which judgment perhaps should be reserved.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, when we have an opportunity to listen to our legal officials, when we have an opportunity to listen to members of the police commission and we have an opportunity to debate the methods and the merits involved, I am quite sure that we can come to a decision that will be helpful in the interests of all the people of Ontario and will not deprive them of any of their rights. It is only on that basis I would vote to have this sent back to committee for further enlightenment, further study, and on that basis I am going to support the original motion and not the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I might, to say a few words on this matter. I have listened with considerable interest to the speakers who have talked about the new hon. members in this House who have been speaking their minds and who should now get up and vote one way or the other. I still think we have a perfect right to make up our minds; we do not need to be told how to do it.

First of all, I would like to point out that I also have received a great number of phone calls, 25 letters, ten telegrams, and so on and so forth, and that all of the people are vitally concerned with this legislation. I have gone on record as making the statement in the local press and the local radio that I would never support legislation which, in my opinion, infringed on the rights of my fellow citizens, and I never will. On the other hand

I have also stated that I feel we need some form of legislation to better enable the control of the criminal element in our province. I must say to you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that last week I heard some hon. members, who now cry so loudly, saying exactly the same thing—that they felt that we needed some type of legislation, but that this legislation went too far.

Mr. Bryden: It sure does!

Mr. Walker: There seems to have been a great change in the last 36 or 72 hours, whatever it seems to be. I would say also, Mr. Speaker, that this debate has gone to some length over and above the original motion and amendment, until I admit quite frankly, that I do not know whether I am going to be asked to vote on the bill or whether I am going to be asked to vote on the motion or the amendment. It is getting a little confusing. I think you will agree that a great deal of laxity has been permitted.

The legal bills committee is composed, I believe, of some 40 hon. members of this House. I have found in the discussions I have had as a new member in these committees, that the committee has been wide open, permitting free discussion.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I want this to be very definitely understood, that my vote today is on the motion or the amendment. It does not signify that I am either for or against the bill that is being presented.

Mr. Trotter: When are you going to make up your mind?

Mr. Walker: I can make up my own mind and I certainly do not need anyone in this House to help me. I feel, as has already been stated in this House, that parts of this bill are needed, as far as we are concerned, and that parts of the bill should be amended. That is my feeling, if you would care to know my feeling. I say that to the hon. gentlemen on my right. But I cannot disagree with the reference to the committee. I think it is interesting to note that, in committee, it has been very evident to me, there has been no solidarity of government voting. In committee, on various occasions, there has been a considerable difference of opinion in the votes which have been held.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to remind this House, or the Conservative caucus, or even the government, that at no time am I afraid to stand up for what I think is the right of individual people. I do want to say just this:

I can see a reason why the Opposition would like to see this bill withdrawn now. I think they are quite aware that when this bill goes to the committee, there will be ample opportunity for the people who proposed some of the suggestions in this bill to explain why they did it, the Opposition will realize that they have lost ground in their political objectives.

An hon. member: No. Poppycock!

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the people of Ontario have been subjected to a barrage of press, radio and television reports. It did not get through to the people what this bill was all about.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Attorney General said what it was about.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that most of the hon. members who are sitting in this House have not read all of the points in this bill. I make that observation because most of the statements which were read in this House were letters from individuals who may have never seen the bill. There were press quotes from the daily press, or quotes from other papers.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Did they never see the bill in the press?

Mr. Singer: Did the hon. Attorney General not see it?

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I am one who believes in freedom of the press, but I do think that sometimes, with freedom, should go a little bit of responsibility. I want to say this, and I have wanted to say it for some time: I think our news outlets are too prone to give wide publicity to the reckless and the irresponsible, and not to the responsible speeches. And that goes for what is said in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wellington-Dufferin has the floor.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I listened on my car radio, coming down this morning, and heard the report which has gone out over and over all through the weekend, about what the hon. leader of the Opposition said—I do not deny it is right for him to have his say—about what the hon. member for York South had to say, and about what the hon. member for Dovercourt had to say. Then after it was all over, and I had listened to about five minutes of this propaganda, then they said

that the hon. Prime Minister had said: "I made a statement in which I said I would not tolerate any legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes the personal rights and freedoms of the individual."

Mr. Speaker, there has been a deliberate attempt, over the weekend, to inflame the passions of people and to distort the intentions of this legislation; and I am going to vote against the amendment. I want this bill to go to the committee. I am not on the committee, but I have every confidence in this—

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member wants to get out from under, does he?

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I have very confidence in the sound judgment of the hon. members of this Legislature, regardless of political party, that in that committee they will ask questions and we will get answers, not propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I exposed myself to the public every place that I could.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I had a higher regard for the mentality of the hon. members of this House. I did not mean that I physically exposed myself to the public, I simply meant that I exposed myself to hear the voice of public opinion.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that some of the hon. members would not appreciate what I was trying to say, because their minds operate on a different level.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the city of Guelph; I was in the city of Kitchener—on Saturday afternoon I attended a seed fair, where there were literally hundreds of people.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Nobody knew the hon. member.

Mr. Root: Well, again the hon. member for Bruce has displayed his ignorance there. I was in my own riding. It was a place where there were hundreds of people there. A few wanted to know what this was about. Actually, I never had a letter, I never had a phone call, about this; but I did have phone calls about other legislation before the House. In the evening I attended a presentation and met hundreds of people.

Yesterday I attended the opening of a church in another community and I exposed myself there to hundreds of people—again I do not mean physically, I mean I made myself

available where hundreds of people could talk to me. I think some of the hon. members better go—I will not say it.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is simply this: In my riding we are not so easily brain-washed by some of the Metropolitan press, radio and television as perhaps other ridings are—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I must remind the member that he must stick to the amendment that is before the House. I would ask him to confine his remarks to the amendment, that the order be discharged and the bill be withdrawn.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to say was that I think it will be in the interests of all concerned if this bill goes to the committee, where people who have views to express can express them. We will get all sides of the story, and if the bill comes back to this House we will deal with it. If it dies in committee, it will die in committee. If it is amended, we will deal with the amendment.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of repetition here. I do not think anything is to be added by continually repeating some of the things which the hon. members have repeated. There is only one thing I would like to make clear and I would like you, if possible, to make this clear to me.

There has been a great deal of suggestion from the Opposition hon. members that if this goes to committee it dies there. Of course, after it comes from committee, it will get second reading here and they can discuss the principles till the cows come home.

Mr. Speaker: To answer the Minister, I would say that the procedure is that when the bill goes to the committee, the committee must bring a report back to the House. At that time the bill will be placed on the order paper for second reading in the House and the principle of the bill will be debated at that time.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to rise—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I noticed the member for Sault Ste. Marie first, so I will have to give him the floor.

Mr. A. A. Wishart (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, one point which I think has not been made entirely clear is that, in all the remarks of the hon. members of the two

Opposition parties, I have detected an impression that the reference of this bill to the legal bills committee would be in the nature of choking off or cutting off debate. That impression has been given by more than one speaker in the Opposition.

I am sure that they are speaking with tongue-in-cheek, and that this is certainly a mark of insincerity in this type of presentation; because if they do not know, I should like to make it clear that in that committee not only the members of the committee have a right to speak, but any hon. member of this House who attends the committee is given the fullest opportunity to speak and discuss the bill. As the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, in his statement to the House today, the public will be invited to attend the hearings of the committee on notice. And as you have been told, and as I surely do not need to repeat, members of the police commission, law officers of the Crown, anyone, any person, any group, anyone who has anything to say with respect to this bill will have the fullest opportunity to be there and state their views and be heard. Then, as has been pointed out by some of my hon. friends, the bill, when it comes back to this House, can be debated fully in this House.

So let me make it clear, if I may, to all concerned, that the reference of this bill to the committee on legal bills is not in any way a choking-off of debate but a widening of it, a full opportunity to debate the bill. Then hon. members have again the further opportunity, when the bill comes back to this House, to debate it clause by clause again.

Mr. Reuter: Mr. Speaker, after listening to all of the debates going on in this House for quite some time this afternoon, I am compelled to rise to express my opinions and the way I feel about this matter as a new member.

The suggestion has been made that a lot of the backbenchers would not support this bill nor would they support the government in the attempt to pass such a bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the motion made by our hon. Prime Minister to refer this matter to the committee for full discussion is indeed, sir, what we must have. I feel that there are a lot of motives behind the report of the crime commission. I have read the report completely myself and I feel there is some desirable legislation that must be passed to endeavour to implement the recommendations. I feel that the bill has been an attempt to implement some of the recommendations, but I do feel that in order to learn what the

members of the commission have been promoting, what their thinking is and what the legal minds in the department of the hon. Attorney General are thinking, we as committee members are entitled to know the facts behind this.

I must say that in my opinion if this bill would be withdrawn, it would simply be an easy way to get out of the whole situation. I, for one, want to know what the facts are behind it. I can say right now in no uncertain terms that if, after it has gone to the committee, there is no recommendation for an amendment to the bill, I will certainly oppose the bill. I must vote against it in its present form. But I do feel that I owe it to myself and to my constituents, indeed to the rest of the government, to find out the facts behind this bill. I must move against the amendment.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I am another one of the backbenchers who have been referred to from time to time and I also, like many of us here today, have received many telephone calls and letters regarding this particular bill. I have listened to the radio, the television, read the newspapers and have seen, read and heard many accounts as to what people think of this particular bill. I for one want to know a little bit more about it. I would like to know about it from the people who were directly concerned in making up this bill and I can think of no better way of finding that out than hearing everyone concerned about it in the committee. I happen to be a member of this committee and I cannot understand why the hon. members of the Opposition are afraid of this going to committee.

It seems to me, and maybe I am wrong, that they seem to be afraid this bill will be changed. After listening to everything everybody concerned has to say, if it is shown that the rights of the individual will be harmed, then I for one will vote against it. I will make up my own mind like the hon. member for Oshawa. If there are certain amendments that are needed to preserve the rights of the individual, I certainly will vote for them. It seems to me that the object of this particular bill is to give more teeth to the police in their efforts to halt crime in Ontario and at the same time this must be done without infringing the rights of the people of Ontario. I do not think there is any question about it, that every hon. member of this government and every hon. member of the Opposition is desirous to see that crime is prevented in Ontario. I also think that these same people would not

stand for infringing the rights of the individual people of Ontario.

I welcome the opportunity of being a member of this committee and of listening to what everyone has to say regarding this. There has been so much printed in the paper, you hardly know where to go, you do not know what actually to believe. I feel that the right way to settle this so that the rights of our people are not infringed upon, and so that we can do the most we can to give the police the power they need in their efforts to combat crime, is by a committee after listening to everyone who really knows a great deal about this particular problem.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I would like to read again the statement, or part of the statement, made by the hon. Prime Minister and he says:

In accepting responsibility for Bill No. 99 as leader of this government I say that it was introduced after it had been very carefully drafted by the law officers of the Crown, who are of the opinion that it did not interfere with the fundamental rights of the people of Ontario.

We have had some flag-waving today, Mr. Speaker, from the other side, a good deal of it. We heard the Opposition say that we are going back into the dark ages, and mention the Magna Carta and other things. I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of our government, the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, served with distinction in the last war.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: Just a minute now, just a minute. Another thing they said is that we are doing away with the fundamental rights of the people of our province, a pretty ridiculous statement in the light of what I have just said. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are just as many hon. members on this side of the House who served in the last war and fought for these freedoms as on that side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Could I just ask the member to stick to the amendment before the House and not to go too far astray?

Mr. Cowling: Very good, sir. It is sometimes difficult to do that when you hear so many speeches from the other side. But I think we should think about this thing seriously, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is taking this

lightly. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition and his party should think very seriously about withdrawing their amendment to withdraw the bill. That makes sense to me.

The very idea of the NDP suggesting to backbenchers that they vote independently, I venture to say, is having about as much effect on the backbenchers as I would have with the NDP; which is practically nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge on the hon. members of the House—and I say all the hon. members of the House, including the Opposition, and some of them have spoken very well here this afternoon—that they do not support the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition but support the hon. leader of our government in sending on this bill to a standing committee of the House.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, may I submit to you and through you to all hon. members of the House that for clarification purposes, if for no other reason, the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition should be defeated and that the motion of the hon. Prime Minister should carry. I would like to comment on that briefly if I may.

I would again submit to you, sir, and to all hon. members who have professed such stirring emotional positions here today, that there has already been too much emotion, too much distortion associated with the remarks of the Opposition. In fact, sir, all too many people have been unduly alarmed by observations made by Opposition speakers. I would say to you, sir, that surely the assurances of the hon. Prime Minister, his sensible comments made in support of his motion, should bring nothing but a sense of comfort and confidence to every person in this province.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

An hon. member: Do you want to bet?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What, Mr. Speaker, may I ask those who have already supported the amendment today, can be more sensible than a motion which will provide all interested people to hear the explanations which will be made available in committee? What can be more sensible and appropriate, under the circumstances, than the provision of a forum which will enable all interested people to express their misgivings and their fears to those who may very well find themselves in a position to allay those fears?

Mr. Speaker, I would submit again to the

hon. members of this House, and those who have spoken from the Opposition benches know it full well, the standing committee of this Legislature is in fact an integral part of the Legislature itself; but, by the very rules and procedures of our standing committees, it is much, much easier to examine legislation in detail. I am going to assume, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that those of the Opposition who have spoken are quite sincere in their wish to express their interest in the people of the province of Ontario, but I would simply ask them to consider employing the same type of responsibility they have seen fit to request of the government. May I simply ask the hon. members of the Opposition to let reason, common sense and a calm reappraisal of their own position prevail. It may not suit their purpose too well, but in this way they can join with the government in helping to resolve a highly important matter in the interests of all, as the hon. member for Downsview has indicated it was his real purpose to do.

What is apparent, from the comments of those Opposition hon. members who have spoken, is that they say, "Do not confuse me with the facts, my mind is made up." If the amendment is passed Mr. Speaker; all too many people are denied the facts, and there would appear to be no fundamental difference of opinion among the hon. members in this House with respect to positions associated with our civil liberties. I believe, Mr. Speaker, those liberties will be protected more effectively in the manner proposed by the hon. Prime Minister. I simply suggest to you that it is about time we got on with the vote.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in this House that has been repeated time and time again. I would like to take some hon. members of the Opposition back to their pre-election statements when they were screaming for action on the crime wave and syndicated crime in Ontario.

I would point out to the hon. members that possibly the best thing that has happened to this government is what has happened this weekend, because we have had it proved to us that when the people do not like anything, they say so. I think, in fairness to the time spent in preparing this bill, that it should go to the committee; anyone can attend that committee. The hon. Prime Minister has said that he is unalterably opposed to any legislation which deprives any individual in

the province of Ontario or Canada, of their liberty; this I believe, and this I support.

The only thing I can say to this House is: Cease the levity; stop the nonsense; it is our responsibility in this House to give good government. This we are trying to do, and the only way we can do it is to get back to common sense and wait until the implications of this bill have been studied by people who have had their thinking cleared for them and know what they have to do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mrs. Pritchard: Something has to be done about crime in the province of Ontario. Obviously the commission has not had the ability to do all they want to do, or the power; and no one intends to give them power which will interfere with liberty. I shall not support the amendment.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Has everyone spoken on the amendment who cares to speak? I recognize the member for St. George, first.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to speak as briefly and as temperately and as moderately as I can, on such an important and passionate subject as human rights and civil liberties.

May I also say that I hope you will extend to me the leniency you have extended to the other hon. members of this House in discussing what should be a procedural motion. I appreciate that you have let some of the hon. members wander off the procedural aspect, and I trust you will allow me to do the same because I do not intend to infringe upon very much of the House's time.

The question of human rights and civil liberties is certainly a passionate one for us all. I must say, sir, that when section 14 of the offending bill was brought to my attention, in this House late on Thursday afternoon, I was quite blind with rage at the incompetence and stupidity of any group of people who would attempt to bring such a measure before this Legislature.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Since then, sir, I have had the opportunity of taking a look at the bill as a whole. I have not changed my mind regarding section 14, in the slightest. I think it is repugnant to us all—it must be, to us all. Over the weekend, and on Friday and today,

I have had the opportunity of speaking to many hon. members of this Legislature, on this side of the House and on the other side of the House. I have spoken to veteran members. I have spoken to new members. I have spoken to old members. I have spoken to young members. I have spoken to Cabinet members. I have spoken to non-Cabinet members. I have yet to find a single person who has a single good word to say about section 14.

An hon. member: How did it get through caucus? Was the hon. member at caucus?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Saying that, I just want to say that I agree with everything which has been said on both sides of the House, here today and last Friday, regarding our human rights and civil liberties. I agree with them. I passionately believe in them; I think we all do, sir. But there is more to this bill than section 14.

I came here today—and I will be perfectly blunt and perfectly frank—I came here today, not having had the opportunity of being able to discuss in private the full implications of this bill. I regret, as a party member, saying that. May I also say that, in my ignorance, I came here today expecting the government to move that this bill would be withdrawn *in toto*. I am now convinced that under our rules this is not possible; and, of course, I refer hon. members to section 60.

An hon. member: Rule 60!

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I am sorry, rule 60, of the rules of this House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Now I have not interrupted a single hon. member today, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: —and I regret very much anybody else doing this to me at this time, on a matter that is as serious as this.

I refer to rule 60 of the rules of this Legislature, which states that every public bill shall be read twice in the House before committal or amendment. Before committal or amendment. Certainly to withdraw a bill, in my mind, must amend that bill.

I think the government, sir, is caught on the horns of a dilemma. I think that every single hon. member of this Legislature—

certainly every single hon. member of the government—would now want to repudiate, if they could, here in this House today, this particular offending section of this bill. I said I think they would. I have not had the opportunity of speaking to them all, but I think they would. I can see no reason why they would not.

The government cannot withdraw the bill in its entirety; and what I have heard here this afternoon has led me to believe that there are many hon. members who believe, as I now have come to believe, that the bill in its entirety should not be withdrawn.

Ergo, what do we do? We have heard a great deal from the New Democratic Party hon. members this afternoon, that they want to discuss this bill in principle. I agree with them. The bill has to be discussed in principle in this House, and how in the name of all common sense and goodness, sir, can the bill be discussed in principle if we withdraw it today in its entirety?

Sir, we have had the other observation made by some of the hon. members of the Liberal Party that they want to find out the whys and the wherefores and the means of the introduction of this bill. I agree with that as well, sir. I want to examine, I want to probe, I want to search the mentality of the men who had the gall to introduce this bill into this House and the only place I can do that is in committee. That is the only place, sir. We cannot do it on the floor of this House. How can we?

I want to publicly castigate the people who introduced that section of this bill. The only way I can do it is in committee. To withdraw it in its entirety today is nonsense. This will mean an end to it. This will lower the boom, sir. We do not want that to happen. Therefore, sir, I feel that we have to support the motion of the hon. Prime Minister in referring this to committee. I may say that I do this with great regret because I do not want to be tainted in any manner, shape or form with that particular section of that bill and I will fight—even cross the floor of this House—and I will vote against this section of the bill if it is put to this House in this House, sir. But I do want to understand the thinking of the people who introduced it. I do want to attempt to point out to them in no uncertain terms how wrong they are. The only possible place, the only possible way we can do that, is in committee.

Therefore, sir, as I say, it is with regret, because I am afraid it is going to taint me with that particular section but I see no other way of doing it, that I say that I do

intend to vote for the amendment of the hon. Prime Minister.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, like the last hon. member who spoke it is certainly my intention to be as brief as possible. Much has been said. I think a great deal was said by the last speaker, who of course, is one of those who is brave of heart and who is not afraid to speak up to the hon. members who are in the government benches. One of the things he said in just the last minute or two in this House was this, that he wanted this bill to go back to committee so he could publicly castigate the men who were behind the thinking of this particular bill and who were responsible for it.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one group of men in the province of Ontario that has been responsible for this bill being brought to this Legislature. That group of people is the hon. members of the Conservative government of the province of Ontario led by the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario. I suggest to the brave young man, the hon. member for St. George, that if he wishes to publicly castigate them let him publicly stand up in this Legislature and put the blame where the blame should be—on the government of the people who have accepted the advice of the civil servants or the enforcement officers of this province and who brought the bill into this Legislature, the highest court in the province of Ontario, so that all hon. members of the Legislature could discuss it and not those, just those, who have the opportunity to belong to the legal bills committee. This is the place where it should be discussed.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, and I have looked back a long time, I have not found one single instance when, after a bill has been introduced in this Legislature, ever since it started, the procedures that have been suggested by the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon have taken effect. Many hon. members particularly from the government benches have said that this bill should go to committee. We on this side agree that it should go to committee but it should go to committee after it has had second reading, just the same as all other bills introduced into this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to you that such important bills as the hospital insurance bill had second reading in this House before they went to committee. Such bills as the Medicare bill and many others of great importance over the past number of years have been debated in this House and every

one of them, without exception, has gone to committee after the second reading. This House, Mr. Speaker, has been treated with the utmost contempt by the hon. members of the government and I would say that it has been treated with contempt in three instances:

Number one was when the hon. Attorney General introduced Bill No. 99 in this Legislature and gave us no intimation that there were any offending passages in it whatsoever. He did not say one single word about the one particular section that most of us are against. Number two is that this House is being treated with contempt here because this afternoon we are not going to have the opportunity of debating it on second reading. Number three is the absence of the hon. Attorney General here this afternoon. The Number 2 man of the government and the man who is responsible for the law-making of this province of Ontario who, after introducing this bill last Thursday, has not got the fortitude to come into this Legislature this afternoon—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The member must not impugn the dignity or honour of any member, particularly if he is not in the House to defend himself. I would ask the member also to stick to the amendment before the House and not discuss the honour of any other member of the House.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to accept your ruling.

Many excuses have been given by our Conservative friends this afternoon, sir, that legislation such as this is needed. Mr. Speaker, I think it was the hon. member for Hamilton Centre who reminded us that before the last provincial election we in the Liberal Party were screaming that the province should do something and the government should do something about crime in this province. Mr. Speaker, we are still screaming and we ask the government to bring in a bill dealing with organized crime in the province that we can support.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the people who bring legislation before this legislative assembly are the government of the province and not the committees? It is all very well for my friend, the hon. member for Kingston, for example, to stand up and say that he wants to be in committee so that he knows what is going on. By supporting the government that he does, he is supporting an organization that is supposed to know what is going on before the legislation is brought in in the first place.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: It is ridiculous.

Mr. Reaume: It is true, is it not?

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I will not take much longer. All I can say is that it is not nearly as ridiculous as some of the things we have heard given by hon. members on the other side today and on other days. May I say this, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker? There is great apprehension, not only in the province of Ontario, but as the hon. member for St. George said, among the hon. members of this Legislature. The hon. Prime Minister called it "the most exclusive club in the land," and we are being denied the dignity of discussing this legislation, which should be put on our desks, in not proceeding with second reading, this afternoon.

There has been great apprehension, not only in Ontario, not only in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, but all across Canada. As a matter of fact, we have heard reviews on radio and television by people who suggest they are going to take this to the United Nations. We are being put in the class of police-state countries whether we like it or not.

I still, Mr. Speaker, share the apprehension that has been shown by the newspapers and by the hon. members here this afternoon, and after reading the hon. Prime Minister's statement from cover to cover I must say most regretfully I still have that apprehension. May I refer you to page seven of his statement, and I quote one paragraph:

May I say also that there are many misconceptions concerning this proposed possible legislation. While the terms "police state" and "police state legislation" have been used, I think it should be pointed out that this legislation gives no additional powers whatsoever to the police of this province. Rather, what it purports to do is to give certain powers to three men sitting as the Ontario Police Commission and then only when they are in the course of making a report to the Attorney General in connection with three limited matters, namely, (a) the extent, investigation or control of crime; (b) enforcement of the law.

Mr. Speaker, what is limited about enforcement of the law? To me this is one of the most important things we have in the whole province, or anywhere in the world, as far as that is concerned.

(c) the function of the commission under The Police Act.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House can support nothing except the complete withdrawal of this bill, not only to save face in the province of Ontario but to put ourselves on a pedestal where we can work again and face the people in this world who believe in total freedom.

The hon. member for High Park mentioned, a few moments ago, that there were many members of the Conservative Party who had a long period of service overseas. We certainly agree with it, and we ask those hon. members now to stand up for the freedom of the people of the province of Ontario the same way they did when they were fighting Hitlerism and Mussolinism, because it is things like this which start dictatorships in the world. And as far as that goes, Mr. Speaker, we have no room for it here in this province.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I rise of course, to support the amendment put forward by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I think I might not have taken the opportunity to speak on a bill of this nature because of inexperience in legalistic or police problems, but one tends to express one's opinions when listening to the debate on such an important matter.

It is apparent to me that some of the government hon. members, in opposing the amendment and supporting the motion, have sort of dwindled down to an appeal to the Opposition to use some common sense and offer co-operation to the government to get this bill into committee before we deal with it in principle. But I think that the government should realize the responsibility of the Opposition; and I think the Opposition is being exemplary in its approach to this problem this afternoon.

The attempt by the government to take this bill out of second reading and into committee is nothing more than an attempt to pass on the responsibility of the government to either the committee, or responsible members of the civil service. We can understand what would happen. They are afraid to debate the principle in second reading, because at that point they have agreed, as a government, that they are in favour of the principle embodied in the bill. But if it can be sent to committee first, the committee then deals with it and the government is off the hook. They have made an excuse to get out from under their responsibilities in regard to this important problem.

Certainly it is the responsibility of the Opposition to first see that their impression of the rules of the House is lived up to, and

that we do not deviate, on a technicality, from the established principles of dealing with legislation.

I can remember many times when the leader of the government, the Prime Minister or whoever was leading the House, sir, would get up and appeal to the Opposition to let this bill go through second reading so that they could get it to committee at an early date and bring it back to deal with, section by section. I feel it is utter stupidity to judge an important bill in committee stage before we have agreed upon the principle.

I have had a lot of experience in dealing with reports of committees in another activity, and certainly the first thing to be done, before a report is drafted, is to come to some agreement that you have a principal objective, and you want that down on paper for people to consider. In this case all that would happen would be that the government, after it has come out of committee, regardless of what happened to it, could say, "Now it has been taken out of our hands; it is now the responsibility of the committee."

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it would be the responsibility of the Opposition, if this amendment is defeated and this bill goes to committee first, when section 14 is reached, to absent themselves from the committee and not deal with the section. That would be my approach to such an important matter as this if it were to go to the committee stage.

It has been said by an hon. member of the government, that the committee stage would give the public a full opportunity to present their views, where they could show faith in the government. Well, certainly, the public have shown their loss of faith in the government, by the reports in the press in the last few days. Certainly there have been expressions by some of the greatest jurists in this country as to their impressions of this particular kind of legislation. So why should they be appealing to the public to come before a committee and give their impressions on such an important piece of legislation?

I would urge the hon. members to support the amendment, and let us follow the regular established procedures in this House and deal with it in principle first. Let the government accept the responsibility of saying to the people, "We still believe in the principle we have enunciated by the introduction of this bill. We are not going to try to get out from under our responsibility by passing it off to a committee who then will have the responsibility of reporting to the House and

then, at the same time, let the civil servants take the rap for the type of wording in the legislation."

Mr. Speaker: Has every member spoken who wishes to speak?

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended saying anything about this matter today but I feel that my constituents would wish me to say something on such an important matter.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is probably the most important matter which has been raised in the House since I have been here, during the last eight or nine years. What we are really trying to evolve is an orderly system to get at a matter with which we are all vitally concerned. We are all vitally concerned about how we are going to handle the matter of crime in the province of Ontario. I feel that the Opposition have conducted themselves in a very responsible manner on this particular subject. The whole debate has arisen over something which I believe, to a very large extent, is a misunderstanding. The press had a duty to bring this matter as forcibly as they possibly could to the residents of this province, and they have done so. I think the Opposition, in the responsible attitude which they have taken towards this matter, is to be commended. Never have I been prouder to be a member of a government in a democratic assembly than I have been here today.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I am really appalled. I have never been more shocked, dumbfounded and surprised than I was today to see the hon. Prime Minister, a most honourable man, come into this House and use such unprecedented unpardonable procedural manoeuvres to have full discussion on a bill shelved. He may have been technically right but he was morally wrong.

Mr. Speaker: This bill is a result of the crime probe. The proper procedure would have been to present the report to the House, have the House discuss the report, take into consideration the recommendations, the suggestions, and then have legislation from that report brought down. Had such a procedure been followed, we would not be in the position we are today, where technical procedural manoeuvres have to be employed to prevent full debate on this bill right at this moment.

Mr. Speaker: It has been said this was in the public interest, that the public is being best served. May I say at this time, Mr.

Speaker, that the public would be best served were this bill completely withdrawn. We can be most thankful today for a very alert press. Had it not had the copy of the bill and alerted the people of Ontario and the Opposition, this—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member would stay away from the bill now and just stick to the amendment, so that we may proceed.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am. I just mentioned the amendment and I mentioned the complete withdrawal of the bill, which is the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: We have to commend the press for alerting Ontario. This is a real dark, dismal day. It is only one week ago—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Newman: —that we mentioned on the floor of the House here, the 116th anniversary of the Hungarian fight for independence and freedom and here we are, on March 23, in one fell swoop, ready to take away one of the vital freedoms of the individual. Mr. Speaker, just imagine what would have happened, had the press not been allowed its freedom of expression.

Mr. Reilly: We would discuss it in committee, that is what would have happened.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this could have followed the regular procedure of all bills discussed right here in this House, and after its second reading, been sent to the committee. That is the normal procedure, that is the way all bills are taken care of. Why, all of a sudden, does this one bill have to deviate from that procedure? Parliamentary procedure has been set up for a set purpose. Why do we have to deviate all of a sudden because the government finds itself extremely embarrassed? Had the hon. Prime Minister come in this House today and simply apologized, stating the government had made a mistake, Ontario would have admired the hon. Prime Minister. Everyone admires a man who is not afraid to admit a mistake.

But to use a manoeuvre to cover up a mistake is unpardonable.

Mr. Speaker, I, like many of the other hon. members of this House, have received many phone calls and letters, asking that this bill be withdrawn. The concern of the people was most astounding. Last Friday, within probably two hours after we had completed the discussion in this House, we had a picket line in front of the Parliament buildings. This is how concerned the people are. This is how concerned they should be, when one of their freedoms is being taken away from them. Is not one of the freedoms being taken away from us right here in this House by this discussion, the freedom to debate the bill on second reading? The government did not have enough—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Newman: There are apparently two rules in this House, one for the Opposition and one for the government to twist and do with it as it pleases.

Mr. Speaker: I want to remind the member that I, as the Speaker, determine the rules of the House, whether in my opinion they are being followed or not, and I would like the member to stick with the amendment that is now before the House, because I think he is breaking the rules.

Mr. Newman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to break the rules. I mean no reflection on your high office. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for about another seven minutes and so I move at this moment the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Can the member finish his remarks? If so, we would like to finish with his remarks.

Mr. Newman: No, not for about another ten minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Newman moves the adjournment of the debate.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, March 23, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Monday, March 23, 1964

Debate on motion by Mr. Robarts that second reading of Bill No. 99 be discharged and referred to standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills for consideration, examination and report, concluded	1893
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1916

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

RE BILL No. 99

(continued)

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned for the supper hour I had been speaking on the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that Bill No. 99 be withdrawn. I had attempted to point out that in the interest of the public the honourable thing for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) to do was to withdraw his motion and withdraw the bill, following that to bring the report of the Ontario Police Commission on organized crime into this House for full House discussion, and after a complete discussion of that report, come down with some appropriate legislation.

By the procedural manoeuvre he has employed here today, he has indicated to this House his unwillingness to follow normal House rules. Never before has the freedom of so many been jeopardized by the wishes of so few.

An hon. member: That is good. That is good.

Mr. Newman: It is as true now as it was then. Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the hon. gentleman to my far left I would like to repeat that last statement. Never before has the freedom of so many been jeopardized by the wishes of so few. Mr. Speaker, just imagine the harm that may already have been done to our own tourist industry—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Our American friends may think twice today—

Mr. Speaker: I am going to inform the members once again that I want an orderly debate. We have had a fairly good debate this afternoon and kept in order and I would like it to continue this way this evening. I would ask the members to give the member speaking their attention and if he is to be called to order I shall do so.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, every hon. member in this House knows that were he to travel to a country where such a law was in existence he certainly would be most wary, and more than likely would think before he would ever consider entering that country.

The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Cass), during his remarks on Thursday, March 19, on page 1799 of *Hansard* was asked by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer):

Mr. Speaker, before we get into the orders of the day I wonder if the hon. Attorney General could advise us if all these bills will be going to committee. There is a lot of new and important legislation here and I think the committee should have a look at all of them.

The hon. Attorney General replied:

I think they would all go to committee, Mr. Speaker, except perhaps The Police Act which might better be discussed in the committee of the whole House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

An hon. member: But he is out now, he has been fired.

Another hon. member: Where is he?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to all the hon. members of this House to think first of the many who came from oppressed areas of this world and who have been fortunate to escape police states, and then to vote for the amendment of my hon. leader.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the amendment, I would like to say that this afternoon when listening to the hon. Prime Minister making his statement to some of the other government hon. members, I found it was quite interesting. We listened to the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) explaining that he would support this bill if it were not for section 14. We also listened to the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) condemning the government—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just want to correct the

speaker. I did not signify or indicate that it was section 14 only.

Mr. Davison: It is even worse if he feels more of it should be withdrawn; but he certainly did say that. The hon. member for St. George also took the position that he condemned the government for bringing in this type of bill. The hon. Prime Minister, in his statement, although he may not say it is a perfect bill, says he still feels that nothing in the bill is going to do too much harm. But we also listened to the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mrs. Pritchard) talking about crime, saying "Sure, I think we all will admit there is crime in this province now. I think we all want to see that it is cleared up. We are all looking for the best way to clear it up." If we are going to clear up crime, the best thing to do is to have a second reading in this House where all the hon. members will have an opportunity to debate the principle in this bill. We must bear in mind that this committee, to which the hon. Prime Minister wants to send the bill, is a committee of about 50 members—

An hon. member: Thirty-five members.

Mr. Davison: Thirty-five members—and there are about 107 or 108 members in this House now, representing all the people of Ontario. I do feel that this should be debated in this House, the decision made here, and then it should be sent to committee. Do not have it sent, first, to a small committee and then brought back with those sections which now, I think, even the government wants out. I think I can predict that when the bill comes back into this House again certain sections will have been taken out.

I would therefore say that the bill should be debated here in second reading. We have had all kinds of important bills in here before, and we have debated their principles rather than send them to committee first. This is only one way the government is trying to get itself off the hook. It has got itself into a mess in this situation, public opinion over the weekend has shown that, and now it is trying to get out. **It is taking the easy way,** rather than taking the responsibility of having second reading here in the House.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the member for Beaches, I would like to correct what I think is an erroneous impression. Whenever the motion was made by the Prime Minister, and the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) was speaking, I said that

in my opinion bills had been referred to the standing committee before receiving second reading. In the interval of the supper hour, I have looked up several occasions of this, and I thought it might be of interest to the members if I just took a second and mentioned some of these which are in the 1957 journals of the House.

On March 8, 1957, five labour bills—Nos. 137, 138, 139, 140 and 141—were referred to the labour committee after first reading.

Then, on March 11, Bills Nos. 137, 138, 139 and 140 were reported by the committee back to the House.

Then on March 13, two days later, Bills Nos. 137, 138, and 140 were given second reading. And on the same day, on Bill No. 139, a motion by the Prime Minister made an order for second reading to be discharged, and the bill was referred back to the committee on labour for further consideration.

Then on March 18 of the same year, Bill No. 139 again was reported by the labour committee with Bill No. 141; and on March 28 these two bills were given second reading. Then there was just one other one here in the same year, 1957, March 21, Bill No. 165, The Hospital Services Commission Act, was given first reading and then on March 27 it was reported by the committee on health, and on March 28 it was given second reading. I just wanted to give the House that information to substantiate the remarks that I made when the motion was made this afternoon, that there had been occasions when bills were referred to the standing committee before they had received second reading.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, may I ask you if on those occasions there was unanimous consent for what was, I think, an unusual procedure?

Mr. Speaker: On some occasions when the first reading was given, then of course Rule 60 of the House was waived, which would be by unanimous consent. The other one which I mentioned with regard to Bill No. 139 was by order of the Prime Minister. The order was made that the bill be discharged after second reading and that it go back to the labour committee for further consideration.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, one cannot have sat in this House for the past three hours this afternoon and indeed for 25 minutes this evening without having been deeply moved by many of the comments from hon. members on all sides of the House.

It is very obvious that we are all concerned

with the protection of fundamental rights that every citizen has under our British system of justice. Under this system the individual is entitled to be protected from being abused by the state and also from those who do not observe our laws. The government must guarantee freedom from both these abuses. It cannot abdicate its responsibility to make certain that the individual is protected against the criminal segments of our society. The protection of the individual from the abuse of power by the state, and the abuse of power by the criminal element may involve a legal balancing act, and one upon which I am not qualified to speak at this moment without hearing the experts who drew up this bill and also the experts who may have contrary views.

I do not wish, and I do not feel that any hon. members of this House wish to appraise the bill and its effects on legal opinions only on what we may have read in the newspapers or have heard on television. It is necessary that we hear these legal opinions directly so that we may properly be able to assess them. The responsibility to balance the aforementioned powers is one I cannot meet without having all sides of the story in front of me. The police commission report indicates that certain powers are required to meet the crime threat. Let us have these people in at committee and let them make their report to us.

We are advised by the hon. Prime Minister that his legal advisers say the powers in this bill are designed to meet the threat without infringing on the rights of the individual. So let us have those people in at committee before us. If there are people who have contrary views, let us have those people in. I say, Mr. Speaker, we have a grave responsibility to ensure that the people of this province are properly protected from all threats to our freedom, and the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Let us be vigilant and study this legislation thoroughly in the manner proposed this afternoon by the hon. Prime Minister. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment to the motion introduced by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, as a backbencher who feels capable of making up his own mind, I am opposed to the amendment to the motion. What has happened over the weekend with respect to Bill No. 99 is a clear attempt on the part of certain individuals from this Legislature and others to circumvent the precise and orderly

manner in which decisions are reached in this House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Utter nonsense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Why did this bill not get second reading?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Knox: Expressions of views from people of all sorts, most of them utterly unknown to me, have given very positive opinions, I suspect without having all the facts. This having been done, and the orderly procedure of our affairs having been unduly upset, my feeling is that I want to hear these people, all of them if necessary, state these views where I can see them and hear them and see what they look like when they are saying it and the inflection in their voices. I want to understand why they say what they do, and I want to be able to question them if I wish to do so.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): The hon. member is not on the committee.

An hon. member: The hon. member should be quiet, or he might get put in jail.

Mr. Knox: I suspect that we have heard only selected parts of what some of these people have said; that only specific questions, perhaps loaded like some that were asked of me, have been answered. The Opposition would have us legislate by argument outside the House from some people who may have been completely uninformed, and possibly may have been biased.

The thing to do is to give these people a chance to speak to a committee of the House, give also those who framed the bill and those to whom we entrusted the investigation, which has produced this report, a chance to tell their side of the story. When all the evidence is in, we can decide what is best to recommend to the government — not what political advantage there may be, but what legislation will deal best with the serious problem and yet guarantee the rights of the people we represent.

The hon. Prime Minister has said on page 8:

May I make it clear once again that the government is prepared and always has been prepared to amend, to change, to withdraw the bill or any portion thereof.

This is a stand that I fully support. Regardless of some remarks on my right, I am a

member of this committee and will expect while sitting there to use the right that I have always understood that I have on that committee. That is, to try to amend or to change if I thought that was the proper thing to do.

Procedure is merely a device by which the business of the House can be carried out in an orderly, efficient manner. It is a tool only, and never, never meant to obstruct. Our hon. Prime Minister in his motion has recognized this and his motion offers us a fine and perfectly proper method of proceeding under circumstances which were deliberately engineered by hon. members of the Opposition.

Mr. Whicher: Does the hon. member still thank God for the hon. Prime Minister?

Mr. Knox: Yes. In this the hon. Prime Minister is—

An hon. member: Where is the hon. Attorney General?

Mr. Knox:—affording to me, a new member, the same fine leadership that he has always done. The amendment is obviously silly, I will oppose it and vote for the motion.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills): Mr. Speaker, in reference to this matter, I will speak only for a few moments because many of us have had our turn. This is a matter that has moved a great many of us in this House during these past days since Thursday evening. There are sections in the bill that is before us, as Bill No. 99, which I am sure as I read them—and I would read them as a layman first and not as a lawyer—are repugnant to me.

Mr. Singer: How does the hon. member do that?

Mr. Bales: They are certainly repugnant to the public.

Mr. Bryden: Why were they brought in, then?

Mr. P. J. Yakubuski (Renfrew South): Cut it out!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bales: As I came to this House today, I expected, and I first thought, that the hon. Prime Minister might simply withdraw the measure that was before this House.

Mr. Bryden: A good idea!

Mr. Bales: But let us face up to this matter, Mr. Speaker. I think there is a more difficult

decision. I think the hon. Prime Minister has taken that decision that we have before us about the report from the police commission in reference to crime. The hon. Prime Minister has realized that this matter must be dealt with, that this matter has had the full glare of publicity in the province, and rightly so. It has had the full glare of publicity over this past weekend and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should bring this bill to a place where the public can deal with it and have its say as quickly as possible.

If we bring it before members of the public so that they may come as witnesses, not merely the members of the police commission, we will have their full views. I feel confident that, when it comes back to this House, this section we find so repugnant will be removed; for I am sure that, for myself, I cannot support it as it stands and I am sure there are many in the House who feel the same way. In the light of what the public has said, we must not only have justice and freedom but it must appear to be justice and it must appear to be freedom—and it does not so appear to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should take this before the committee as quickly and as expeditiously as possible. Earlier in the day I heard some suggestion that perhaps it would not be reported by the committee. Mr. Speaker, I should regret that very much. I hope and trust it will come back to this House as soon as possible in an amended form. Thank you.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the amendment, and say very few words. It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to avoid being repetitious. However, as one who is opposed to some of the provisions of the bill, and as a member of the legal bills committee, I want the opportunity to question and even grill the law officers of the Crown. I am rather surprised and intrigued by some of the provisions of this bill, and I want to hear their opinions.

I think, Mr. Speaker, during the next few years, we will have much legislation dealing with the rights of the individual and civil liberties, brought in in the name of the common good. We have to be careful of this type of legislation. I want to be able to attend the committee hearing because I feel that if we gave this bill second reading—after debating the principle—the public would be even more apprehensive.

Imagine the headlines: "Police Bill Given Second Reading." If we think the past weekend has been bad, we can imagine what the

next weekend would be like. The public would be even more worried, and certainly apprehensive, than it is now. I have faith in the committee system, Mr. Speaker. I have faith in the legal bills committee. There are 35 members of the legal bills committee, and nearly all the lawyers in this House are members of that committee. All parties are represented, and I understand that all lawyers in the Opposition parties are members of the legal committee.

As a new member I have had a certain amount of satisfaction and pride in my committee work. I feel that we, as MPPs, have a job to do and I accept that responsibility. Without being repetitious, without being emotional, and without being partisan, we can question the people who are responsible for drafting this legislation in a proper way.

I, frankly, Mr. Speaker, do not have any worry that the outcome will be to the benefit of the people of this province. I do not think that the people have any worry about this procedure, or the hon. Prime Minister's motion. In view of that, I support his motion.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Speaker, as this House knows, I have had some differences of opinion with my own government on occasion and I am inclined to exercise my own judgment at all times and to voice my opinion whenever necessity demands it.

I have witnessed this afternoon a spectacle, a two-ring circus, participated in by the two Opposition parties. They are interested in protecting civil liberties, but at the same time I would suggest, in political capitalizing. They were not discharging their parliamentary duties, one of which, now that the crime report has been released, should be directed at stamping out crime in this province immediately.

Very succinctly, to withdraw the bill, in my opinion, would be a backward step and what is most frightening, would delay our getting on with the job, thus playing into the hands of the criminals and subversive elements of this province. The introduction of Bill No. 99 and the attendant publicity respecting section 14 has erased for the time being all other parts of the bill and indeed, the crime report itself.

We have two duties: one, to stamp out crime, and two, to protect and safeguard the civil liberties of the individual. These, I suggest, are not irreconcilable. There is, I submit, no better procedure to follow and no finer method available than to refer this

to committee where all relevant facts will be brought out where a thorough and exhaustive examination will take place.

The most redeeming feature of our parliamentary procedure for me to date has been my attendance at committee meetings. I have found them to be most educational, most informative, most non-partisan, and most productive. The Opposition, I suggest, is not sincere in its contentions and in advancing its arguments because its hon. members know full well in their hearts that section 14 is repulsive and repugnant to any clear-thinking individual and would not, under any conditions, pass through this House.

Mr. Bryden: How did it get in here?

Mr. Carton: I would resign forthwith if I thought otherwise, because under no condition whatsoever will I ever be inveigled into thinking that the ends justify the means.

We have a job to do, Mr. Speaker, a collective job to do forthwith and without delay. All parties should immediately join together for a common cause, that of stamping out crime. It is so much easier, so much more expeditious to build upon something. We have Bill No. 99 with one extremely repugnant section, but with many other sections universally acceptable. I would urge the Opposition, now that it has had its day in court as it were, to rise above party politics and earnestly and sincerely think of the interests of the people of this province by withdrawing its amendment and joining forces with the government in committing the legislation to the committee for full study.

In the event that the amendment is not withdrawn, may I state that I have unalterable faith in the hon. Prime Minister of the province. He has stated his position clearly, precisely and unmistakably. He has made it abundantly clear, in unequivocal terms, that section 14 will not stand under any conditions whatsoever. No citizen of this province need be under any misapprehension whatsoever, and to say or suggest otherwise, in the light of what has transpired today to date, is untruthful.

In conclusion, it is my considered opinion that I would be doing my constituents and the people of this province irreparable harm and damage, were I to do other than support the motion of the hon. Prime Minister and reject the amendment of the Opposition for one reason and one reason only, that full disclosure be made and full attention be focused on crime in this province at the very earliest opportunity.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, the main reason I suggest to the hon. members of this House to withdraw this bill is because it was in embryo state—a brainchild of the Ontario Police Commission which I suggest was wrongly formed and is now endorsed and presented to us by this government.

As I said at the outset in the House in my maiden speech, Disraeli said a long time ago that, "Politics is nothing but organized opinion." I suggested to the hon. Prime Minister then that we on this side of the House, through my hon. leader, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and my hon. colleagues are going to organize opinion in this province to show the people of Ontario what this government truly is—a smug, arrogant machine—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I would advise the member that he must stick to the amendment which is before the House and not become political in his remarks.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Police Commission is a newly created body which, I understand, was formed in 1961, probably at the request of the government. The personnel of this commission, I suggest to this House, is not democratic in that it does not contain in its personnel sufficient elected people. At the formation of this commission I, as an elected official, was there with possibly 50 or 60 other elected officials. The meeting was loaded I would say, speaking very kindly, with magistrates and judges, and so on. This is to the point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am sorry. We are not debating the police commission at this time. We are debating the amendment to the motion of the Prime Minister that this bill be withdrawn. I would like the member now to stick to that if he can.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I plan to show where the commission was not capable of presenting a proper bill.

We, the elected officials, were howled down by the magistrates and judges, because we wanted to have more elected people on this commission. They suggested we should keep the business of crime out of politics. Then the mayor of London asked them how magistrates and judges got their positions except through politics.

I suggest to you in closing then, Mr. Speaker, in voting against this bill and voting

for the amendment to throw out this bill, that this police commission be dismissed and reconstituted by personnel who reflect the views of ordinary people of this province. I suggest that my many good friends in this House, on both sides of the House, cannot oppose our amendment, regardless of politics—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: How can they report back to their people if they do otherwise?

Mr. Speaker: Does the member wish to speak to the amendment?

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): I have listened to the discussion which has gone on this afternoon. I will try to speak, and I only wish I had the ability to speak, with all the emotion and with all the logic and with all the ability with which men have spoken when rights have been abused throughout the generations of parliamentarians in the history of the British Commonwealth.

I am unabashed in saying that I will speak with every emotion I can put into this. I would say, sir, that I welcome—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: —and I hope it will be put in *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: I welcome the jibes and the jeers of any men who are not sufficiently sensitive to the momentous situation that is before us, when a bill such as this, and when a procedure such as this, is contemplated.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: We have seen—and I appreciate any remarks thrown from the other side, because students of history in later years are going to look with shocked disbelief at the cynicism which certain hon. members have displayed with respect to the dangers presented by this bill, and by the whole procedure.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: What are we debating today? We are debating the extraordinary procedure on an extraordinary bill. We have been asked to have faith in the hon. Prime Minister, to place our faith in this man. I would say to him that the whole procedure within the last 48 hours has been one of utter confusion, certainly not one of responsible government. And I will detail this.

At the start we had the hon. Attorney

General, who was reported to have said that he is going to see that these amendments are going to be passed by this Legislature. To this date he has not refuted that statement. Then we have the hon. Prime Minister, who is reported as saying on Saturday that this legislation was drafted to fight crime, and we are going to have to find another way. Then we have his press agent, or his press officer, Mr. Bill Kinmond, putting out a release on Sunday which quoted the hon. Prime Minister as saying the offensive sections of the bill were being withdrawn. Then we have Mr. Kinmond saying, later on, **that he should not have released that statement.** He added that the hon. Prime Minister would clarify, not necessarily withdraw, the offensive sections. With all this chaos and confusion, we now have hon. members standing up and saying, "Have faith in this government. Go along with what they are suggesting."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: We, sir, are contemplating the danger of continuing a bill which has shocked the whole of the western world.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say this: We had a situation in this bill—and it is connected with procedure because, after all, if we do not know about the bill, we do not know why we are having this extraordinary procedure. All across Canada, there have been outraged outcries about this bill. There has been puzzlement that good men, men who sit in the Legislature, who have been voted in, supposedly men who believe in freedom and liberty, could possibly contemplate this kind of bill. And what do we have? We have, for example, people like the previous Attorney General, who says—and I mean by that the Attorney General in 1963, because we do not know—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I find the member straying a little too far from the amendment. I would ask him to get back on the amendment that the bill be withdrawn, which is before the House at the present time, and not to continue speaking about the principle of the bill—whether it is good or bad or indifferent—unless it is connected with the withdrawal part.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it might be wiser if I followed the remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister. If I talk about his remarks then I cannot go astray.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Prime Minister has said—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: May I say that some of us do not believe as much in a person as we do in institutions? The hon. Prime Minister has said: "As leader of the government I accept full responsibility for this bill and its introduction into this Legislature."

I would assume that he speaks for all his Cabinet. Referring to what the hon. Prime Minister has said, I suggest that he does not. Because we have a previous Attorney General who has said that if he had known about this bill and the dreadful implications, which he was alert enough to see, he could not have voted on this bill.

On the other hand, sir, we have an Attorney General who says, "I am going to see that this bill is going to be passed through the Legislature." We have chaos and confusion when we would assume that a government would believe in Cabinet solidarity. Is this Cabinet solidarity—like rats of a deserted ship? We find that some of the hon. Cabinet members were suggesting they were not in Cabinet when this was proposed; and then we find later, from a story in the *Toronto Telegram*, that only four of them were absent.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. member should hear them talk in the back halls, too.

Mr. Thompson: I would say, sir, that the first point I noticed, expressed by a number of the government hon. members who were speaking on this bill, was that they wanted us to have faith in the personal attributes of the hon. Prime Minister. In no way do any of us question the personal attributes of the hon. Prime Minister. What we question is the public office of a Prime Minister.

We question that, no matter if he has served in the Navy, or whether some of the rest of the hon. members have served in the Navy, no matter if the hon. lady member thinks he is a nice gentleman, those are not the questions at stake. The question is: Are we going to sweep aside all the rights which have been developed over the centuries and have faith in the personal qualities of a Prime Minister? This is really what is being asked here. We are being asked to believe in a benign dictatorship when we are in the twentieth century, in Ontario, a part of Canada, a part of the British Commonwealth.

The next point that was raised—and which surprised me immensely—was one of the

Ministers, sir, who said that he was disappointed at the irresponsibility of the fourth estate, the press, because they saw the dreadful implications of this bill. He went out and exposed himself in various parts of his area—and he was trying to explain this. I say, sir, thank God for an alert press which will expose the implications of a bill like this.

The third point—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the member wish to ask a question? Was it a point of order or did you want to ask the member a question?

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): The hon. member said that I was a Minister. He is about three years behind the times; he apparently does not know what is going on. I am not a Minister.

Mr. Thompson: I apologize to the hon. member. It is so hard to know in that large overgrown Cabinet who is a Minister and who is not.

I would say that the next point that was raised was that crime is a very serious situation in Ontario. It suggested to us, the Liberal Party in Ontario and this Legislature, that crime is a serious situation. I only repeat again, because obviously they want us to forget it, that it was John Wintermeyer who pointed to the government people and told them they should get alert to the serious situation of crime in the province. I am referring to the points that were raised by other hon. members. Other hon. members suggested to us when they talked of this that because it is a serious affair they should throw out the baby with the bath water—that is more or less what they were suggesting.

Sir, the fourth point they raise about this, is to suggest to us that we want to hear the experts on this bill. Therefore, let us come before a committee in order to hear the experts. I would suggest to you, sir, the expert in connection with a bill which is presented before Parliament is the appropriate Minister who presents it. We have heard the hon. Attorney General with respect to this bill. What kind of things did he say to the press? He told them that it was a terrible bill. He told them that people could be detained without legal counsel. He told them they could be kept in jail indeterminately. He told them that you could have no public hearing, and he went on about incommunicado, in fact described in detail what to us sounds very much like Star Chamber methods.

Then they turn around and say that they want to delve into the thinking behind the experts on this. What kind of a ridiculous situation have we got in Ontario when they suggest they will bring in any kind of horrible bill, a bill which will throw us back to the Middle Ages, in order that they can find out the thinking behind people who would present such a bill?

We have heard from the expert on this, I suggest. The expert on this bill was the man who presented it to the House and, sir, I would suggest that on this occasion it is disappointing to us that he is not here to continue with his elaboration on the bill.

I would say this, sir, that I think on the part of the hon. Prime Minister it took considerable courage to stand up and to associate himself with the deliberations of this kind of bill and to say that, "I, as head of the government, take full responsibility for this bill." Everyone respects a man who will stand up even though the ship is sinking and say "I am captain of it." I would say we respect him for that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. members can laugh about that. They can laugh that this kind of stain of political philosophy can be permitted in this House. I would say with respect to this, we would hope that the hon. Prime Minister would have further courage with respect to the procedure. We would hope he would come before this House and say, "Look, this bill has caused great concern to all the citizens of this province and I did not know all about the bill," if he wants to put it that way. Or, he might want to say, "I did know all about the bill, but I realize that this is a mistake."

The hon. Prime Minister is a man who is reasonable, he is a man I think who has as great a love for the liberties of people as anyone else. The hon. Prime Minister must know that there is a section of this bill which is abhorrent to every principle of a free society. Why then keep that section still towering above us? How do we know what will happen unless this thing is not completely taken away? How do we know what deliberations are going on? In the past 48 hours, we have heard one point of view and another. Is the hon. Attorney General's point of view going to prevail or will the hon. Prime Minister come in and take charge and the hon. Attorney General leave? How do we know what the situation is?

Surely at this time, sir, the honourable thing, the big thing for the hon. Prime Minister

ter of Ontario to do is to stand up, as many of these hon. members have, and admit this bill was wrong, this section was wrong, and say, "I agree with you on this; let us completely withdraw the bill and bring in another." Instead, he wants to hide this situation, take it away in this extraordinary method—because to me it is an extraordinary procedure—take it away into a committee. How do we know when the committee will meet? How do we know that he will not hold this thing off with people still wondering what is going to happen with respect to this? We have no assurance when this bill will be studied. We have no assurance when it will come back before the House again.

Sir, in order that everyone can rest at ease, knowing their liberties are secure, in order that this government and this Parliament again can be a place where we can reflect the obvious decent thinking of people, the obvious respect for the liberties of men and women in this province, I suggest the hon. Prime Minister withdraw the section of this bill. I say, sir, as my hon. leader has said, that if this is not withdrawn, and if the government comes back again with that odious section before this House, we will filibuster and filibuster and filibuster. All we do at this time, sir, following the parliamentary procedure which we respect and love, is plead to the hon. Prime Minister, because this is the only approach in the parliamentary system we have. We plead to him, sir, in view of the outcry of the bill, in view of his own hon. members' outcry in connection with sections of the bill, to be big enough to stand up in this House and say that "I know that sections were wrong and I withdraw this bill." If he does that, he may still hold a place in the history of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The chair recognizes the hon. member for Forest Hill.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the contention of certain hon. members opposite that this procedure will have the effect of limiting debate on this measure. In fact it adds a stage to the ordinary legislative process, and this measure, quite probably amended, will return to this House by way of report and for second reading. Or are the hon. members opposite afraid that this bill will die in committee? Were it to die in committee it would simply have accomplished what they seek to accomplish by way of their amendment—withdrawal.

An hon. member: We would like it to die tonight.

Mr. Dunlop: The process will be added to rather than subtracted from. The opportunity for the debate of this measure will be expanded not reduced, and I think it is very unfair to suggest to people who are not familiar with parliamentary procedure that the object of this method is a reduction of debate whereas actually it is increased.

You, Mr. Speaker, have allowed people to say some things on the merits of the bill and I will say this: There is much that is good in this bill and therefore it would be stupidity to withdraw it. Some of it is bad; and on those sections, in committee and otherwise, I, like most hon. members of this House, would vote against that which is bad, but we would not kill that which is good.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, some 12 years ago, as a young man of 33, I made a maiden speech. In that speech, I recalled for the Speaker of the day and my fellow members of the House the fact that it gave me—and I spoke with some great emotion, because I came from a stock of men who, for centuries, had not known the way of free men. Neither my father, nor his father before him, nor his father before him, nor for generations had the people of my stock known how to live as free men. At the same time that I was learning the history and traditions of the stock of my father and my mother, it was my privilege, through the educational and other institutions of this province which the young people have the privilege of attending, of learning the magnificent history of the development of the British institutions.

It was in those schools that I came to know of Magna Carta—none of my people ever knew of Magna Carta. I came to know of Habeus Corpus—none of my people had ever known of Habeus Corpus. I came to know of the right of counsel—that a man who could not speak for himself could have someone trained speak on his behalf. I grew up with one foot in the tradition of a people who had never known freedom for centuries. At the same time I was learning of these traditions.

So, 12 years ago, I took my place in this House and I was determined that one of the things I would do, and speak for, would be the continuous maintenance and development of the rights of free men, not only in this province but in this nation and beyond the seas—and to that I have devoted my life. I have said in this House, and outside, that there is no finer place in the world in which to live than in this province. I did not say that because my stomach was full, and the

stomachs of those who were associated with me were full, nor because they had a roof over their heads and clothes to wear. That is not why this place is a decent place to live in; it is because this province is the place where men live as free men.

I shall not take as long as the hon. member for Bruce. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, this bill should be referred to the committee. It has been my lot to have been speaking on behalf of the rights of free men all my life—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: I was there for five years myself, and I am sick and tired of hearing of it.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Order!

I do not want this debate to get into questions and answers across the floor of the House, and I would ask the Minister perhaps to come back to the amendment and speak on it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking on the reference of this bill to the committee, of the legal bills committee. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to this coin, and it is in that committee that those two sides would be presented. Over the weekend I have read the connotations in the papers of the police state; that is one interpretation that has been put on this bill. I do not question for a moment that that point of view has been put fairly and honestly on the interpretation of the readers, as they saw it in that bill—that thing which was pointed in the press over the weekend concerning the police state, that this is what this bill was going to do.

I recall for the hon. members of this House that, for two years I, as Provincial Secretary, had to live with accusations which came from the other side of the House, and which were supported outside this House. And why was I subjected to criticism, to ridicule, to vilification? Because I, as a member of the civil authority, had done what? Had overruled the judgment of a policeman. And there was not one hon. member on that side of the House who ever rose to my defence.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The hon. Minister ignored the judgment and gave charters to the gamblers.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There was not a person outside of this House who ever said—

Mr. MacDonald: Completely out of order!

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Faces are pretty red over there.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And that is why this bill should go to committee. There was never any suggestion that that overruling was improper or had some wrong intent. It was a—

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member state his point of order?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I submit the hon. Minister has been out of order throughout his entire speech. He is not talking about either the motion or the amendment, and I think it is now time to call him to order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have listened for several hours. I have taken my lead from the scope of this debate, from the hon. members opposite in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am speaking to why this bill should go to the committee because there—

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is not. He is talking about everything under the sun.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A year ago the hon. member was throwing accusations against me in this House, that I, as a civil authority, had overruled—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister come back and speak to the amendment now before the House, or the main motion moved by the Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister of this province has clearly stated the position of himself and the government he leads; and the hon. members opposite have failed, but I shall not fail, to state why the people of this province need not have the slightest bit of apprehension about this bill going to the committee.

Mr. Whicher: Ask the hon. member for St. George about it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. Prime Minister has clearly stated the position, that he speaks on behalf of himself and his government supporters, that he would not

tolerate any legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes the personal rights and freedoms of the individual. That is the point, and it is in committee—

Mr. Whicher: Why did he bring it in?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the point, and I am reading the statement he made in this House this afternoon.

Mr. MacDonald: Where was the hon. Minister when the bill—

An hon. member: The hon. Minister is out of order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I bring this to the attention of the hon. members of this House, because several hours have passed since the hon. Prime Minister read it. He is asking that this bill be sent back to committee. He stated the position that the bill had been put forward in the belief that it did not infringe or violate basic individual liberties and privileges but that it must be changed.

As the hon. member for Lambton West said, the terms of reference of the committee are of the broadest, not only the word "change," but the word "amend." It is clearly established that every opportunity will be given to all sides—to the members of the legal profession both within the service and outside the service, and to responsible organizations—to put their case. If the case is made, the terms of reference are broad enough, the word is to withdraw the bill or any portion thereof.

Mr. Speaker, those are the terms of reference to the committee and I will close my remarks by stating this: There was an honest belief when this bill was put forward, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, that there was no infringement or jeopardizing of personal rights. I make this one suggestion. I have been one of those who has all my life supported a bill of rights. It is not sufficient that the Magna Carta be there or the right of Habeas Corpus or the right of counsel. It is perhaps time that we had a bill, a federal bill and a provincial bill, which will spell out once and for all the principle that this government is dedicated to. Then never again, unwittingly or otherwise, will there ever be an infringement on that bill of rights because there would have to be then a definite exception in any bill put forward.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, that was called the bill of wrongs.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite laughed at the federal bill

of rights. I recall those days too when the hon. member held that federal bill of rights to ridicule.

Mr. Speaker, I close my remarks by suggesting this, that the hon. Prime Minister has always maintained that it is not beyond the human competence of men to solve a problem. We have the problem here of how to cope with the alleged invasion by criminals of this province, and then we have the fact that civil authorities have to deal with this matter in a way that will not injure the history of this province. We need a sharp sword to make sure that the elements of crime will be wiped out, but we must be careful that that sword is not a double-edged sword. The purpose of sending it to the committee is just to ensure that.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Has every member spoken who cares to speak?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, could I just say a word and I can assure you that I am not angry at anybody. I will not call anybody any names, but I have heard the hon. Opposition members stand up—

Mr. Whicher: And the hon. Minister's own members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: —with a great show of humanitarianism, emotionalism and all the other things that go for histrionics about this bill we are debating. We talked about fair play, Mr. Speaker, and there was one thing that I wanted to bring out and the hon. Prime Minister—

Mr. Bryden: It is the motion we are debating.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I had better look like you—

Mr. Bryden: I must say your appearance has improved, George.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to ask the Minister if he will address his remarks to the chair and I am going to ask the members to give him a hearing with no more questions and answers back and forth across the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, has moved that Bill No. 99, which has had first reading, go back to

the committee for discussion. I think that that is absolutely fair play. We are speaking in here about humanitarianism. Do we ever give a thought to the gentlemen who wrote this bill in the first place?

Mr. Whicher: Where is he?

Mr. Singer: Who did it?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Just a minute, just a minute—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Are we going to give them an opportunity to tell us why and what their thinking is regarding the sections that are alarming many of us?

I think they should be entitled to be heard as to why these proposals were made and why they thought it was necessary to have them in for law enforcement in this province. They should be given an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I think, to justify their thinking before we, who know nothing about it in this House at all, do nothing but criticize them, which has been done here tonight in very bitter terms. They have used every adjective that they could lay their tongue to that was possible to use in public. They have been drastic in all their accusations, never giving a thought to the people who were the architects of this bill.

We are objecting to things in that bill which you all know about and with that I agree, but when hon. members of this House refuse to send the bill to committee where the architects will have a chance to justify their findings or not, we are refusing to do just exactly what we are objecting to in Bill No. 99, and do not forget that. Hon. members are objecting to Bill No. 99 and they know the clause as well as I do that they are objecting to, yet they refuse to let the people who are the architects of this bill explain why they did it. Is that fair, Mr. Speaker?

I favour this bill being sent to the committee for discussion and explanation, Mr. Speaker. I want to say to the Opposition that I heard a term once, "Consistency, thou art a jewel." Why do they not stay on the one track and tell us what they want and not be talking all around the bush? I am getting tired of it.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the hon. Prime Minister's suggestion and will go along with it 100 per cent as I know every other hon. member in this part of the House will do, and if the Opposition were sensible, they would do the same thing.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. K. E. Butler (Waterloo, North): Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately—and I will stick strictly to the subject on a three-minute basis—have not had too much time to exercise any oratory in this House or prior to it. Basically, my reason was that my opponent in the last election talked so much that I did not have to. This has put me in an embarrassing position as far as practice is concerned on this.

I would like to say, quite seriously, that obviously everyone in this House can win on a pretty good ticket of motherhood and freedom. We are not permitted to talk on the bill, as was pointed out so often, but I do sense, with a very sensitive ear, that there are certain people opposed to this bill. It is an odd thing, but I feel that.

All we are talking about is, basically, procedure. It is a procedural proposition. We have a motion from the hon. leader of the Opposition that we withdraw this whole bill and we have a motion from the hon. Prime Minister that it be referred to committee. In the final net result, I cannot see the basic difference at all.

If the committee brings this bill as it is, back in, there is full freedom for discussion on the entire bill and this controversial section, which we should not have been mentioning, will come up for discussion again and give everybody a big, fat chance to get back at it.

If this controversial section does not come back, then the Opposition has achieved the purpose that it wants in asking that this bill be withdrawn. To go to the problem and trouble of drafting an entirely new bill, after this one has been withdrawn, takes time, takes more work and makes difficulty. So I cannot see in any way, how we can support the withdrawal of this entire bill when the same object and aims are being achieved by a better route than if the bill were withdrawn. I strongly favour, and I would hope that very shortly the question will be asked, that we do not support the withdrawal of this bill.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I shall now read the amendment which is before the House and upon which you shall vote:

Moved by Mr. F. R. Oliver, seconded by Mr. A. J. Reaume, that all the words after "discharge" be deleted and there be substituted therefor the words, "and that the bill be withdrawn."

As many as are in favour of the amendment will please say "aye". As many as are opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

The amendment was lost on the following division:

YEAS	NAYS
Braithwaite	Allan
Bryden	Apps
Bukator	Auld
Davison	Bales
Farquhar	Beckett
Freeman	Boyer
Gaunt	Brown
Gisborn	Brunelle
Gould	Butler
Lewis	Carruthers
(Scarborough West)	Carton
MacDonald	Cecile
Newman	Connell
Nixon	Cowling
Oliver	Davis
Paterson	Demers
Racine	Downer
Reaume	Dunlop
Sargent	Dymond
Singer	Eagleson
Spence	Edwards
Taylor	Evans
Thompson	Ewen
Trotter	Grossman
Whicher	Guindon
Worton	Hamilton
Young-26.	Harris
	Haskett
	Henderson
	Hodgson
	(Scarborough East)
	Hodgson
	(Victoria)
	Johnston
	(Parry Sound)
	Johnston
	(Carleton)
	Kerr
	Knox
	Lawrence
	(St. George)
	Letherby
	Lewis
	(Humber)
	Mackenzie
	MacNaughton
	Morningstar
	McNeil
	Noden
	Olde
	Peck
	Pittock

NAYS

Price
Pritchard
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Sandercock
Simonett
Spoonier
Stewart
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardrope
Welch
Wells
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yakabuski
Yaremko-70.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 26, the "nays", 70.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. We shall now—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the main motion. I have spoken on the amendment, I have not yet had an opportunity to speak on the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I might say, for the benefit of the member, that I allowed each member who did speak to join the main motion and the amendments together in their remarks, which everyone did.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the main motion. Furthermore, I submit that this motion admits any number of amendments the hon. members feel they want to submit.

I shall be brief, Mr. Speaker; and before I sit down—I hope, before the barracking begins—I suggest that there is a solution which can resolve this difficulty in which the House now finds itself, or more particularly in which the government finds itself. Before I come to that solution, which I shall propose in the form of an amendment, I want to say in as quiet tones as I can that I am not only surprised but disappointed in the hon. Prime Minister.

I have many differences with the hon. Prime Minister, and I shall continue to have them, but there is one thing I had begun to

appreciate about the hon. Prime Minister and that was that he was a pretty uncanny, political realist; he recognized a political situation and was able to deal with it rather skilfully. I wonder why that capacity has left him in this particular situation. The disturbing thing, Mr. Speaker, which has emerged in the four or five hours of debate we have had on this very important matter, and it is important enough that we perhaps should have four or five hours more, is that the hon. Prime Minister is sticking, at least to a degree, to the offensive section in this bill.

All he has presented to the House is the suggestion of qualified withdrawal; indeed I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I did not even realize how qualified it was when it was first made earlier in the afternoon. All that the hon. Prime Minister has done is to move that second reading shall be struck from the order paper and that this will go to the committee. Then it is going to come back to the House for second reading. There is no withdrawing of this bill at all. This bill is technically still before the House; it is going to go to a committee and then it is going to come back to the House again, so we are still faced with this bill.

Mr. Singer: What is unusual about that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Furthermore, if I may just repeat very briefly a point I made earlier, the hon. Prime Minister has, to a considerable degree, been unrepentant. I cannot quite make all the statements add up—those the hon. Prime Minister and other hon. members of the government have made.

The hon. Prime Minister, for example, on Friday, got up and said that he was not going to support anything that was personally offensive to him, or was offensive to basic civil liberties. In spite of having said that, he got up today and said that he had discussed this once again with the law officers of the Crown and they still contended that this was not offensive to civil liberties. So he is willing to accept this, even though he implied on Friday, if he did not state, that he found this offensive. There is at least a half-contradiction, if not a whole contradiction, in what he has stated. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government, through the action of the hon. Prime Minister in his motion this afternoon, has made a bad situation worse.

He has appeared to be willing to manoeuvre, to deal in technicalities, instead of dealing in a forthright way with a situa-

tion which surely has become pretty untenable. Does the hon. Prime Minister not realize, for example, that he has repudiated this bill, or at least the offensive section, while his Attorney General continues to support it? Does he not realize, for example, that the hon. Attorney General apparently misled the Cabinet—or else the Cabinet was asleep, one or the other, you cannot have it both ways—and then misled this House by not—

Mr. Singer: The caucus was—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, there were only ten of the caucus there, so you cannot mislead a majority who were not there. He misled this House in a very interesting—I was going to say “calculated”—way. I do not know whether it was calculated or not on Friday, when he skipped over the offensive section of the bill, though he explained that the powers of the police commission were being expanded.

The point I want to get to, Mr. Speaker, and I am trying to keep my remarks as short as possible, is that it has become very obvious through the debate, in the last four or five hours, that everybody in this House is opposed to section 14. Everybody is opposed to section 14 as it now stands.

I am interested in the silence, because I have not heard any protest. I take the word of the hon. member for St. George, who said he has canvassed the Cabinet Ministers, he has canvassed back-benchers, he has canvassed everybody, and he has not found anybody who is in support of section 14. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, there is an obvious solution to this? As long as section 14 is in the bill, you are going to have this whole atmosphere of uncertainty, indeed of consternation, which has been created in the province of Ontario in the last three or four days. Is there not an obvious solution, that we get rid of section 14?

I do not think it is the best solution. I think the whole bill should have been withdrawn, but at least the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), who is not with us here tonight, pointed out, which is accurate, that apart from section 14 all the rest of the sections of the bill are more or less routine, some of them important. They may be amended when they get to committee. But it is a normal bill.

The one section of the bill which is completely offensive is section 14. Why can we not, Mr. Speaker, since we have not been able to persuade the government or the hon. Prime Minister to withdraw the bill completely, refer this to the committee with instructions

that section 14 shall be deleted? Let the committee proceed and deal with the rest of the bill, which is a routine bill, and take section 14 as a problem in itself, because it is a problem in itself. It is the problem of how we can shape more effective machinery to cope with organized crime without encroaching on the rights and civil liberties of every human being in this province. Let this Legislature, when it comes back, as I suggested this afternoon, debate this report of the Ontario Police Commission on the first day. Having debated it and having got conceivably a consensus of hon. members of the House as to how we can achieve a more effective machinery for coping with organized crime without encroaching on the civil liberties of the citizenry of this province, then we can bring in a second bill to amend The Police Act.

The government has brought in two or three bills to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act or The Labour Relations Act during the year. In other words, deal with the routine aspects of the bill by referring it to the committee now, set aside this section 14 which is offensive to everybody in this House—everybody, including the hon. Prime Minister—and let us deal with it in the fashion that we should have dealt with it in the first instance. That is, by debating this report and getting a clear conception of the danger of organized crime.

If I may just interject here briefly, Mr. Speaker, I bow to nobody in this House over a concern about the threat of organized crime and the need for more effective machinery.

Indeed, six or eight months before John Wintermeyer read his speech in this House that somebody had written for him, I was the only member in the House on the Opposition side or the government side who was talking about the problem of organized crime. So I am not bowing to anybody on the dangers and the need for coming to more effective curbs. But what I cannot understand is why the government will not set aside this section 14—kill it, so that the people of this province will know it is killed. That is what they want to hear, that this Legislature has killed section 14 as dead as a dodo. Then they can relax into some sort of normal calm and not fear they are going to have a police state imposed upon them, and we can give the bill sober second thoughts.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very simple way to resolve the problem that the House now finds itself in and that the government finds itself in. I do not know why the government wants to rub salt in its

own wounds by sticking with section 14. I would think it, more than anybody, would want to get rid of section 14, and bury it and say it is part of the past, completely part of the past.

Therefore, I move, seconded by Mr. E. G. Freeman, that the motion be amended by adding thereto, "and that the committee be instructed to delete section 14 of the said bill." That will leave the committee free to deal with the rest of the bill. My submission is that we, in this Legislature, can then proceed to deal with the substance of section 14 when we come back after Easter, first with a debate on this report and then moving to whatever amendments or legislation the government thinks would emerge to deal with the problem as a result of our debate.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this amendment.

I would say that section 14, if its effect is what it has been interpreted to be, is as offensive to me as it is to any other hon. member of this House. I think we may start from that position. In my part in this debate, in making the main motion, I have not at any time attempted to show that any other man in this House has any desire to impose a police state upon the people of Ontario. I think I can say in all fairness that nobody in the Opposition is attempting to prove that anybody on this side of the House is anxious to impose this type of legislation on the people of Ontario.

I think we can clear the air because there is a position, in my opinion, from which we all operate. It is as unthinkable to me that the Opposition would wish to have legislation which would infringe the basic and natural, if I may put it that way, and age-old rights of our people, as it is for me to think that anybody in this party, which I lead, and the government which I lead, would wish to infringe the rights of our people. This is basic, in my humble opinion, to all of us. It is the cornerstone of the political philosophy of the party to which I belong and I think that in the debate here tonight we have perhaps become sidetracked.

I would like to have the exact wording of the hon. member's motion, but I would suggest this, that in referring this bill to committee, I would think that section 14 would be dealt with by that committee exactly in the way that the hon. member has suggested in his motion, with one possible exception. I am of the opinion that there has been a lot of rather fuzzy thinking about this bill. I am also of the opinion that it

may not be so that these sections, as drawn, will necessarily have the effect that has been attributed to them. For this opinion I take the advice of men who are skilled in the interpretation of statutes of this kind.

What is suggested by the main motion is that this bill go to committee so that it can be examined and this section can be interpreted and all sections of this bill can be interpreted. That interpretation will be given to them by the man who drew them, and will be given to them by anybody else who wishes to appear before the committee and give the committee his opinion of what these sections mean. Then, and this is what my statement and my argument on the main motion meant, those sections will be altered if that is necessary, or withdrawn if that is necessary, to ensure these basic rights which we are all striving to protect. Every one of us in this House is striving to protect the same thing.

My point is simply this, that as far as the amendment of the hon. member is concerned, I think the same effect will be achieved whether the amendment to this motion is made or not. If it would help in this situation I would agree with the amendment if he will add to it "if the sections are found to be offensive", because it is this question that interests me.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the hon. Prime Minister not start afresh?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What I am suggesting to you is that I was not aware that the form in which the bill is, and on which there have been varying opinions expressed as to what it means and what interpretation can be put on it, when it was brought into the House originally, contained this possibility that it would infringe these basic liberties. I said on Friday that I would re-examine it to see if it did, and I got the same opinion that I had in the first place and that was that these sections did not so offend.

As I said this afternoon, I have grave misgivings about this, because of the comments of learned counsel in law, and that is why I wanted the bill treated in this fashion, so that we can ensure these liberties, one way or the other, as far as this section is concerned. I do not think your amendment is necessary to have that section treated in the way you want it treated. I think, under the main motion, this bill will go to the committee, it will be examined, section by section, and if the sections prove to be offensive—and I think that this is so obvious to everyone, so completely obvious—there is

nobody in this House, there will be nobody on that committee, there is no one who supports this government, I would say to you that there is no one who supports the Progressive-Conservative Party in Ontario, who will ask for the section to remain.

Several hon. members: Take it out.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying to you this: There is at the moment a conflict of opinion as to what that particular section and perhaps other sections of this bill mean, and the procedure that we are following is simply to find out what in fact it does mean. When we know that, the course of action open to us will be clear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would suggest to you that this is the procedure which would be followed. Much has been made of the particular procedure we have followed here. But I can point out that in certain controversial bills last year, where we did want to establish exactly the type of thing I am speaking about now, before there was a debate on the principle of the bill they were referred to committees and dealt with—

An hon. member: Which one?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I will tell the hon. member. I can go back to 1955, but let us—

Mr. Singer: No, last year.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —take 1963. Bill No. 160, The Milk Industry Act, 1963, went to the agricultural committee to get sorted out before it came back here to have the principle of the bill debated on second reading.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We are not trying to close off debate on this subject. We are trying to find out what we are debating.

Bill No. 159, The Oleomargarine Act—and hon. members cannot say that was not a controversial bill—received exactly the same treatment in this House last year.

The Minimum Wage Act was referred to the standing committee on labour before it was given second reading in this House, in order that it could go to that committee and be examined in detail. I do not recall whether amendments were made in the committee, but they could have been made; and then it would come back here for debate

on the principle of the bill, as it was going to wend its way through this House.

So this is not new. I have got several others here, but I just mention these of recent date, which have happened recently.

Mr. Speaker, the point I make is that the position we take is that this bill will be dealt with in exactly the same way the hon. member suggests. What I am really seeking is to find an interpretation of these sections and this is the way we will get it. I think that the purpose the hon. member is after with his amendment will automatically flow from the procedure we have established in the main motion.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question?

The hon. Prime Minister has indicated to us that he did not think it was necessary, so far as the amendment was concerned; but, because of a possible misunderstanding and possible misinterpretation, would he not consider it desirable to support the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, let me have the wording of the amendment, please.

Mr. Speaker: For the benefit of the House I shall read the amendment:

Moved by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Freeman, that the motion be amended by adding thereto: "And that the committee be instructed to delete section 14 of the said bill."

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party can say that we will support the motion moved by the hon. member for York South. We will do anything in our power to kill section 14 of Bill No. 99 tonight.

We would have preferred that the House would have accepted the suggestion we put forward earlier, but we are not going to stand on ceremony. We are not going to play any games. We are not going to resort to rules of procedure or explanations which try to differentiate without enunciating the difference. In our opinion, if we accept the words of the hon. Prime Minister, there is no hon. member of this House, there is no member of the Conservative Party inside or outside the House, who believes in the provisions of section 14. Well, Mr. Speaker, what have we been talking about since three o'clock this afternoon? If we take the hon. Prime Minister at his word, surely again the simplest thing in the world would be—whether it was in line with the amendment moved by my hon. leader (Mr. Oliver), whether it is in

line with the amendment now moved by the hon. member for York South or, if he wants to have it his own way, in line with any wording he wants to make—for goodness sake, to take section 14, once and for all, from the purview of this Legislature.

We do not care whose wording it is; just do it. It is no more complicated than that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, how did we get section 14 here in the first place?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the hon. Minister of Mines wants to find out. Mr. Speaker, who in the world, who in the Legislature of the province of Ontario, has been in a better position than the hon. Minister of Mines to find out? The hon. member for Grey North? Grey South (Mr. Oliver)? The hon. member for York South? My hon. colleague from Bruce or myself, or anyone in this 32 we have here? Is it? The hon. Minister of Mines sits—and I do not know how frequently he meets with the Cabinet—but he has that privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: He has the privilege of examining every bill this government introduces. He has an obligation to examine and to question anything he has doubts about, and he says he wants to get down to the bottom of it. Mr. Speaker, if he had been doing his job he would have been down to the bottom of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: And if he had been doing his job, or if his 21 colleagues had been doing their jobs, it would never have been here in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I am not even going to be so unkind as to say that there is one hon. member in this House who thinks section 14 is appropriate. I accept the hon. Prime Minister at his word. We all abhor the principles in it. Well, then, what are we wasting time about? It is now ten of the clock. We started at three o'clock this afternoon, we have taken a short recess for dinner, and we are still at the same point.

If we all believe in the same thing, as the hon. Prime Minister says, for goodness sake if he does not like the wording that my hon. leader introduced, or the wording that the hon. member for York South introduced, let him take the wording of the hon. Minister of Mines, or anybody's wording; but, for

goodness sake, remove it, once and for all. This is all we ask. This is all we ask in the name of the people of the province of Ontario; and let this be the end of it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to accept the suggestions that have been made here and I think I can see a way to accomplish what we wish. What I am interested in, of course, is the conditions of this bill when it was introduced into the House. Now section 14 is the offensive section. I would like this section to be discussed in committee stage. I would like it to be examined there. I would like to know if there are conflicting opinions as to what it means.

I would be quite prepared to accept an amendment by which we could ask the committee to delete section 14 after study. This means that it can be examined in that committee by the people who will be appearing before the committee. This means that what is required under the section can be dealt with and explained by the people who ask for this in their wish to combat the crime element in the province; and it means that the section will simply not be pulled out of the bill without any discussion as to why it was there and what it means. It does mean as far as the people of the province are concerned, that they will know this particular section is gone; but the reason for it being there in the first place will be a matter of study and consideration by the committee.

Mr. Reilly: Then I understand, Mr. Prime Minister, that this section is to be deleted.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would recommend that it be deleted; but the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is simply this—and perhaps the drafting of these amendments is better done some place other than on the floor of the Legislature—but I do not want this section of the bill to simply be taken out without any discussion in the committee of why it is there, of why the people who are charged with certain responsibilities asked for it to be there. But if in its present form it is considered to be offensive—and I think there is some doubt about this, at least there is in the opinions I have been given—however, in order to allay the fears, in order to ensure that the people of Ontario need not worry that this section in its present form can ever be passed, I am quite prepared to have it removed, to have a direction given to the committee that this section be removed. But I want the benefit of the examination of the committee and of the people who appear before the committee, on the section itself.

Now if this can be achieved in an amendment that we can reach here—

Mr. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. Prime Minister in the dilemma in which he now finds himself—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Oliver: No, I am serious about this—wanting to preserve at least a segment of his political reputation. But I do not think the hon. Prime Minister is in a position to save even a shred of it tonight.

I say that because of this. My hon. friend says: "I am prepared to go along with the amendment of my hon. friend from York South with the reservation that we shall say from this House, in this amendment, that we direct the committee to throw this section 14 out but," the hon. Prime Minister says, "we want to have a discussion on it."

Now of all the ridiculous positions for a Prime Minister to find himself in. What he is saying and what he is agreeing to is this: That we shall say from this House to the committee that we instruct you to throw out section 14 and the only reservation we have is that you shall discuss it.

Now what an untenable position to find oneself in. The hon. Prime Minister has agreed, here on the floor of the House, that it is going out; but he wants to save a little bit of face by saying that it shall be discussed after the event. Now what in the world use is that? What political sagacity can be attached, what significance can be put, to my hon. friend's contention that he agrees to have it thrown out, but he wants to have a discussion after it is thrown out? Now that is a most ridiculous position in which my hon. friend finds himself.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, no, no!

Mr. Speaker, this really is the difficulty in trying to arrange an amendment on the floor of the Legislature to a piece of legislation.

I said in my remarks in first commenting upon this amendment to the motion that we would achieve what is required, and what my hon. friend from York South is after with his amendment, we would achieve this if we followed the procedure under the main motion. Now it is made clear, and it has been made clear in the debate here, right or wrong—whether that section carries with it the characteristics that some say it does, whether it has not got them as some say it has not—the problem we are facing here is that this particular section of this bill is the

one that is bothering the people of Ontario. I think this has been made eminently clear by everyone who has spoken here today.

Now then, I say this: first of all, under the main motion this section — and under the statement that I made today—this section would be examined and if it proved to be in any way offensive it would either be altered, amended or withdrawn completely. This was the purpose of sending the bill to the committee, that this section, along with other sections of the Act, would be examined in this way. Now my hon. friend comes along with a motion dealing with one particular section and he says why not send the bill to committee with a direction that the committee take this section of the bill out. All right! Now I am prepared to go along with that, as long as we do not have this additional effect of taking it out. I am prepared to go along with it, because this is the section that, I say right or wrong, regardless of whose interpretation is put on it—and there has been more than one, there is not unanimity as to what this section means.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Just about!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member says just about and this is not so. I have tried, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this matter without reference to partisan politics. I have tried to get at the root of the difficulty with this legislation and I would hope that I would get the same kind of treatment from the other side of the floor, because this is bigger than party politics at this stage of the game.

Now this section which is so offensive was asked for. I set out in my remarks this afternoon the section of the police report, or the report of the police commission, in which they asked for these powers. There is a reason. These are the ancillary matters, if I may put it that way, that I do not want to see taken out of the hands of the committee because we send a bill to the committee with a direction that this section be deleted.

All I say is, arrange it so that these other matters that concern the section can be dealt with in the committee, so that we may know, so that we may put it to the people why these powers were required, and so that we can find out whether we may have to bring back another bill. Let us settle in the committee what the drafting should be. Should it be worded this way, or should it be worded differently? Does the wording of this Act mean what some people say it means, or does it mean what other people say it means?

Now if we can settle these matters in front of the committee—and this is the reason I

wanted the bill to go to committee and this is the reason that the motion is here—I will still argue that this is not an unusual procedure in this House, it has been followed many times. If it is going to relieve the fears and if it is going to relieve the apprehension of people in the province to say that the committee will eliminate this particular section, I am quite prepared to go along with that. But I do not want—to use the expression of the hon. member for Dovercourt—I do not want to send the baby down the drain with the water. I want to know, and I want the investigation to be made as we discussed in this House today, why the section was there and will a similar section or something like it serve the purpose in the field of crime investigation. If we can ensure that this is dealt with by the committee, I have no objection if the instruction is to the committee to remove or to delete this section.

Mr. MacDonald: Just where does that leave us?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It leaves us with this: one amendment which has been suggested to me would be to accept the amendment that the hon. member has put forward by adding thereto, “provided that the same shall first be studied in relation to recommendation 11 of the report of the OPC.”

Mr. Oliver: Of course that is ridiculous!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I cannot see why.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? I am afraid at this point we are quibbling over words.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not quibbling, I think I have suggested something.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if I may ask my question: why can this amendment not be accepted which kills section 14? And I repeat, I would think the group which wants to get it killed more than anybody else, sir, is the government. I do not know why they want to live with it, like a bastard child you want to cling to for some time longer, or something like that. Get rid of it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member should keep his language clean.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it is not too inaccurate a description of what you are now coping with. But, Mr. Speaker, the question I

wanted to ask the hon. Prime Minister is: If he accepts the amendment, the committee will deal with the rest of the bill to begin with, and then, at the next meeting of the committee—I presume we are going to have time for at least two committee meetings afterwards—it comes back and deals with it for as long as is necessary; deals with the next topic, the subject matter of this in relation to recommendation 11, in relation to anything else. There are some things left out of this which should be included, and other things have been included which should be left out. The subject matter of it can be reconsidered afresh in the light of the crime report, which I submit, Mr. Speaker, should be discussed before the committee gets at it altogether, because this is the genesis of this recommendation.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the hon. member for York South's amendment, for this reason: I, too, would like to have the controversial section 14 discussed in the committee. I believe, sir, that the amendment, if I understand it correctly from the hon. member, will allow us in the committee to discuss that section, because we are referring it to the committee with instructions to delete. Now if we do that, the very first thing to come before that committee would be the instructions to delete. I see no reason at all why the chairman of that committee, at that time, could not say that the instructions of the House are to delete this measure, therefore a motion will have to be made for the actual deletion. Certainly we can then discuss the thing sensibly, calmly and coolly, and yet with the unavowed belief of every hon. member in this House that the section as it now stands is repugnant to us all.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the comments of the hon. member for St. George, as I understand them.

I had a number of comments, Mr. Speaker, which I had thought of making in relation to some of the speeches made here. Some of them were not very friendly or kind comments, and now I have decided I will not make them. I think we possibly are reaching the point where we can find a solution to the problem before us, and I hope that no words of mine will upset any possibility of a solution.

I believe that every hon. member in this House, bar none, is concerned about the liberties of the subject and wants to do everything possible to see them protected. I

believe that every hon. member, honestly, is as much concerned as I on this matter. We have differences of opinion as to procedures taken in this House, but basically we are all concerned about the welfare of the people of this province and the protection of their legitimate interests—both the protection of their basic liberties and also the protection of them against criminals. We are all concerned about both of these things.

I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that what he, at the end of a very long time, is hoping to achieve can quite well be achieved simply by the acceptance of the motion of the hon. member for York South. The advantage of his motion, as I see it, stating boldly and simply that section 14 will be deleted by the committee, is that it is clearcut. There can be no doubt about it and any fears people may have will be allayed. But as the hon. member for St. George has pointed out, that would not preclude the committee from considering the general subject matter, from considering the purpose the government had in mind when it brought that section into the House or from considering the relevant sections of the report. It could do all of those things; and if necessary, it could make a report to this House as to its findings. Or alternatively, and I think this surely is the better procedure, the government itself can also consider that section and the objectives it had in mind and come in at a later date with new legislation which will avoid the features of section 14 to which we now object.

But I think it is very important at this stage that the people of Ontario should have a complete assurance that section 14 will not be proceeded with. The only way we can give them that assurance is by a clear and unequivocal statement that the committee has been instructed to delete section 14 and there is no possibility that they will bring it back. What further consideration they give is up to them when they meet. But at least let us make sure that everybody understands section 14 will not come back. If any attempt is made to legislate in this area—and I think some legislation is necessary with regard to the powers of the commission—then it will be new legislation; it will be considered *ab initio* and it will be introduced as an entirely new bill. This, as I see it, is the only possible solution. I think the motion of the hon. member for York South meets the problem that the hon. Prime Minister has in mind and I would appeal to him to accept it. We can thus dispose of this matter in a way, I think, which will provide assurance and satisfaction to the people of the province.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to say I have listened to the motion by the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald), and I would say I think the hon. Prime Minister is trying to get a reasonable solution to this. I think he feels the concern that is in the House reflects the concern, all across the province, about this section. As I listened to him, it seemed to me that his concern is that the section must have been drafted, by men who are close to the administration, for the protection of the citizens with respect to apprehending criminals. And he, it seems to me, if I could use this phrase which some of the rural hon. members know more than I do, puts, in a respect, the cart before the horse. I question the point of where the police commission—I am trying to get more direct on this—the police commission writes legislation for us and this legislation is presented by the hon. Attorney General. I question us saying to a police commission who writes a section, because I am assuming the police commission are the authors of this section—it seems to me always the police commission has to be the servant of the Legislature. This section, which they have written, should not be allowed to continue in the House but must go to be re-examined as proposed legislation. I think what we should do, in view of the abhorrence to the section, is to withdraw that section. On the other hand, I think we should meet the hon. Prime Minister's concern that the members of the police commission, which I understand drafted this section—and if the police commission did not, then whoever did draft it—were not legislators. The hon. Prime Minister is saying that he wants to hear the reasoning of those people who drafted it.

I would suggest, sir, that we, first of all, to allay the fears of this legislation, and to allay the fears of the people of Ontario, should say, "Withdraw the section before it goes to the committee". Then, sir, I think that in the committee, if we want to have a discussion with the people who have drafted this, why cannot we call them to hear their point of view—

Mr. Singer: Not just the people who made that recommendation, but other people.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, we would ask the people, for example, who made the recommendation "that section 39 was drawn and introduced as a result of the 11th recommendation contained in the report of the Ontario Police Commission and other recommendations". By all means let us hear from these people. Do not let us feel it is somewhat sacred to keep legislation here

until we have heard from them. Let us get rid of this.

I suggest we get rid of this section that is so abhorrent; right now, let us get rid of it. Tonight, let us get rid of it. I am sure we would all wish this. Then, sir, let us hear the other points of view; and if we feel we have to get stringent rules, then let us bring stringent rules into the committee and redraft some legislation. But at this point our plea, sir, is that we withdraw that section.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member want to speak to the amendment to the main motion?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, it is very evident we are stretching the rules of debate. I am aware of this, but perhaps in view of what we are attempting to do this is necessary.

I do not think the hon. member for Dovercourt quite understood what I was getting at. My point in sending the bill to committee in the first place is to ensure there is a discussion in that committee concerning the various sections of the bill—whether they are offensive or whether they are not, whether some think they are and some do not—regardless of what interpretation might be put on it. The other point in sending it to the committee is to ensure that the actual interpretation of the sections is looked at. Do they destroy the things it has been said they destroy? These things we do not know. What I am seeking, and I am quite prepared to consider a motion that would instruct the committee to delete this section of the bill, as long as I can be certain that the investigation, which is the reason for the bill going to the committee, is carried out.

Mr. MacDonald: Surely you—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I just do not want the bill to go into the committee with the statement that there are instructions to strike this section out and that is it.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you want our assurance that we will not oppose a discussion of the subject matter of this?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, as long as I can have that; as long as I can be certain that we are not taking this section out of the discussion. We may be removing it—

Mr. MacDonald: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Pardon?

Mr. MacDonald: We will give that assurance.

Mr. Oliver: As long as it is out of the bill, that is all we care about.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why I have the amendment here. The hon. member's amendment is: "and that the committee be instructed to delete section 14 of the said bill." In order to meet the point I am making, if we were to add to it: "and that the committee be instructed to delete section 14 of the bill after discussion," that would cover it completely.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I am not certain just how the hon. Prime Minister left this, after his recent speech. Does this mean that the hon. Prime Minister, if I could ask him a question, sir, through you, is ready to accept the amendment if the Opposition in this House will not oppose at the committee level some discussion of the merits and demerits of section 14? Is that what he means?

If that is what the hon. Prime Minister means, Mr. Speaker, I am dead certain that the group on this side of the House is quite willing to have a discussion. I think the hon. member who spoke before, the hon. member for St. George, put this thing very clearly when he said that there is every opportunity in the committee for this kind of discussion.

As a matter of fact, it cannot be prevented, because when that section comes for deletion, as it must come in the committee, then and there the thing is wide open for whatever discussion the committee may see fit. I plead with the hon. Prime Minister, and with this House, that the time is here for us to take this action to assure the people of Ontario that section 14 is out, that it will not be reported back to this House with the bill. I think this is the thing which is needed desperately, and this is the thing which will give people confidence in Ontario once more.

I simply feel that when the discussion comes we are all going to be willing to participate in that discussion. And if this motion can be accepted by this House, it solves the problem and does not force the kind of division which could shatter confidence throughout this province as well throughout this House.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the amendment to the main motion.

Moved by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Freeman that the motion be amended—

Were there any other members wishing to speak?

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, I did not see anyone.

Mr. Eagleson: Mr. Speaker, I am perhaps, personally, on the horns of a dilemma; and we have heard this expression thrown about tonight with reckless abandon.

I must say, in speaking to the amendment, that I am greatly surprised with the attitude of my hon. friends in the Liberal Party. Now let us just get one thing clear. There have been no interruptions tonight, and let us just keep it that way. This is a serious problem we have, now let us just listen to it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Eagleson: But the hon. members of the Liberal Party tonight have, on the basis of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York South, completely—I should not say completely—but partially compromised their position of this afternoon.

Mr. Oliver: Oh, go on!

Mr. Singer: Utter nonsense! This is worse than the first speech you made and that was bad enough.

Mr. Eagleson: When this was proposed at an earlier time, in the discussion we heard the hon. member for Downsview stood up and said he would support, without any doubt at all any amendment to remove this section.

Mr. Singer: That is right.

Mr. Eagleson: Since that time, there have been definite scurrings among the Liberal ranks to form ranks around him, and around that thought. I say this, as a member of the labour, legal and municipal bills committee, that I would sincerely trust there will be full discussion given to section 14, and that I personally would support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York South.

Mr. Singer: That is a wonderful process of reasoning.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I want the members to be given a proper hearing.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, may I add a few words to what the hon. member for Lakeshore has just said?

On behalf of the Liberal Party, I wish to say that the jewel of consistency has never shone as brightly as it has shone today. I do not know how the rest of the hon. members

of this party feel, but I am certain that they feel with me that when we came in today we knew what we were going to do—we were going to stop this bill no matter what. This is what we are trying to do now. Although I value the hon. member for Lakeshore as a personal friend of mine, I must differ with him here tonight. I must say that we are all together in this—it matters not whether it comes from the side of the new party or from this party—if we stop this thing tonight we have done what we started to do today. I am satisfied.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can be forgiven for taking a little time to consider these matters, but I am prepared to accept the amendment made by the hon. member for York South. I think that I should say that I do so with the thought in my own mind, and with the assurance that has been given to me, that this section will be debated and discussed and the other sections of the bill, of course, will go to the committee and be dealt with in the same way as they would have been under the main motion that is before us today.

Mr. Speaker: Moved by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Freeman, that the motion be amended by adding thereto

and that the committee be instructed to delete section 14 of the said bill.

As many as are in favour of the amendment will please say "aye". As many as are opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

The motion was carried on the following unanimous vote:

YEAS

Allan	Lewis
Apps	(Scarborough West)
Auld	Lewis
Bales	(Humber)
Beckett	MacDonald
Boyer	Mackenzie
Braithwaite	MacNaughton
Brown	Morningstar
Brunelle	McNeil
Bryden	Newman
Bukator	Nixon
Butler	Noden
Carruthers	Olde
Carton	Oliver
Cecile	Paterson
Connell	Peck
Cowling	Pittock
Davis	Price

YEAS

Davison	Pritchard
Demers	Racine
Downer	Randall
Dunlop	Reaume
Dymond	Reilly
Eagleson	Reuter
Edwards	Robarts
Evans	Roberts
Ewen	Rollins
Farquhar	Root
Freeman	Rowe
Gaunt	Sargent
Gisborn	Sandercock
Gould	Simonett
Grossman	Singer
Guindon	Spence
Hamilton	Spooner
Harris	Stewart
Haskett	Taylor
Henderson	Thompson
Hodgson	Trotter
(Scarborough East)	Villeneuve
Hodgson	Walker
(Victoria)	Wardrope
Johnston	Welch
(Parry Sound)	Wells
Johnston	Whicher
(Carleton)	White
Kerr	Whitney
Knox	Wishart
Lawrence	Worton
(St. George)	Yakabuski
Letherby	Yaremko
	Young—96.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 96, the "nays", none.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now bring the main motion as amended; do the hon. members want to accept with the same vote—the main motion as amended? If so, I will not necessarily have to read it. If the hon. members are in favour I shall declare it carried.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Whicher: Any more bills like that one?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day: This is the first opportunity I have had—I have been staying in this House today—and I would like to read a letter addressed to me:

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER:

I have been greatly privileged to serve under you as Prime Minister, as well as in the Cabinet of your predecessor, the Honourable Leslie M. Frost.

The warm association I have had with you and my other colleagues in the executive council have been most rewarding and pleasant. I have thoroughly enjoyed the challenge of the onerous duties involved in the administration of the various departments over which I have been appointed to preside as Minister.

I come from the Ottawa Valley and sit in the Legislature as member for Grenville-Dundas. In the past, this historic riding has been represented by two former Prime Ministers—the Honourable Sir James Pliny Whitney and the Honourable G. Howard Ferguson. They were honourable men and political warriors of the highest order and not unaccustomed to the hurly-burly of the political arena, its hazards and its high traditions. I was raised in that tradition and therefore have always had a realistic approach to the fact that while today the weather may be calm, tomorrow may bring a hurricane.

Believing as I do in the British and Canadian parliamentary system, embracing the responsibility of Ministers of the Crown, I acknowledge my responsibility as Attorney General with respect to recently introduced amendments to The Police Act contained in Bill No. 99. It is the opinion of the law officers that such legislation does not in any way interfere with the existing rights of the citizen to have counsel or to have access to any other constitutional remedies of our courts.

In answer to certain questions put to me by the press with respect to Bill No. 99, I felt constrained to stress the urgent nature of the whole problem and in my capacity as Attorney General I could do no less. The price of our freedom from the invisible tyranny of syndicated crime is

the continuance of the vigilance which has thus far protected us from these infamous agencies.

In making those comments, I have unintentionally touched upon the sensibilities of our people. In doing this, however, I was answering the dictates of my own conscience. I can assure you, sir, that during the period that I have had the honour to be a member of Ontario's Executive Council, all my loyalties and efforts have been devoted to the very best interests of the people of Ontario. Indeed, throughout my whole career, I have persevered to ensure that the principles of justice and liberty which we all hold dear shall never be the less because of my own, or any other man's action.

Having in complete innocence aroused the concern of the people about these same principles, I do not feel that I wish to continue in this office.

I, therefore, tender you my resignation as Attorney General and member of the executive council.

(Signed)

Fred M. Cass.

Mr. Speaker, with regret and reluctance I have accepted this resignation.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.45 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 24, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Fourth report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans	1919
Third report, standing committee on standing orders and printing, Mr. Edwards	1919
Extending sympathy on death of Mr. Maurice Belanger, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Oliver, Mr. MacDonald	1919
Statement re joint studies on automation and social change, Mr. Robarts	1920
Supplementary estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis	1922
Supplementary estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond	1926
Supplementary estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts	1931
Supplementary estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan	1931
Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, continued	1931
Recess, 6 o'clock	1954

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1964

The House met at 2.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome visitors to the Legislature; in the east gallery students from the Sudbury High School and Barton High School in Hamilton; in the west gallery students from Brantford Collegiate Institute and Vocational School and Deer Park Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's fourth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 45, An Act to repeal The Investigation of Titles Act;

Bill No. 46, An Act to repeal The Custody of Documents Act;

Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act;

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Securities Act;

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Registry Act;

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth), from the standing committee on standing orders and printing, presented the committee's third and final report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the customary supplies allowance for the current session of the assembly be fixed at the sum of \$50.

Your committee recommends that copies of the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*, the

Canadian Almanac and *Canada Year Book* be purchased for distribution to the members of the assembly and also that each member be given a year's subscription to the *Labour Gazette* and the *Municipal World*.

Your committee recommends that the following sessional papers be printed for departmental use and distribution:

Accounts, public, 1,650; agricultural college and experimental farm, report, 1,375; Agriculture, Department of, Minister's report, 2,175; agriculture, statistics branch, report, 6,675; auditor's report, 525; civil service commissioner, report, 675; Education, Department of, report, 2,875; estimates, 1,400; Highways, Department of, report, 775; Labour, Department of, report, 1,375; legal offices, report of inspector, 575; liquor control board, report, 675; Niagara Parks Commission, report, 400; Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, report, 450; police, provincial, report of commissioner, 675; Public Welfare, Department of, report, 1,375; Public Works, Department of, report, 450; Reform Institutions, Department of, report, part one, 1,420; part two, 1,420; Transport, Minister's report, 775; Travel and Publicity, Department of, report, 2,175; Veterinary College, Ontario, report, 2,175; Workmen's Compensation Board, report, 2,175.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the provincial auditor be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1964, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): **Mr. Speaker**, there are several matters to come before the orders of the day. Perhaps first I would refer to the passing of our colleague, the member for Windsor-Sandwich, Maurice Belanger. He died earlier today.

Mr. Belanger entered this House in 1959 in the general election then and was re-elected in 1963.

While he and I sat on opposite sides of the House, we were always close friends. I found him in the various functions in the life of of this Legislature to be very good company indeed. I would also like to comment on the service he rendered in the House to his constituents from Windsor-Sandwich. He was unremitting in his attention to the detail of that riding and to the needs of the people he represented, and I know that he will be missed by them.

I would express on behalf of myself personally, and indeed the entire Legislature, our regret and our sympathy to his immediate family.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would join with the hon. Prime Minister in saying that we on this side of the House grieve very much today in the passing of Maurice Belanger, the member for Windsor-Sandwich.

Mr. Belanger was a dedicated public servant if ever there was one. He was a man, as the hon. Prime Minister said, who paid particular attention to detail. He was loyal to his colleagues in the House, ever willing to share whatever responsibility there was put on his shoulders. He was a good debater in the House, he was particularly acquainted with the needs of his constituents and unrelenting in seeking ways to help them.

I may just say this in passing, Mr. Speaker, that this morning in talking to one of his colleagues, he told me that when he went to see him just a day or so before his death that at least 25 letters were on his desk written in longhand about the matters affecting his constituency to departments of government here in Toronto. The riding of Windsor-Sandwich was well served by our hon. friend. We on this side of the House have lost a real and a loyal friend and an hon. colleague who will be hard indeed to replace.

We extend to members of his family our sincere and heartfelt sympathy in this bereavement that affects us very deeply.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, this House has sometimes been referred to as the most exclusive club in the province. I think that is certainly true to the extent that we develop ties of friendship with fellow members, no matter what party they come from, and when one dies suddenly, as has been the case in this instance, the news comes with a sense of personal shock and loss to every one of us. I cannot add to the

personal tributes that the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition have made, but I certainly would like to join with them in expressing our sense of loss and in extending to his family our condolences on their bereavement.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, the hon. members here may recall that in the concluding statement in the conference on automation and social change which was sponsored by this government last September, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) expressed our hope that in the extensive research and study to be undertaken in this field—and we have had some debates on this subject here already in this session—the hon. Minister of Labour expressed our hope that we might be joined by the federal government and by the governments of the other provinces in order that we could attack this problem on a national basis. This is a field in which cause and effect are national, in fact they are more than national they are international, and many of the warning signals that we may have to watch for in our jurisdiction will come from larger and more highly industrialized jurisdictions than our own.

I am happy to inform the House today that as a result of some negotiations which were initiated by the Economic Council of Ontario, the Economic Council of Canada, the Quebec Economic Advisory Council and the Nova Scotia Voluntary Planning Board have agreed over the next several years to join with us in an arrangement under which there will be a sharing of the responsibilities for and the costs of the necessary research studies that we see ahead. I would say this, Mr. Speaker, the door we attempted to open last fall will remain open, and we would hope that we will, as time progresses, have further participation by other provinces.

In the light of the acknowledgment that we have of the co-operative concern in an area in which we, through our economic council here, gave leadership, I have asked our economic council to give consideration to the report of the steering committee which was headed by Dr. Arthur Porter. Hon. members will recall that I mentioned the report of this committee during a debate on this subject some time earlier in the session.

Full agreement with the provincial-federal approach has been voiced by Dr. Porter and his colleagues who comprise that steering committee.

The specific nature of the field studies, which will be undertaken on a joint basis, will be determined by agreement between the economic councils who are participating in

this endeavour. We hope that they will survey not only representative segments of industry and commerce, but will concern themselves also with programmes by public and private agencies which are seeking to facilitate adjustment, by individuals and communities, to the dislocation arising from automation and technological development.

Because of the federal participation, it will be necessary for us to resume our studies as to how this might best be put on a long-term basis. However, we have set aside funds for the research and the educational activity involved and if, at the conclusion of these federal-provincial studies, it appears necessary that some semi-autonomous national or provincial foundation on automation, social change and employment should be established, then this government will be prepared, in co-operation and concert with industry, organized labour, commerce and finance, to accord financial support to it.

However, in the interval, the federal and the provincial governments will join their facilities and their funds to undertake, without any other financial support from either labour or business, the preliminary research which is required.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to address to the hon. Minister of Mines.

Is the hon. Minister in a position to indicate when the commencement of pelletizing operations by Steep Rock might offer some prospect of alleviating the chronic unemployment of the Atikokan area?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I want to give my thanks to the hon. member for Fort William for giving me advance notice of his question.

Commencement of pelletizing operations for alternative processing for further upgrading of Steep Rock ore will depend upon the results of pilot plant investigations. These decisions have been proceeding for the past three years, and are continuing. Results to date are very encouraging.

Concurrently, market reviews are being made to determine the domestic requirements of the steel industry, with special emphasis being placed on product type and volume. Meanwhile the Caland Ore Company is commencing construction on a pelletizing plant scheduled to enter production late next year.

There is some chronic unemployment in every community in Canada but the per capita unemployment in Atikokan at the present time is 2.4 per cent of the male

population, while in Fort William it is 4.5 per cent. There will be 300 more men taken on shortly to handle the special construction at the pelletizing plant for Caland Ore Company in Atikokan, and these men will be employed for the next two years. There is not enough labour in Atikokan at present to take care of this construction, so many more men will have to be hired and brought in. Caland Ore is trying to rent 100 houses, in Atikokan, which belong to Steep Rock Iron, for these men who will be taken on for Caland's pelletizing project; but these houses are now occupied so more houses will have to be built in the town of Atikokan.

This is the situation at present in Atikokan.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

When might the Legislature expect a statement from the hon. Minister on the Metropolitan Toronto hospital bed shortage?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped and anticipated that an answer would have been made before this House before we rose for the Easter recess. However, the hon. member and you, sir, will recall that when I answered his previous question ten days ago, I stated then that a complete answer could not be given until certain discussions and negotiations, then underway, had been completed. These are still not complete, sir; they are being carried on at all levels of government. They involve hospital authorities, nursing authorities, and all others interested in this difficult and complicated question.

In addition to this, sir, the Dominion-provincial conference scheduled for a week from today has, I understand, cost-sharing programmes on the agenda as one of the main topics. Hospital financing is very much involved in this, and until these discussions have been completed, sir, or at least brought to the point where we can see our way through this programme, I do not believe it would be wise or even satisfactory to put our answer before this House.

I can assure the hon. member, sir, that certain measures for immediate relief have already been put in hand and will be operative, I expect, within a very short time indeed; by that I mean within a matter of weeks. Well-founded plans have been laid—and these have been again very carefully scanned and considered—and are believed to be sound, and capable of meeting the whole problem. It has been so considered, by those

whom I believe are skilled to know of what they speak, that these plans which are now before us, awaiting the outcome of the discussions I have mentioned, will completely meet the need. All of this I would hope, sir, will be laid before the hon. member before this session ends.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I hear the question first?

Mr. S. Lewis: Respecting his position of the long-term proposals, would the hon. Minister inform the House as to what precisely are the certain measures he indicated to alleviate the immediate need?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe, Mr. Speaker, it will be in the public interest, and in the interests of this House, if this whole matter is laid in one piece before the hon. member.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, since the hon. Minister has said he will hear questions first, will the hon. Minister inform the House whether the use of veterans hospitals—we have several in Ontario—will be discussed at that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, I did not hear it.

Mr. Troy: The use of veterans hospitals by the provincial government — will the hon. Minister discuss those at his meeting in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the use of veterans hospitals has been a subject of discussion between this department and The Department of Veterans' Affairs over the last four years, to my knowledge.

Mr. Troy: I know they have; but will the hon. Minister say something definite?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, one of the responsibilities of the Minister of Labour is to report to the Legislature on behalf of the Ontario Human Rights Commission and it is in that connection that I wish to make a statement before the orders of the day.

An historic agreement has been reached here, this morning, between the Ontario Human Rights Commission and the Association of Professional Placement Agencies and Consultants; representing some 15 private employment agencies in this province. This agreement has been formulated into a de-

claration in which the association and its members pledge their co-operation to the advancement of full and equal employment opportunities for all qualified workers, irrespective of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin.

This agreement, Mr. Speaker, is more than just a statement of general principle and philosophy; it includes tangible evidences of good faith.

I would like to commend the association and its member agencies for the moral leadership they have displayed in this field. Their pledge will serve to dispel any doubts or fears which individuals or organizations in this province may have had regarding their practices.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 48th order, the House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask if we could deal with the supplementary estimates now. It has been brought to my attention that these should be dealt with before the end of the current fiscal year. They are few in number, and are in the estimate book.

Mr. Chairman: Supplementary estimates of ordinary expenditure of the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1964.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

On vote 518:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, no doubt there will be some additional information about both of these votes from the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) but I would like to make a comment on item 2 having to do with the new universities' library project, which approaches \$500,000. In connection with this, one of the most serious condemnations of the ordering of our universities' development in the past few years has been that the library facilities at this level have not been adequate, if we are going to maintain our universities at the level that we hope to in this province and in this country.

Although the figures are not at hand I understand that an objective assessment not only of the books available but the whole library service at the university level in Ontario, would classify our best library as about

fourteenth among the university libraries in North America. Certainly this is not good enough and my very serious question to the hon. Minister is: What are the long-range projects that are going to be undertaken by his department to bring the library facilities at the university level up to a reasonable standard, and is he sure that the amount voted here is sufficient?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that we will get into matters of university grants problems in a more detailed way during the estimates of the department. In dealing with the second item today—the grant to the new universities' library project—I should explain to hon. members that this is a co-operative project organized through the university advisory committee with The Department of Education.

This project involves the new university at Brock, Trent, the two new off-campus colleges at Erindale and Scarborough, and the new campus here at the University of Toronto. These new institutions have combined to purchase and catalogue books co-operatively for the establishment of new libraries and also to add to the existing library here at the main campus of the University of Toronto. This amount is the first amount to be expended and I am speaking now from memory, but I believe that the total expenditure to build the basic library—and this refers to the basic library only—is somewhere in the neighbourhood—and I will have this during my estimates—of \$1.5 million. It represents, by doing it in this way, a saving of close to \$1 million to the public of the province. The great saving is realized through the central cataloguing. In other words, all the cataloguing will be done at the main campus here at the University of Toronto and then distributed; and all the purchasing will be done through one agency.

The hon. member's general observation as to the status of libraries at the universities in this province is perhaps one that we might discuss in a general way in the estimates of the department. I would make this observation that the departments or the government through its grants, have not dictated the type of library that the universities have been establishing. I think this is one principle that we must accept and make it very clear that we accept, that we are not interfering with the academic development of any of these institutions. I will question the observation of my hon. friend, the member for Brant in that he suggests that our best library at the University of Toronto would rank per-

haps fourteenth. I do not think that this is quite an accurate statement, but I shall become more specific during the estimates.

I think it is very necessary for us to be careful not to infringe on the academic development of these institutions and I assure the hon. members that this whole question of universities and the amount of monies they have available to them will be discussed, I assume, very thoroughly in this House. But this is a separate project apart from any other government grants in order to establish these four new libraries and to add to the existing library here at the University of Toronto.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that even the most sensitive university authorities would consider the provision of adequate funds an unnecessary infringement on their authority, and I hope that the hon. Minister is not under this impression.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not suggesting that, Mr. Chairman. I question whether the amount of monies available to some of the universities to build up the library has been a detriment to the type of library they maintain and I think you will find that many of the libraries at the universities in this province are reasonably adequate. But they themselves select. It is not just the number of books that constitutes a good library, the selection of the books is left definitely in the hands of the universities themselves.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. Minister, particularly insofar as these funds are going to be devoted, as I gather, only to purchasing books and cataloguing. I wonder if the hon. Minister noted a press release given by the chief parliamentary librarian for the House of Commons just a few days ago, when he indicated that he thought there was a real crisis existing in the library field insofar as finding available trained librarians is concerned. This is a point that has been made frequently by many of us on this side of the House during the estimates of The Department of Education, but I think it is particularly pertinent since the hon. Minister is embarking on a library project. Somewhere along the line there has to be far, far greater consideration given to the training and availability of librarians.

I have forgotten the figures that were quoted by the parliamentary librarian from the House of Commons but they were shocking, dealing with the number of students presently going through the various library courses, and so on. His prognostication

was that it was not reasonable to anticipate that there was going to be any reasonable number of librarians available anywhere to serve properly the existing libraries and these would include university libraries.

One of the things that is common through so many of these fields, one of the things that I think deters young people who might have an interest in this field from progressing further in their education and taking a university degree and then a postgraduate degree—I have forgotten what the name of the degree is, but a postgraduate degree showing that they are qualified librarians—is the lack of pay at the end of the course of study. There is no point in having buildings and books unless you have people who know how to run those buildings and what books to buy and so on. I think that this government has a real duty and responsibility to do everything in its power to produce more librarians to serve the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think once again, the more appropriate place to debate this would be, say, in the vote for library grants during the regular estimates of The Department of Education. I have observed Mr. Spicer's remarks on the number of librarians available. I notice also, they applied on a Dominion-wide basis rather than just to the province of Ontario—

Mr. Singer: It is not any better in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I think perhaps I can indicate to the hon. member that certainly we are no worse here and that we are better than certain other provincial jurisdictions. I would also observe to you that there is a great demand for librarians, not just in the public libraries and at universities. Librarians are needed in secondary schools now with the greater interest, fortunately, in the development of libraries in that field. In this area they receive very adequate compensation, I think.

Mr. Singer: Yes, if they are teachers, they are paid as teachers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I might also add, in case the hon. members opposite are interested in item No. 1, just a short explanation. This feasibility study is once again a recommendation from the university affairs committee and it corresponds to the present programme in operation at Waterloo where there is a joint programme between industry and the university itself. Waterloo is going to study the feasibility of extending this into the social sciences and not to just, say, the

applied engineering field. The university affairs committee and the government thought that the programme had met with such great success in the engineering faculty at Waterloo that it was worthwhile expending this sum of money to see whether this might apply to the social sciences as well.

Perhaps we had better clear this first vote and then I will have this word on superannuation.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Just on that last point with which the hon. Minister has been dealing. Has there been any extension of the co-operative approach to other universities? Is one of the purposes of the study to view the pioneering of this extension into other universities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, while there is no agreement by the other universities as to the merits of the development at Waterloo, I think it is obvious that if this experiment turns out to be successful the other universities would very obviously take note of this and see whether it might apply to their own situations. It may be that this type of training would apply only to engineering; maybe it cannot be done in, say, business or the other studies which might be available, but certainly the other universities will have full knowledge of the results of the experiment at Waterloo.

This is not the same type of situation which I expect we will debate during the university estimates as far as the tri-semester system is concerned. This is something apart altogether from that again, which I think is a matter which should be discussed here in this House.

Vote 518 agreed to.

On vote 519:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): I know that this government, Mr. Chairman, acts precipitously at times—we had a crowning example of that in the last few days—but I must say they are certainly dragging their feet in regard to a brief that was presented some time ago by the teachers' federation concerning a superannuation fund; and we were assured by the hon. Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts), who at that time was also acting Minister of Education, that there would be some answer.

For years now we have been asking that the number of years be reduced. In the civil service; in many other groups it is down to three years. I am just wondering, in the time between now and the full estimates of

the hon. Minister, that perhaps this might be thought over and, in the intervening weeks, a report prepared.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, the question of the teachers' superannuation fund, I think once again, might properly be debated during the regular estimates; or I may have an amendment to The Teachers' Superannuation Act which perhaps we could debate at that time. As for the superannuated women teachers about whom the Legislature has been concerned—and I recall the education committee meeting last year where certain recommendations were made—I could point out to the hon. members opposite that last Wednesday we had arranged, through the good offices of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), to have this group present their brief and state the facts to the committee studying pensions. This Wednesday we will have what we refer to as the retroactive widows—they are two separate groups as you will recall—who will be making similar presentation to the pensions committee.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wonder—we see this estimate of \$1 million to be added to the teachers' superannuation fund year after year; and year after year after year, we see the report of the provincial auditor saying that the fund is actuarially unsound, and is getting more unsound as the years go by. Is anything going to be done? Is this a cause of concern to the government? Is anything going to be done to either make it actuarially sound—or perhaps, if it is felt it does not have to be made actuarially sound, then to advise the provincial auditor that, really, it is not worth reporting upon? Because the situation is not being changed; \$1 million is being put in and, according to the figures of the auditor, the situation gets worse year after year. Let us either do it one way or the other—put up or shut up. Is it worth while making this actuarially sound? Is it government policy to do so? If it is not, then what is the point of putting in \$1 million? Is that much needed, or more?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I had really anticipated we might get into this in some detail during my estimates. If I recall correctly, the hon. member for Brant made some observations on the teachers' superannuation fund some three or four weeks ago, sir. I made a particular note at the time and I think, if I recall his words correctly, he indicated that it was probable and likely that the fund could or should be made actuarially sound.

I do not think this is what he was suggesting. I do not think that the teachers' federation expects that it will be made actuarially sound. I think what they suggest, and I think without any question they have logic on their side, is that certain alterations be made to the fund with increased monies paid into it; and I expect I shall have something, in greater detail, to suggest to the House during my estimates, or when the bill to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act is presented to the House.

I think that we have to realize that the provincial auditor, when he suggested the fund is not actuarially sound, is not suggesting that the fund is in danger of becoming bankrupt tomorrow. I think the hon. member for Brant touched on this subject—I believe it was in the Throne Debate—and I do not think anyone expects it to be made, in words or in strict interpretation, actuarially sound. I do not think they expect this to take place.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is really good enough. I know the hon. Minister is going to bring in his estimates. I know, in the course of them, that he is going to be dealing with teachers' superannuation funds. We have made this point over a great number of years, but I think at this time we deserve a proper answer. The other estimate, 518—I can understand some good reason why it should be more fully discussed, the items shown there under his estimates. But this has been a recurring item.

These votes, these supplementary estimates, traditionally I have always understood, were something extra and unexpected, something that was not anticipated. But over the years we always see a supplementary estimate of \$1 million for the teachers' superannuation fund; it is in every year. And if there is nothing else in the supplementary estimates, there is always this additional \$1 million. Every year the auditor says the fund is not actuarially sound; and, as I say, it is getting less actuarially sound as the years go on.

We have suggested in the past that there should be a statement of government policy as to how far it is going to go to make it actuarially sound; or a positive statement of policy that it does not believe this is necessary. We have suggested again, Mr. Chairman, that this \$1 million should be put in the regular estimates of the department, and not continue as a supplementary. It is nothing new. The purpose of supplementary estimates, is for some programme which is new and unexpected. But year after year after year, this same thing goes on, and the auditor writes the same sort of report—only he makes it more

forceful if possible. And year after year after year, we do not get an explanation. We want some leadership from the government, and this is one spot in which it could come.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. member that I shall make a rather full statement on the teachers' superannuation fund either when the bill to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act is presented, or during my estimates.

Vote 519 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

On vote 715:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): I would say that for our part, sir, we are in somewhat of a dilemma in that, first of all, when I first came into this House and for a long period, there was no question in my mind that the most outstanding Minister in the whole of that group—with regard to the fight he would give—was the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). I looked on him with a great deal of personal respect and admiration, for a number of the progressive legislations he was putting through.

For a long time, sir, I thought it was the Scrooge of the department who was holding back a great deal of this progressive legislation. I must say, that apart from my own personal feelings towards the hon. Minister as a person, I would say again—I want to distinguish this—that, as the Minister of Health, he is a different kettle of fish.

As the Minister of Health, sir, for whose department we are being asked to pass a supplementary amount of money, a large amount, for hospitals, I say we are on the horns of a dilemma. We realize that finances are needed to build the hospitals but our question is: With the lethargy there is with respect to this crisis of hospital beds, we wonder whether, in passing this, we have the right Minister of Health to see that aggressive, vigorous action will be taken.

I listened, for example, to the question this afternoon. We are told that the hon. Minister is meeting with various groups and is going to try to come up with a solution to the over-2,000 bed shortage in Metropolitan Toronto. I listened to a supplementary question from the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy), in which he asked about veterans hospitals; and the point that I raise on this is that the hon. Minister said he has been discussing, for four years, the question of the role of veterans hospitals.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with these estimates.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Provincial Treasurer asking on a point of order?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): This is on the vote.

Mr. Thompson: I am talking on the question of passing estimates on the building of hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There is nothing in here for building hospitals.

Mr. Thompson: Well, what about special grants to public hospitals?

Mr. Singer: The \$3,555 million. Is that nothing?

Mr. Thompson: That is what I mean, hospitals and the funds attached to them. This is a question of concern to everyone in this area.

We have looked at the situation of the lack of hospitals, we have looked at the answers given previously by the hon. Minister of Health. It was not myself who raised the question of whether he is hoodwinking or whether he is being hoodwinked, it was Dr. Morley, who I understand writes a very authentic journal, the *Journal of the Canadian Medical Association*—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the vote in these supplementary estimates is for grants toward debts and a bed grant for hospitals.

Mr. Singer: If you do not get bed grants you cannot build the hospitals.

Mr. Thompson: We have had the dismissal of the shortage of nurses, we have had the dismissal of the shortage of hospital beds and now they are trying to dismiss the very basis of building hospitals—finances.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose the hon. member would believe me if I told him that we are looking after matters pertaining to health. I could give him a very logical and very sound, authentic answer to many of the questions.

You see the whole trouble, Mr. Chairman, is that their mouths are going so fast that their brains cannot absorb what is falling on their deaf ears. If they would look up the

speech centre and open up the hearing centre of their brains they might get somewhere. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, what the purpose of these grants—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, I would rather be a wolf than a yapping cur.

Mr. Chairman, may I explain to the hon. members what this grant is for?

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Is this on a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, I did not ask on a point of order, I asked that I might be given the opportunity to explain to the House what this grant is for.

Mr. Thompson: Is it a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Since this grant affects my department, I think I should have the right to tell what it is for. I do not like the statements made by the hon. member through lack of knowledge.

Mr. Thompson: I will concede after I am through, sir.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I rise on a point of order. My point of order is that this matter has nothing to do with the building of hospitals whatsoever.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask if special grants for public hospitals under the authority of The Public Hospitals Act and the regulations thereto, have anything to do with beds or the building of hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member sits down I will be glad to give him clarification.

Mr. Thompson: I am asking you, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister will answer it but I am not asking the hon. Minister, I am asking you, sir, am I out of order to talk about the building of hospitals?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. We have to have an explanation of this first.

Mr. Thompson: From whom, sir?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister.

Mr. Thompson: Why do we have to have it from the hon. Minister?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: We do not know what we are talking about until we get an explanation from the Minister.

Mr. Thompson: Are you demanding I sit down, sir?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked if this had to do with building hospitals. It has not. After the Ontario hospital services insurance plan came into operation the government from year to year has given a special grant for capital purposes. This grant is computed on a per bed basis and is equal to \$75 per active bed for every hospital operating in the province of Ontario.

The purposes for which this money may be used include repairs that are not approved under other grants, the wiping off of capital debt, the payment of interest and the payment of other things which are not approved under the cost-sharing agreement.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanation by the hon. Minister because it gives me all the greater foundation to discuss what I was discussing. I will also try to discuss it in a vein that is not personal. I hope that will be reciprocated on the part of the hon. Minister.

I am saying, sir, for example, that this is a grant towards hospitals beds and I am suggesting that if we have to pass on the basis of—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this is not a grant towards hospital beds. The grant is computed on the basis of the number of beds that the hospital has in operation, but it is not a grant for beds.

Mr. Thompson: Then, sir, I am talking about the number of beds that a hospital has in operation and I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that the number of beds that are in operation have been presented to us by the hon. Minister in such an oblique manner, in such a vague manner, that we are told at one point that there is a surplus of hospital beds. This is denied by Dr. Morley, who is the editor of certainly a well-established paper. It is denied by doctors across this province. Everywhere they are asking: "Will there be a statement from the Minister about how he is going to tackle this problem?"

We have him stand up today and heap personal abuse on us and say that he could give an answer in a logical fashion about the shortage of beds, but then with a kind of a small child attitude he sits down and does not give us a logical solution.

One of our problems on this, sir—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

An hon. member: When an hon. member is telling the truth why do you want order?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has explained item two of vote 715 and what the hon. member is speaking on at the present time has no relation to it.

Mr. Thompson: I am very sorry. If I could correct you, and I hope you will accept this with the proper deference with which I submit it to you, the hon. Minister mentioned the number of hospital beds, that this relates to the number of hospital beds. I am talking about the number of hospital beds, and surely I am permitted to continue talking.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, sir, I shall not attempt to put it any more simply. The only reason that the number of beds comes into this at all is to give us a yardstick by which to measure the grant. The matter that the hon. member is speaking about has reference to capital construction grants which were discussed under the estimates of The Department of Health. It has no relationship to this supplementary grant in any way, shape or form.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What are these grants for, Mr. Chairman, could that be explained to us? It might help.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They may be used for the payment of capital debts, the payment of interest on capital debt, the payment of certain other capital costs of operation which do not come in for any other cost sharing—building costs, interest on capital debt are not approved under the Dominion-provincial agreement for cost sharing—and then these grants can also be used for other costs that do not qualify for grant purposes.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this, I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he is paying off the capital debt. The purpose of paying off the capital debt is in order that you can build more hospitals—I would hope, indeed, that is the desire of the hon. Minister in trying to pay off the capital debt!

I would also say, sir, with respect to the number of beds the hon. Minister said the

reason he mentioned the number of beds was so he could have a yardstick in order to measure the amount to be given. I would ask, sir, how do we arrive at this yardstick when we have had the hon. Minister stand up and tell us there was a surplus of beds, when in fact we find that in this area there is over a 2,000 bed shortage of active treatment beds?

I cannot think why I am not allowed to continue and in this vein, because this is of extreme pertinence to the whole question of building hospitals and giving adequate health services to the people of Ontario. Surely that is the principle behind the whole of your wish, to get more funds.

I would say, sir, on this, if the hon. Minister would talk to his hon. friend and colleague to the left of him in connection with capital debt, he might get some very sound ideas from him. I do not know if you have read the speech that the gentleman to the left of you, the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop), made, but I know that the *Toronto Telegram* has seen fit to have a full page devoted to that speech. Why, sir, I ask, do we have this kind of crisis developing—

Mr. Chairman: Order. I feel that you are speaking on another subject, not related to item two—special grants to hospitals under the authority of The Public Hospitals Act and the regulations thereunder. It should have been discussed under The Department of Health capital construction.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I would ask, sir, with all deference to you: We are passing an amount of money in order to reduce the capital debt. If the capital debt on public hospitals—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has explained this to you very carefully and I feel we should all understand it by now.

Mr. Thompson: What did he say, sir—the reason that I am not talking in connection with the estimates? Could you give me a ruling on why I am not talking on the estimates?

Mr. Chairman: As the Chairman, my understanding is that \$75 per bed—the only use of the grant is based on the number of beds in arriving at this grant of \$75 per bed. The hospitals themselves have the right to spend this \$75 in certain directions within their organization, whether it is repairs or whatever it might be. It has nothing to do with the building of further beds for hospitals.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, in view of your suggestion that it should be \$75 in order to keep on the basis of this, I would suggest it should be \$100, and in order to substantiate why I am suggesting this, I will say sir, that we are aware that there is a drastic shortage of active treatment beds, in fact not only in Toronto but around the province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Does the member want to discuss further this item?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The estimates before you here cover a certain amount of money. I think that we have to vote for that amount of money. We have no right to enlarge it or increase it. Therefore I would ask you to vote on the amount shown.

Mr. Thompson: Well sir, I will abide by your ruling but I do so with grave misgivings.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister how it came about that it was not possible to anticipate at the beginning of the year that this sum of 3.5 million dollars approximately, would be required. Now I assume—I have not checked back on last year's estimates—but I assume there was a sum of money appropriated for this purpose. Apparently it was found to be insufficient by a quite considerable amount and I would like an explanation of the reason for the discrepancy in the estimate and what is now found to be required.

It would seem to me on the face of it, that this is the kind of item where one ought to be able to anticipate quite accurately. Apparently that has not been the case, so I would like to hear the hon. Minister's explanation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is in error in believing that we fell short of the anticipated total by this amount. The hon. member will recall ever since he came into the House there has been this item in supplementary estimates. It is placed here each year because we hope that the time will come when it will no longer be necessary and strangely enough, we can already foresee the time when this grant will no longer be necessary because the finances of hospitals are reaching that stage of competence, shall I say, that they will not need this special grant. This special grant has appeared in supplementary estimates in this House for many years. It used to be—

Mr. Bryden: There is no corresponding item in the regular estimates?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, there is not. It used to be \$250 per bed and then with the inception of the plan it was reduced to \$75 per bed because at that time, prior to the plan, hospitals were allowed to use this in some measure to wipe off accumulated debts. They do not face those accumulated debts now in the same measure that they did prior to the inception of the plan and this is why it was reduced to \$75 per bed. May I repeat that we can already foresee the time when it may well be possible to wipe this grant out completely.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like now to inquire about item No. 1, a grant of \$150,000 to the Ontario Heart Foundation. Why was it not possible to anticipate that expenditure at the beginning of the fiscal year when the regular estimates for the year were before us?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is not an expenditure in the sense that the department spends it. This is a grant to the Ontario Heart Foundation—

Mr. Bryden: Did you not have many grants in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, we have and I cannot frankly tell you why this one always finds its place in the supplementary estimates. Maybe this is where all grants should go because I am a firm believer in the principle of putting grants on an annual basis so that they may be reviewed every year. We do this with the heart foundation. They submit their statements to us and we do review it each year, but for some reason, which I frankly cannot explain, it finds its place on the supplementary estimates each year. This is an outright grant to be used for heart research.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I must confess to an ignorance that has now been dispelled. Now that it has been dispelled, I have a considerable concern to think there is \$4 million of expenditures—I would take it that the same answer the hon. Minister has given me on two of these items will probably apply to all of them—so that we have a matter of over \$4 million involved which is not voted in advance or passed on in advance by this Legislature. I do not go along with the suggestion the hon. Minister threw out that all grants should come in by way of supplementary estimates. In that way the hon. Minister

or the government would have a completely free hand during the course of the year to hand out money without any authorization from the Legislature at all and an authorization that only comes retroactively. I think retroactive authorization is a bad principle at the best of times. It is sometimes unavoidable, but—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I must stand on a point of order. This is a misapprehension. This money has not yet been paid and if you do not vote it, I am afraid we cannot pay it. This money will be paid before the close of the fiscal year, but it has not been paid. This is not a retroactive authorization from this Legislature. The explanation for items four, five and six are somewhat the same but I think if you will recall last year, I did explain that in some of these cases the grants have already been reduced, because of the fact that the need has not been established. Some of these facilities for convalescent treatment—some are camps, which at one time were included in The Department of Health estimates, being justified as deserving of grants as hospitals—could not be approved again under the cost-sharing agreement with Ottawa. They have been carried along since in supplementary grants for The Department of Health. Each year their financial statement is reviewed and if the need is not there, the grant is reduced by the amount that the need has disappeared. Now it has not been reduced this year from the sum last year; indeed, the grant for hospitals is up because of the increased number of beds. But in case of items four, five and six, the grant is exactly the same as it was in the supplementary estimate of last year. It will remain there in order that we may review it and keep it consonant with the need.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, while I am on my feet, No. 3 was a \$400,000 item that is going towards the cancer treatment and research foundation to help to build a facility in Hamilton.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the cancer treatment and research foundation, there is in this year's estimates a vote which has been passed—I am not trying to reopen it—of \$1,200,000. Now is it anticipated in the future that this will be dealt with in the regular estimates, the grant for this particular organization?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this particular grant will not reappear. This is a one-shot deal, if I may put it in the vernacular, to build this facility in Hamilton.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister a question regarding item No. 5 in vote 715: Ontario Society for Crippled Children for convalescent camps, \$48,200? In the regular estimate there is a grant of \$6,000 to the society for crippled children. I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the work with crippled children and to what extent the government does support it because there came to my hand the other day an appeal for the Easter seal fund. They say this, that "each contribution for Easter seal campaign helps to give crippled boys and girls the many things they can obtain in no other way—the professional care and treatment of medical specialists, nurses, therapists, the advantage of speech correction, corrective braces, artificial limbs, camp holidays and other valuable services. The crippled children in our area are included in the more than 16,000 crippled children in Ontario who need care and treatment," and so the appeal comes for contributions.

Now, I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us whether the government does take any real responsibility for the crippled children in Ontario. It seems to me that if this is true, if this is all done on a voluntary basis, without any systematic assessment of the need and treatment of the need, then there is a field here for very direct and very needed action.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member the exact amount of money but I can tell him that the government is very deeply involved in this programme.

The \$44,200 and \$6,000 which appeared in my regular estimates between them go to provide 75 cents per day maintenance at the convalescent camps and for capital bed grants again or for place grants of \$150 per year. That is what these two grants are for.

Then, concerning the crippled children's centre in Toronto here and in other places: They can elect to come under health grants or assistance under the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. There is a place in Toronto, one in London, I believe, and I think there is one other in the province elected to come under the Ontario hospital services insurance plan, and therefore for in-patients a per diem rate is provided. For the building they qualify for capital construction grants just like any other hospital. They also qualify for out-patient grants just like any other hospital. Now, this year, as announced in my estimates, we are involving ourselves to a far greater extent with these out-patient

services either through the hospital insurance plan or through grants, whichever is the more advantageous to them. I may say they are very good business people and we find they are very persuasive.

In addition to this there has been a long-standing grant provided by this government. This government's share is about \$168,000—I am quoting the figure from memory and I may well be wrong, but I am not far wrong, of that I am sure. I believe it is \$168,000 per year to be given to the crippled children's centre for work among cerebral palsy children. This grant is matched by federal money so it is over \$300,000 for that.

Mr. Young: I want to thank the hon. Minister for the answer and I would take from his answer that this phrase, they "can obtain in no other way" is a bit of salesmanship rather than actual fact.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is very well based and I believe it is very well put because the organizations which stimulate or support the Easter seal programme provide a great variety of services. They transport them, they look after entertainment, they provide special braces, and just as they say, they actually do provide things that are not available to the children in any other way.

Vote 715 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

Vote 1117 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Vote 2306 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1964.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

(continued)

On vote 1801:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I would like to make some inquiries with regard to item No. 2, designated as travelling expenses in the amount of \$12,000. I am assuming that figure covers the anticipated travelling expenses of all personnel of the main office such as the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile), the deputy Minister and their staff. I notice that in the

public accounts for 1962-63 the actual amount spent by the hon. Minister on travelling expenses was what I would regard as the modest sum of \$1,200. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if it is anticipated that the figure for travelling expenses for the hon. Minister will be approximately the same in the coming year. If not, what allowance is made for the hon. Minister's travelling expenses in the total figure of \$12,000 for the coming year?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I do not anticipate spending any more on travelling expenses. As far as I am personally concerned, as is known, I am not a great patron of the airplane, and I use the train when I can but in my particular circumstances I also use the automobile a great deal in travelling and as far as I am personally concerned these expenses will not be any higher than they are now. As a matter of fact, I might say that in some instances I provide myself with my own transportation without even thinking of The Department of Public Welfare to reimburse that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment with regard to item 1, and in regard to general policies of this department. The hon. Minister emphasized repeatedly in his introduction that they were under review and he expressed great hopefulness with regard to what was going to be achieved. His repeated emphasis was on research and he paid a very justifiable compliment to the competence and to the dedication of his staff in seeking to implement these changes.

But the interesting thing is, Mr. Chairman, that when my colleague from Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) presented his introductory statement on behalf of this group in the House, he commented in lines that can be described only as a projection of the research and the study and the various papers that are presented to this government and this department by its consultants and advisers.

As a matter of fact, practically all of his comments were a restatement or at best a projection of the comments of the deputy Minister in his report to the hon. Minister; of many advisers such as Bessie Touzel and John Morgan, advisers and consultants of this department; or reports contained in the needs and resources report of the Metropolitan Toronto social planning council. In other words, from all these people advising the department, what my colleague stated is merely a projection of what they had stated.

Yet when he had finished, the hon. Minister got up, Mr. Chairman—and I want to return to this now—and what he said was about as cheap and unworthy a comment as I have heard from any Minister of the Crown for quite some time. He dismissed the whole thing, if I may borrow his phraseology—as “the gospel of the socialist point of view.” He referred to it as being deplorable because in his conception of socialism, it involved paternalization—this is an interesting word in both French and English—yes, paternalization.

I can think of nothing that is closer to establishing a paternal approach than the kind of welfare which seeks to perpetuate, or results in the perpetuation of dependency, instead of the removal of dependency; or the kind of welfare that keeps people bordering on subsistence so that they are regimented by the very existence in which they are living.

Yet this is what the hon. Minister dismisses. In fact, he ended up with the cheapest of all his comments by saying that there are only three places in the world where you will find a perfect man: in an Ontario hospital, the cemetery or the NDP. I do not object to the hon. Minister getting up and making cracks about our socialism. If the hon. Minister is in effect saying that progress means socialistic measures, fine. This is not new.

We have listened many a time to some Ministers of the Crown, sir, who dismiss something as socialism on the one hand, and then are willing to adapt it and put it into effect when they think it will get votes at election time.

But the thing that becomes very obvious, Mr. Chairman, is: That this department is headed in the right direction. Public money is being spent on getting reports that are good reports; they are reports which are leading in the right direction.

It becomes more and more obvious that the man who is the chief roadblock to these competent officials of the department being able to achieve an effective purpose, through the expenditure of public money, is the hon. Minister himself. He is the man who is frustrating it. It is all very well for him to go around the province and read speeches which have been prepared by his competent staff, but when the hon. Minister is on his own, for even two or three minutes—the fleeting period between the time it took for him to get up and make his comments and his advisers to get up here—he utters the kind of cheap, unworthy comments he did here in the House the other day.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I am concerned the hon. Minister's statements make him unworthy of the confidence of this House. I am not stating anything new. The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) has said so already. What I would do, Mr. Chairman, in light of this—and I would have done it a lot earlier if there had not been so much happening in the last, intervening three or four days—is indicate our lack of confidence in the hon. Minister, because I am convinced he is the greatest single roadblock to progress in this department.

We cannot attack the statutory estimate covering his salary, but what we can do to express our lack of confidence—and I now do it—is to move “that item 2 of vote 1801 be reduced by the \$1,200” the hon. Minister is going to spend on travel expenses.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

It is moved by Mr. MacDonald that item 2 of vote 1801 be reduced by \$1,200.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): May I speak on this motion, Mr. Chairman?

I would say, sir, like the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, that I certainly have some misgivings in connection with the vigorous leadership applied to this department. I was just reading through the estimates of March 18 again, and I notice there that in some of the answers which are given—I do not know whether they are vague because of the hon. Minister's legal background, and given in this fashion purposely, or not—it certainly seems to be such a vagueness that it is purposely done to avoid answering questions.

I think, for example, that the hon. Minister was asked about mothers' allowances. He was asked what he was going to do up in Ottawa, in connection with the whole question of division of power and working together with the federal government; and the hon. Minister said that some of the things he might discuss are: “disability pensions”—and I am quoting the hon. Minister—“old age assistance and mothers' allowances, and also all the programmes that we share in equal participation—”

On page 1776 of *Hansard* of March 18, 1964, you will find the following query addressed by me to the hon. Minister:

Mr. Thompson: Could you clarify one of them? Mothers' allowance. How are you going to deal with mothers' allowance? What is going to be your stand when you go to Quebec?

The hon. Minister replied:

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to deal with that particular problem when in Quebec city.

He further said that he was not going to deal with mothers' allowances at all.

What I am trying to point out is that previously he had mentioned that mothers' allowances would be dealt with. When we asked him how he would deal with them he replied that he did not expect that would be included in the agenda. I offer that, sir, as an example of the vagueness or the swift footwork with which the hon. Minister operates, when his estimates are presented, in order that we get no answers about this.

We raised questions about research. Both Opposition parties raised these questions. We were told that he is vitally interested in research, and I am reiterating in a sense the remarks of the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party. Then, when we asked him to be specific, to give us concrete examples of where he was going to apply research, he tells us vaguely that research is applied all the time.

Then we asked him if he had a research project. The deputy Minister suggested there should be new thinking, but could he specify what the new thinking is and how it applies to the department; and again we get no answer. In other words, sir, in this department we must come, unfortunately, to the conclusion that the hon. Minister is either trying to dodge questions or he does not know the answers to questions.

I would be very inclined to agree with the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, that we should cut the hon. Minister's expenses. On the other hand, I think this: One of the problems may be because the hon. Minister needs these travelling expenses in order to travel around more, to visit the institutions, to get out and see some of the children's institutions—then he will be more versed in connection with the problems, and he will be more vibrant in the House, more decisive. We will see new blood come into the department. For that reason, sir, my party feels that the travelling expenses are justified expenses if they are used properly, and we would not vote in connection with it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen on the Liberal benches can take whatever position they wish. We have put forward this motion as an expression of no confidence in the hon. Minister.

The travelling expenses, admittedly, are

neither here nor there; but this is the only way we can bring to a head the question of confidence in the hon. Minister. I think there are full and sufficient grounds for the House to express no confidence in him, and I do not think all the travelling in the world will make him a good Minister of Public Welfare.

It is obvious he simply has no comprehension of the kinds of problems involved in this department. He is completely out of touch with all modern thinking on the subject. The contrast was put very squarely when these estimates were last before us on March 18. My colleague, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Scarborough West presented a proposed programme to the House, setting forth what we consider to be desirable objectives within this field. I would say that it represented a programme of enlightenment; over against it the hon. Minister put his own obscurantism. It was a straight choice between enlightenment and obscurantism.

The hon. Minister described it as a choice between Socialism and Conservatism. If he wants to put it that way, it is fine with me. I do not care about the terminology, but I am concerned about substance. It is quite obvious that the programme that the hon. member for Scarborough West put forward, and which the hon. Minister dismissed with cheap gibes, is the kind of programme the government should have before it. I believe that the department has been, and is, continuing to move in the direction of the objectives enunciated by the hon. member for Scarborough West; but all the time, as it tries to move forward, it is dragging along an anchor in the person of the hon. Minister. He is holding back, clinging to 19th century concepts of welfare, encouraging dependency, treating welfare as if it was a dole instead of a method whereby human beings can be assisted to become self-supporting, self-reliant individuals again.

There are very few—as the department's own studies have shown—who, if given a proper opportunity, if they have the proper services and facilities available, cannot become self-reliant and self-supporting individuals. This should be the total philosophy of our welfare programme, instead of the antiquated 19th century, charity handout approach of the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the government find some less challenging and less responsible portfolio for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, and should put in his place, in this department, in this portfolio, someone with some comprehension of modern thought in this field. I do not think we can

ever develop an adequate welfare programme in the province under present circumstances. Therefore, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members on the Liberal benches, and other hon. members, can make up their own minds. But I think that the case has been made out clearly for a vote of no confidence in the hon. Minister; as far as this group is concerned, we are going to indicate it by our votes, and other hon. members can do as they see fit.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, speaking to the motion, it is an extraordinary fact when a Minister of the Crown, in effect, rejects every report, every piece of advice, every stratagem, every programme, which his own department presents to him. I say, with no particular shame, that the basis of my remarks last week were founded on the reports and programmes submitted by his own department and by those consultant agencies with which he is frequently in contact. And indeed, when one reads in the reports of the department the words of the deputy Minister and I want to quote them again:

In the administration of welfare programmes today there is primarily need to revise our thinking. It is not enough merely to maintain persons on public assistance.

When one reads that in a report of the hon. Minister's department, and then requests a reply, and all one receives is a totally elusive response, then it is incumbent on the Opposition to express non-confidence in the hon. Minister. His remarks completely refute those of his own department.

I am frankly very interested in the approach taken by my hon. colleague from Dovercourt, because the hon. member felt constrained to put things rather more strongly last week. I want to remind the hon. member for Dovercourt—who does not think that a non-confidence motion is justified—of his own remarks. He asked the hon. Minister, what are the new approaches to the grave problems of welfare? The hon. Minister gave a reply which is rather interesting. The hon. member for Dovercourt said, "This is almost like an itch, one can keep itching away all the time just on research. At some point you need action." We all chuckled in agreement.

Then the member for Dovercourt asked, where is the research and how are you going to apply it? The hon. Minister again gave an answer which disregarded the question. Finally the hon. member for Dovercourt—I do not think I am misinterpreting—pressed to

the wall, angered by the lack of response, right in his anger, said, "We are talking about men and women and children who are suffering, who are not getting the opportunity and you are taking the most dilettante approach."

I will say to you, Mr. Minister, and to the hon. member for Dovercourt, that when such passion, such feeling can be expressed on this side of the House, when a Minister can take a position totally incompatible with the specific evidence of his department, then we must make some move in expressing a lack of confidence, however immaterial, however small that move may be. The point is that the \$1,200 expense money represents a matter of principle, the principle being that the hon. Minister is not worthy to hold this portfolio. His position is antediluvian and we need a 20th century approach to welfare.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, it is really amazing, the nitpicking that our hon. friends on the left indulge in on such frequent occasions.

Mr. Chairman: You are speaking—

Mr. Singer: Oh, indeed I am. I am speaking to the nitpicking qualities expressed in this motion and that the great emotion that the hon. member for Scarborough West—

An hon. member: You forgot to call him a backbencher.

Mr. Singer: —can bring, I am sorry I missed the—

Mr. S. Lewis: I am not one of the Chicago gang.

Mr. Singer: If the hon. gentlemen opposite would rather make the speech, I will be perfectly happy to listen to them as soon as I am through.

Mr. MacDonald: As usual, you have missed the principle in the motion.

Mr. Singer: It is very difficult. I do not know whether the barracking is coming from over there or from here. I was going to defend you fellows just for a minute or two.

An hon. member: Believe you me, you need it. You need the defence.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, meanwhile back at the motion. I was going to say that this motion really expresses a sense of futility which the group on our left feels called upon to put forward from time to time. Certainly our views on the functioning of this department do not express to any extent whatsoever

that we are satisfied with the way this department is being run. My hon. colleagues from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), and from Dovercourt have set forth their views which are the views of our party in a clear explicit manner. We believe there is much that can be done and much that must be done in this field of welfare, by bringing new direction to it and so on.

But what purpose this motion has in this expression, completely escapes me and completely escapes my hon. colleagues. To get on with the business of this House, certainly we are called upon to express in our opinion what are reasonable and logical objections to government policy. My substantial objection to the direction in which The Department of Welfare moves, is similar to that which seems to run now through so many government departments. It was expressed to some extent in the ill-fated section 14 of Bill No. 99.

It is a direction that "we know better in government, because we have a Cabinet portfolio or a Cabinet mantle around our shoulders, we know better than all the people and we are going to do what in our mind is best, we are dictators, albeit munificent dictators, we are going to be pleasant about our dictation. There is no real reason to pay any attention to the studies that have gone on in the various fields we are charged with."

There is no real importance to pay attention to a man like Professor Morgan, for instance, who for many, many, many years has set forward the idea of having a common system of welfare grants, not trying to departmentalize grants for blind people, grants for widows, grants for this person and that person. There is no real purpose in going at this because the government does not think with this sort of an idea, expressed by one of our best informed educational people in the welfare field, so forcibly, so ably, so succinctly. We agree that the functions of this department in the light of present-day times are not being carried on properly, but we are hoping that somewhere along the line our pleas directed to this hon. Minister and to the whole department and to all of the departments of government, will perhaps fall on some little bit of fertile ground and that a little bit of progress will be made, at least until the next election. This government will be charged with supplying a Minister of Public Welfare and at least until the next election we would hope that the travelling allowance voted to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare will be used by him for the best possible purposes. We cannot support this motion for these reasons.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested to hear the remarks of the group on my right.

An hon. member: It is not a group, it is a party. A very honourable party.

Another hon. member: The right wing party of the House.

Mr. Young: The hon. members to my right, if I might be permitted to say so. My hon. colleague from Scarborough West pointed out that the speech he had made last week in this House was based primarily upon reports from this department, from its various agencies and staff. In reply to that, we have these words from the hon. Minister and I quote:

You have full right to have these views and express them but unfortunately I am not in that thinking group, although I appreciate the statements that were made in this respect. And I must confess there are some good things among them, things that we feel we could associate with our thinking in the matter and which we will be pleased to take into consideration and possibly use. But until such time as the people of Ontario are satisfied to have a socialist government in Ontario by which they will be regimented and for which they will be paternalized, well until then I will leave it up to the people.

These are the words of the hon. Minister. In other words he is saying that until such time as there is a government which represents this group the reports of his own department will not be implemented.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are strong words from a Minister of the Crown and this group feels very strongly about what he has said. When the hon. members to the right call our motion "nitpicking" I do not know what they want done. Perhaps they would cut off the whole appropriation for this department. But if they did then they are handicapping the staff of that department which is faced with a challenging job and which is determined to do a good job in spite of the hon. Minister dragging his feet. And so there is only one place that we can reach the hon. Minister and still say we agree with the department estimate of the job, and that is to move that the expense allowance be cut off. The hon. Minister's salary is statutory, we cannot touch that, and so we are distinguishing between the Minister and the department.

It seems to me that when the hon. Minister cuts this whole business off by saying it is socialism, this is an old trick which has been

tried for years to dismiss an argument which is basically sound. I think here in this House that argument should be outmoded. This motion which has been made today should be passed as an expression of our lack of confidence in the hon. Minister who cannot take the advice of his own department.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): When the motion was first introduced, Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party stated his real reason for it and that was, he said, that the words of the hon. Minister were irresponsible when he compared the members of his party to inmates of an Ontario hospital. I agree with him that this is so. I agree with the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party that the comments of the hon. Minister were irresponsible—but I would also say that the motion was introduced more or less as a slap back at the hon. Minister and it is based on these reasons only and for that reason, which we consider unimportant, we are not supporting the motion.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but vote against the motion. The motion is too picayune. The idea of deducting \$1,200 from the hon. Minister's expense allowance is a very insignificant way of approaching this, sir, or an unimportant way of approaching this.

For one thing, Mr. Chairman, we do not know if this hon. Minister is going to be the Minister after April 1. Are we going to deduct \$1,200 expense allowance for the next individual who is going to be the Minister?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: The way that the Ministers have been changed around recently and the way they will change around in the near future, we may be jeopardizing a man who has intentions of doing a very good job by deducting this \$1,200.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief comment—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing has the floor.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that since—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: With these fellows as friends you do not need enemies.

Mr. Troy: Praying for your gavel, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Troy: Thank you, sir.

It seems to me the hon. members to my left, our hon. colleagues to the left, are reluctant dragons. If they feel that the department itself is of very high calibre it seems to me that it would be very good business to give the hon. Minister some travelling expenses so that he can get out of town—

An hon. member: A one-way trip to South Africa.

Mr. Troy:—and be away from the department altogether and let the department run itself.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken I want to make one brief word of clarification.

I recognize this is a serious motion. I trust that in my introductory comments something of the seriousness of what I was going to say was obvious. The motion is a simple matter of no confidence in the hon. Minister and there is no other way to express it during these estimates; no other way of expressing it.

Mr. Thompson: There are all kinds of ways.

Mr. MacDonald: Now the first person to express no confidence in this hon. Minister in his own words, very forcefully and with passion, was the hon. member for Dovercourt on the first day of the estimates. Now we have had another indication of a lot of bark but no bite from the Liberals. It will be interesting once again to see the forces of reaction lined up when this vote comes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion to delete item 2, the \$1,200 for travelling expenses. I feel that the group on our right, and I consider them a group at this point, are not acting like a responsible party in Opposition to the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: They do not understand, and this explains their ineptness over the years to provide the type of Opposition that is needed in a Legislature of this type. This is one way, if they will study the procedures that are available to the Opposition to express a principle and a no confidence approach.

Certainly the remarks of the hon. Minister following the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough West would discourage any

member of this House who has a responsibility to represent his constituents in regard to public welfare. I have always felt some pride when I get a request from a constituent in regard to their problems.

What does it make one feel, when they approach a problem of a widow on mothers' allowance and they call you to tell you that they were very pleased that three or four days ago they received a notice that they had now been given a small army pension of \$12 or \$13 a month? Then you find out within a few weeks that they had been notified they would either have to refuse to accept that little bit of extra money or it will be deducted from their mothers' allowance.

How does this make a member feel when he is aware of a case of an emotionally disturbed epileptic who is in and out of the Ontario hospital three or four times a year and when the person goes in her allowance is cut completely, she does not even have a dollar bill in her purse to go down to the tuck shop and spend as one would like to do? She has to depend entirely on relatives and if the relatives have no money they have to just go without.

The Liberals have expressed their interest in the welfare of the people of Ontario in this House for years, but now, when they pretend to throw the lifeline out to the people of Ontario, it ends up that before they get it back in they get a knife and cut it off. It is about time the Opposition in this House accepted their responsibilities and criticized in a sound manner and took every opportunity to express opposition when they find the department is not doing the proper job.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, before the motion is taken I would simply like to say that I have tried as a member of the Opposition to detail criticisms. Someone has been kind enough to suggest that I have done it with passion and eloquence. But, sir, I am not going to sully my criticisms by aligning myself with a picayune effort such as this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! All those in favour of the motion please say "aye".

All those opposed please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

All those opposed to the motion, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are seven and the nays 86.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

On vote 1801:

Mr. Troy: Yes, sir.

In the statement to the House, the hon. Minister referred to what they were doing in regard to Indian services. He said there is one racial group in Ontario which has been the source of much concern. I refer to our native Indian population, and particularly to those Indians living in northern areas where there has been little opportunity for association with civilization.

Mr. Chairman, the Indians north of the CNR are treaty Indians who get their treaty money from this provincial government, they are not the responsibility, as far as that is concerned, of the federal government. That is one thing that has been their responsibility for years.

Also, one would seem to think that it is only in the last few years that the Indians from north of the CNR and those areas have come into such areas as Red Lake. They have been there ever since the mines were opened up. They have drifted into those municipalities and it has been the government's responsibility. Once they get off the reservation they do not become the federal government's responsibility at all.

The same thing applies in Batchawana, they are not registered Indians, they are the responsibility of this province.

Many of the Indians in Moosonee are your responsibility. They are not treaty Indians, nor are they registered Indians.

If the hon. Minister would prevail upon the Cabinet to get rid of some of that land that is controlled by the ONR in Moosonee and give these Indians up there an opportunity so that they can buy land, and then they will build homes that will be suitable for them. It is mentioned here that they live in squalid shacks and so on; naturally, because they do not own the land. Now with the air force in Moosonee, with that very fine establishment up there, these Indians can get employment. Give them an opportunity to buy a piece of land and then they will improve their lot.

The hon. Minister mentioned too, about the bands in southern Ontario doing very well. Well, I assure him that the Nipissing band, the Ojibway band in the Nipissing area, have

done extremely well. It just shows you what Indians can do. These Indians have taken that area and they have made subdivisions of it, they are leasing lots at \$100 a year for some lots, some \$75, so that they will be having an annual income of anywhere from \$30,000 to \$40,000. They are a very progressive band and this proves what can be done if you show some interest in them. But when you say it is just a matter of recent years, these Indians have been the department's responsibility for years and years. And now we are getting a great hullabaloo about it.

I must compliment the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) who at long last has done something. He has an Indian committee set up with the Indians themselves running the show. Also he has seconded to that committee a very fine employee of his department, Mr. Cam Currie, who knows the Indian problems. He was a Hudson's Bay employee before he joined the Indians. He has joined The Department of Lands and Forests, he knows the Indians in various sections of this country and through his great help we have a very fine trappers' auction in North Bay now. But this committee, I understand, will also have no interference from the department except to get advice when they need it. But to say that these things—

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Would the hon. member let me interject there, that we are also going to have the assistance of Chief Armstrong, the captain of the next Stanley Cup winners.

Mr. Troy: Well, I do not know to whom the hon. Minister refers. Where does he live, this fellow?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Is the hon. member a Canadian supporter? I am talking about the Maple Leafs.

Mr. Troy: I certainly hope that the particular one the hon. Minister refers to—I am glad to know he is going to join the committee and have something to do with it. But if he has no more success in the committee, than he will have in the next few days, God help the committee.

The point is though—do not get me off this subject. Seriously, I say again that it is a long, long time—we have let this thing go for years and years. These Indians have been the responsibility of the provincial government, not the federal government at all in certain areas. In Batchawana I understand they are not registered Indians, therefore they are not the responsibility of the federal

government, they are the responsibility of the provincial government. I say again, if you will induce the government to make some changes in regard to Moosonee so that the Indians may be able to buy land and build homes. The same thing applies in Red Lake and other mining areas. They came there when the mines were opened. I am sure I will get support from the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope), he knows that section. They have been there for years, and not much concern has been given to them.

Now we are getting it, but I again plead that the hon. Minister not only assist them in Red Lake, in Batchawana, in Moosonee, but in other sections of the province. We are finding now that the Indians are coming to our high schools this year. In the city of North Bay alone we will have some 18 young Indian students graduating from the three branches of our educational system in the commercial, academic and technical schools and I hope that you will make use of these and see to it, particularly The Department of Lands and Forests, that you will give every opportunity to young Indians to become employed by the department as rangers, as scalers, and in other ways, because that is the life that they know best and a life that they are happiest in.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I should like to pursue just a little further the matter of research. I notice in the first instance that there is, as has been pointed out, no individual estimate for research in this department whatsoever, despite the fact as the hon. Minister himself pointed out, it is an ongoing process.

Secondly, he said it was scattered through the estimates and I am prepared to accept that, except that it certainly is not discernible to the naked eye.

Thirdly, the two projects on which much discussion has been based, the long-term chronic cases and the special unit for over 50, are in the words of the report—and I found this most fascinating—"supported by federal funds under the national welfare grants programme". Now, in view of the fact there is no individual research listed in the estimates at all, and such research as has been done is supported by federal monies, can the hon. Minister be a little more specific as to precisely what kind of research the department is engaged in with provincial monies?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I will answer the hon. member for Scarborough West that this research he is speaking about—

I hope that is the one he means, the one that was sponsored by the province, in many diversified fields in respect to long-term welfare recipients and mothers' allowances cases—is research as between the city of Toronto and The Department of Public Welfare.

As you know, there has been a pilot project where a certain group was investigated along these particular lines to see what they were doing during the day and what they were doing in the way of looking for work or what they intended to do. They were followed very closely by those who were looking at this project from the department and also from The Department of Welfare from the city of Toronto. That is one project; I trust you had that in mind at the same time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it said in the report that that particular project was supported by federal funds under the National Welfare Grants programme. This is the study of long-term family cases, I imagine that is the one you referred to.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I am interested in knowing which precise projects are under provincial funds in the research you mentioned through your department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I suppose it would be a repetition of what I have already said. This has been initiated by the province and we are receiving, under the general welfare agreement which we have, parts of the monies from Ottawa. It is really one and the same project that we speak about. I was wondering what you meant by having a special Ontario programme and one fostered by Ottawa and Ontario. What we are doing from Ottawa is recouping some of the money that was spent, that is really what it is.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Minister, I would just like to add to that if I could. If I could I would like to add to the question that you have just answered—may I do that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to add, sir, that you spoke with great vehemence about your research and the necessity for research. I am going back to the last session. The hon. member for Scarborough West is asking: Where is the responsibility that you place on research? You, as the head of The Department of Public Welfare—not what is done in co-operation with Ottawa—but what research do you actually do? You have told us that this is vital to the department. And the

question has been asked: Give us concrete examples of research you are actually encouraging.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, do I understand from my hon. friend that he is asking what we are doing with respect to research in the department, over and above these special research projects?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think I can answer this by stating that there is no specified amount in the estimates for the specific purpose of research, as my hon. friend might have in mind. Basically, research is included in the estimates, as they are now. I do not think I can express myself any better than to say this: Every branch of the department, while it is doing its administration, is also doing research by means of everybody in the field—it might be a field worker, it might be an administrator or supervisor. It is a continuous matter of research. As you know, we have tried many things. The research might even go as far as individual cases which are presented to us and which are a matter of study, and also as far as finding out what the situation might be, or what might happen if something else should come into the picture.

It is a very interesting subject, in the sense that it is continuous research. But to pinpoint a certain group of people, as we have had in this Toronto and provincial research, is difficult. It is not, in a definite way, in the estimates of the department.

The other research about which you might be thinking has now been completed, except for one last meeting, I understand; this is the committee on child welfare which, I hope, will be reported here in the next three or four weeks. I hope I have answered this in the way you expect; that is, we have no specific research department. Every branch of the department, indeed, every person dealing with every case, whether it be an individual or a group, is a research department.

Mr. Thompson: Just to follow up on this, sir, and I appreciate your efforts to clarify it for me. As I understand research—I do not think you understand it on the same basis, sir—my understanding is that you collect facts, you examine situations, and you have competent, trained people to look at these facts and try to relate cause and effect to them.

You say you have that in different departments, that you are doing this continuously. Could you tell us who the research people

are, in each department, and what their qualifications are, to do the research?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to tell the hon. member that I felt everyone who is the head of a department or section was doing some research. I confess to you that, if there are any specially designated persons in each group, I would have to find out who they are—and if they have a specific job to do in this respect. My understanding was always that the head of every branch in the department is a research worker in his own right.

Mr. Thompson: Could I pinpoint this to one department? You say that the head of every department is doing research projects. Could I take, for example, the day nurseries branch? What is the head of the day nurseries branch doing with respect to research?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am sure you know the person who is the head of that department—Miss Stapleford. She is an expert in these matters, and I am sure that research is done for the purposes of establishing standards—I remember we talked about this last year—for the purposes of establishing what would be required for people working in these particular institutions. Naturally, again, I would say that she is the research worker and the advisor in this respect, for any regulations which might be drawn up under the Act, or any inspections which might be made of these places. At the same time she will be providing herself with the knowledge and co-operation of these people who are in this particular field.

But, if you ask me if I have a special research worker in that particular branch, well, I must confess to you that I cannot give you that information. I thought you meant it in a general sense. What I meant to say is that I do not know if we have a person specially designated in The Department of Public Welfare to be a research person—I am not saying that it would not be a good thing—who would look into all these programmes and advise us accordingly.

Naturally, as you stated a moment ago, we do take full advantage of all the groups such as the groups you mentioned, and the persons who are expert in the field; and we work with them in that particular respect.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow upon this particular question. The hon. member for Dovercourt chose a rather interesting sub-estimate when he mentioned day nurseries. In the last annual report of the department, Mr. Chairman, for 1961-62,

under day nursery expansion, it says—I am quoting from the report:

A study will be commencing shortly, which will give greater understanding in creating additional facilities, and so on.

Is one to understand that this study is done by the person who also administers the entire department? Or is the study not done by anyone you can specifically name? Or has the study, in fact, commenced? If so, is there a special group—and might we know who is in it?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned a moment ago, Miss Stapleford is the one who is heading this particular branch of the department. She has been doing the research, the study of the needs and what is required along that line. As you will recall, I think there was an amendment to the statute last year, giving her wider powers to go into this field, with some help of her own choice.

If my hon. friend would allow me, or would wish to have this postponed, I can consult with Miss Stapleford and get any names she might have—of a group of that description.

Furthermore—I should not have forgotten it because it is a very important research department—we have geriatric studies made, as you know, in conjunction with the city of Toronto and also, I think, at Western Hospital. There, we have certain beds designed to conduct that research, and we have some very able doctors doing that; it is a continuous matter.

The other thing I spoke about a moment ago, in respect to the city of Toronto, was in reference to long-term assistance cases. This, I understand, is in the process of being completed also. We will have some results which will be very interesting.

I hope, as was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, that there will be a select committee of this House appointed for further study of the aged. I am sure this will be a very considerable area of research when it comes about.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, in this \$90 million budget The Department of Public Welfare is presenting to the House, the major portion is administered at municipal level. In this particular section, 1201, I wish to show that there are many inequities as interpreted at local level. Not many of us are authorities on unmarried mothers but the law, as it is now constituted and administered through the department, is

that an unmarried mother receives welfare allowance if she has one child out of wedlock; but if she has another child she is cut off allowances. Now this is a great cost to the municipalities and I suggest to the hon. Minister first that morals cannot be legislated, so why cut her off? Her morals are not going to be improved by so doing!

Second, on the cost of drugs, I would like the hon. Minister's answers to these questions regarding the reason or the intelligence, or lack of it, in the ministration of these. The cost of drugs for adults who are sick or children who are sick, is now fully paid for by the municipalities. This is another great drain on the taxpayer; and it has no relation to real estate tax which I constantly put forth to this House.

In regard to artificial limbs under this section 1201, Mr. Chairman, the position as it is now set forth in the Act splits the cost at 50-50. Currently, in Owen Sound, we are faced with providing a \$500 artificial limb for a double amputee. It is going to cost us \$250. There is no sound basis for change here.

The Child Welfare Act is the biggest drain on our municipal welfare budget at local level—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Are you speaking on 1201?

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking on section 12, Mr. Chairman, of vote 1801.

Mr. Chairman: You said 1201 on several occasions. Continue!

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking on vote 1801, Mr. Chairman, on page 100, section 12.

The largest cost to municipal welfare budgets, Mr. Chairman, is the cost of The Child Welfare Act. This is now paid 60 per cent by the municipality and 40 per cent by the province.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, might I tell the hon. member that the vote here is strictly for capital construction. The 60-40 per cent he speaks about is under the other vote. This vote is for capital construction—buildings, for example. Here the government pays 25 per cent of the capital construction costs.

Mr. Sargent: It is all welfare and I think the whole system is wrong. I think that it should be on an 80-20 basis as other welfare is.

Getting back to unmarried mothers, I would like to hear the thinking of the hon.

Minister on this very moral and economic question at municipal level.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, again I would like to follow on the heels of the suggestion—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. S. Lewis: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member for Grey North, if there are any restrictions, as he mentioned, on unmarried mothers, I do not know about it. I would like him to point them out in the regulations.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister should know if there are restrictions there, that is his department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I do not think there are any restrictions there in this respect. As a matter of fact, I think that when this Act was passed—

Mr. Sargent: Then the welfare administrators of Ontario are very wrong, because that is one of the things they are after; it happened in our city.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, again I would like—

Mr. Sargent: May I have my answer?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the other questions, if I remember them, deal with matters of drugs, for the aged, I imagine.

Mr. Sargent: And for people who are sick and for children.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I appreciate my hon. friend's question. You know that with the aged there is a supplementary payment that can be made of up to \$20. When there is need this can be used for drugs; and I am not saying that is sufficient, mind you.

In the other cases that the hon. member speaks about, general welfare cases, these are matters which are being discussed right now with the government at Ottawa to see what can be done. I appreciate, as I am quite sure that the hon. member for Grey North does, that this is a very difficult field for the people to deal with, because drugs are one of the most expensive items. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we are looking into this very seriously and we have been doing so for quite some time, trying to find a way in which we can provide these services without causing too much harm one way or another.

As a matter of fact we intend to discuss this with the federal authorities because we have asked and we have been told that they were quite willing to discuss this matter with us in a general way under The General Welfare Assistance Act.

As far as child welfare is concerned, I would remind the hon. member that before these grants there was nothing. These grants were increased as time went along with the result that today we pay 25 per cent for capital grants in construction for child welfare, and as will be stated in the following grant, operational cost sharing has been raised to 40 per cent.

I have no objection to what my hon. friend says, but surely he does not expect to relieve completely the obligations of the people in these matters. I would hate to see the day when everything would be controlled by a department of government in respect to all these. I am not saying that it is enough, but we have to do this work with the means that are at our disposal and at the same time try to conduct the programme as well as possible, especially that of child welfare.

I am quite satisfied that when I have a report from the committee which is now having its last meeting to make out its final report, they will be able to guide us along those lines. I appreciate, with my hon. friends, that it is a very difficult area and one which we must go at very carefully because of its implications.

It is not only care for the children themselves and their protection, but also the cost of this in the home.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to, finally, follow on the remarks which the hon. member for Grey North raised at one point on the question of unmarried mothers and again ask the hon. Minister a specific question. I may remind him that back in 1951 the Canadian Welfare Council recommended that provincial governments assume financial responsibility, total—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not want the hon. member to raise his voice but as there is a little buzz in the House I would appreciate it if he would raise it a little higher.

Mr. S. Lewis: I would not want to seem as though I were indulging in shouting. The Canadian Welfare Council back in 1951 recommended that provincial governments assume full responsibility, full financial responsibility, for the maintenance of unmarried mothers and their children and since that

time the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Newfoundland, have followed precisely that policy.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the principle embodied in that policy is a highly intelligent one. At the moment, the unmarried mother to escape the odium and stigma, frequently from insensitive people in her own locale, moves from a municipality far afield, to a major urban centre. The nature of the financial arrangements require that the municipality of origin be charged with the cost to look after the unmarried mother and child, so that all the effort the mother went to to rehabilitate herself and remove the stigma attached to the unmarried factor, is brought back to her and is frequently sensationalized in the community of origin.

Taking this into account, it has again and again been recommended that if the provincial government assumes this financial responsibility it can remove the so-called "immorality" that is attached to the act and give the unmarried women a dignity which they are presently denied. What it would mean for the province is that instead of paying 40 per cent of the cost for children born out of wedlock, it would pay 100 per cent of the cost and instead of paying a mere \$100 a month toward welfare workers in this field, it would pay the full cost toward welfare workers in this field.

I say to the hon. Minister that surely unmarried mothers in the province deserve the self respect which would be given to them if the government took this step, a step which has already been taken by five other provinces at least and is contemplated by several more. So I specifically ask the hon. Minister what he thinks of the recommendation in the study of needs and resources, the Toronto Metropolitan study, recommendation 146 of which says:

The province of Ontario should assume responsibility for the total cost involved and the maintenance of and services to unmarried mothers and their children.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I think that the remarks that were made by my hon. friend from Scarborough West are rather welcome remarks. I think they are refreshing for the simple fact that there are so many schools of thought in this respect. I even receive some correspondence at times which is absolutely opposed to what he has said. Sometimes I have had to answer this in as nice language as possible to explain why we,

as you know, have helped in that field by providing them with mothers' allowance, providing they would take care of their child or children. Now, I think it is very refreshing to hear that because I can assure the hon. member that my line of thinking is quite exactly the same in respect to the problem he posed a moment ago, in respect to unmarried mothers.

Mr. S. Lewis: Could I add to that, Mr. Minister, by asking whether you think the precise recommendation has validity, and is the government prepared to contemplate assuming total costs? Quite apart from whether or not the idea is refreshing or worthwhile, does the hon. Minister endorse it and does the hon. Minister feel that these girls deserve this particular government action?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that I do endorse that because I think there might have been a time when this was considered very dishonourable. Naturally, I am not one that would wish to promote the idea of laxity, however, I am quite sure that help is being given. There is not only the fact there is a mother to look after but also a child, and it is certainly no fault of his. I can assure the hon. member through you, Mr. Chairman, that I endorse his thinking in this matter and I think that a better day will come, and I am very sure it is close at hand. We have progressed already in that field and, as I say, it is a matter dealt with by many groups, the church groups and other groups, and I think that the thinking today is exactly along the lines my friend has mentioned and we will go along with that completely.

Mr. MacDonald: There has recently come into my possession the plans of the Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada. This is an organization in which I have been increasingly interested and impressed with the work they are attempting to do. They apparently have taken as a basis of their operations the nine economic regions in which the province has been divided by The Department of Economics and Development and are taking three regions each year for the next three years to do a study in co-ordination with all the agencies interested in Indian affairs. Now the question I wanted to ask the hon. Minister is twofold: One, is it the intention of the department to participate in these regional studies which will go on over the next three years? Secondly, I do not see the Indian-Eskimo association listed among the organizations that are in receipt of grants.

Does the government intend to make a grant, or has a grant been requested from the Indian-Eskimo association for this work that they have mapped out?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise the hon. member for York South that the director was in just recently. We have offered to him our full co-operation in this research. Now I am advised that the study that you speak about is under The Department of Education.

Mr. MacDonald: Falls within The Department of Education?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. Thompson: My hon. friend is going to speak on Indians and I have conceded to him.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, continuing the subject of Indians, I understand the province of Quebec has taken over the Indians and Eskimos within their jurisdiction, and I know the hon. Minister will be having a meeting in Ottawa some time soon. Will this government take over the responsibility of the Indians as has happened in the province of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I think that if my friend will watch that very closely, he will learn that the province of Quebec is actually in negotiation to do that and, when we go to Ottawa, we will propose doing the same. As a matter of fact, I made a tentative arrangement, or a date, if you wish to call it that, with the Minister at the time, hon. Mr. Favreau, when we had the conference in Ottawa, and I am assured that his successor will deal with this problem with us. If I remember rightly the meeting was set for the month of May.

Mr. Troy: I knew too that it was just in the stage of negotiations and I hope that this government will also negotiate.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell the House whether he favours the assumption of the responsibility of the Indians by the province? Does the hon. Minister favour the province taking over the responsibility for the administration of these people?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is a very difficult question, Mr. Chairman, to answer fully, in the sense that there are so many things involved—property rights and things like that. My personal impression of this with the contacts I have had and with the committee of

Indians we have working with us—we appoint them every year and will be doing this again pretty soon—it has been favourable to what they have advised me. It is a question, I think, of education and I mean not only education by going to school, but trying to promote the idea. What the Indian hates the most, I think, is the word “integration.” He does not want to be integrated. He wants to feel that that has been done a long time ago and that he is just an ordinary citizen, and also at the same time, I believe from the contacts I have had with the committee and the people in that field, likes the idea of being the special subject or the ward of the Queen. This is one of those things which is to the advantage of the Indians as we know them, as for instance those in your area who are getting the same services as other municipalities. I hope we have been successful in that and I think we have but I am speaking of those from the areas mentioned a moment ago, like Red Lake, for instance, where we have a project which I believe I mentioned in my remarks, which has been in conjunction with the municipality, and it seems to have had some measure of success. I can assure you that it is a frustrating deal in the sense that it is long term and we have to look at it from that standpoint. It just cannot be done overnight. I think the federal government feels the same way about this. They realize that there is a big problem. Now, should the blame be on a particular department, either of this government or of the federal government in this respect? This is also very difficult to define, but I think we are making progress, but progress slowly.

At the same time, if I may use, sir, the good old Latin expression that I am sure you have heard “*festina lente*” and I think we are succeeding gradually. As I stated in my speech there have been 1,000 children that have been up for adoption and have been adopted. As a matter of fact, I can only express this, sir, to you, and I do not like to do these things, but however, just to show the position we are now in and what success we have had so far. I have here a letter which is dated on the 17th of March from the reeve of Red Lake which states that,

The council of the municipality, all rate-payers and especially all acting committees wish to thank the continued efforts in assisting us with our problem of rehabilitating our local Indian residents.

So really, the word is rehabilitate more than integrate, I think.

It is a consolation and indeed assuring to know that this work is continuing to be

accomplished. The housing situation, if we could conquer that, I think we would do a great deal. Actually some of the Indians have been taken into the labour force now and I suppose the example and the experience that you will acquire will lead us to some success in this matter.

Mr. Troy: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the word is not gradually but slowly that you have been working in this. We have in our area of Parry Sound, a reserve—the Dokis Indian reserve. It is a fairly wealthy reserve. I would wish, Mr. Minister, that you would prevail upon The Department of Highways and The Department of Lands and Forests to do something about the road communications going into that reserve. It goes through the riding of Nipissing. We are getting very fine communications in the telephone field; but still the road into the reserve remains a mud-and-bush road.

The Indians, themselves, have spent somewhere in the vicinity of \$100,000 to build that road. Each year, from the band funds, they contribute a certain amount. They get very little assistance from The Department of Highways or The Department of Lands and Forests. They give timber licences to bush operators in the area and they pay nothing for the upkeep of the road. So would you, now that you are showing concern for the Indians, then see if something can be done so that communications by road will be comparable to communications by telephone?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I come back? I am reading the last *Hansard*, of March 18. I notice there, where I suggested there should be some kind of co-ordinative programme, such as the one President Johnson enunciated, to have a war on poverty. He was suggesting that they were going to encourage a number of organizations to help Americans who, generation after generation, seem to become welfare cases. You have done a study on this, sir, on a certain hard core group. In the discussion on your estimates on March 18, I was asking you whether you had thought of a co-ordinative approach to this, a sort of a “new frontier” challenge to idealistic young school teachers and others, in getting different departments to look at it, in going to an area where you have a hard-core problem. It would seem to me that you could look to the children, so that there will not be another generation coming forward to be welfare cases.

I say this, because I notice in the United States that they are obviously attracting a group of idealistic young Americans to tackle

this very serious problem. I am wondering, sir, whether you have looked at this at all. I had given an example of—going away out to B.C.—the Doukhobors. Here is a problem group, in a sense, for reasons other than that of poverty, for religious reasons, and yet the community in B.C. concentrated on the children in trying to raise their rights by giving them educational opportunities.

I think they did this, really, with a disregard of one of the sacred cornerstones in our civilization—that is the sanctity of the family.

But I am wondering, sir: Is there any new fresh approach on this? Is there any new approach by which we could inspire a group of idealistic young social workers and teachers and others to have a corps formed, which is going to work with unfortunate Canadians to help them—not just give them financial aid to continue eking out an existence, but to give them an inspiration and an opportunity so that the younger generation, particularly, will move out of this and take its full place in our community?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I could not disagree with what my hon. friend has said. The approach that could be made, from The Department of Public Welfare, for instance, I suppose, is a co-ordinated effort with groups which already exist, like the United Appeal people in Toronto, or the different groups who specialize in that kind of study, like the welfare council and that sort of thing. But, as you say, I quite appreciate that it is a matter of co-ordinating the teacher in the school as well as those groups I mentioned a moment ago. I think that social groups of all kinds—religious and so on—should be interested in this matter.

Unfortunately, and I am not saying this discouragingly against anyone, most of the time, when these cases reach where we stand, they are in particularly dire need. This is why we have undertaken that specialized study with the units now based in the city of Toronto.

I think, in that study, we have looked at each individual case—where a person was followed throughout the four or five or six months he was on relief. Some of them were educated along the lines, you indicate, to go back into the economy of the city or the village where they had worked. Sometimes it might be easy enough to get a chap a job, but it might be more difficult to keep him on that job, for some reason or other. That is why, at the same time, we also have to look at this other picture. You have got to be generous, but not too generous so as to

permit him to stay on welfare; because why should he work if he has so much?

This has been the study we have been doing. I cannot tell you what the result will be as yet, because it is too new; but we certainly have some great ideas along that line. We can pass them on to the welfare departments of the different municipalities, and the cities themselves, and work in co-operation with them. The plan we spoke about when we had these estimates before us—of the larger units, county units—would be, I think, a field where we can have more co-operation in this respect, and we would be in touch with more people. These studies we have, I think, are very revealing.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I appreciate very much what the hon. Minister is saying. Just to re-emphasize this, if I could, I am thinking of a group in my own constituency who had asked me to go to a meeting they were having. I went to the meeting. The group are new to this country. They told me that one of their problems is that they are living in rundown houses, but that there is a single landlord who, apparently, is renting out these houses. He thinks a change is going to take place in this area and he does not want to improve the houses to any great extent.

The first thing is that, from the point of their housing environment, they live in a depressing, dilapidated condition. I think that, surely, we should talk to the housing authorities. So we go to the housing authorities to demand that the standard be raised with respect to this. Then the next thing is to encourage this group, with their children, to impress on them the need for staying with education. This is the key by which they can advance themselves.

Then you go to the school and talk to the school teachers, trying to describe some of the cultural backgrounds. And then, in one case, because of lack of overall social legislation, one fellow had workmen's compensation which was inadequate—so he was going to get on welfare and so on. It seemed to me, as I looked at this, that there was no co-ordinated approach. There was bad housing. There was the need for encouraging the enforcement of education. There was the need to encourage job retraining. And I could not help feeling that, instead of just doing this in a kind of piecemeal approach with one government department looking at its own narrow preserves, if when we are encouraging people to move upwards, we had a very broad attack, we could be much more effective.

I see what the hon. Minister is suggesting with the county units; he is hoping that the county units would be in close liaison with the health units, and with other areas. But I would just like to suggest that the only way we are going to tackle some of this is by having constant co-ordination between various levels of government.

Mr. Troy: One question, Mr. Chairman, before we finish this: Is the committee on Indian matters, to which the hon. Minister refers, the same committee to which the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests referred? Or is this a special one?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, it is not. This committee was formed a few years ago, much before the other committee the hon. member speaks about.

Mr. Troy: Are there Indians as members of that committee too?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: They are all Indian members, and the chairman of that group is a very able person.

Vote 1801 agreed to.

On vote 1802:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1802, under the child welfare branch. One year ago I asked the hon. Minister if he would consider the use of a social worker in schools in an attempt to improve the welfare of the individuals attending. His answer was not satisfactory to me. I thought that possibly he should have had some type of research into the benefit of the social workers in the school. I can see it having a marked effect on drop-outs, it can have a marked effect on the opportunities that the individual would have. And I think this hon. Minister should be prepared at this time to give us some answer as to what his thoughts are concerning the use of a social worker in the schools from the welfare angle.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the only answer I could give, I guess, to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville is, as he will appreciate, we are not against that, we encourage it. But it is entirely a matter for school boards and for The Department of Education in the particular area, to deal with that. And usually what we try to do when a request is made along that line is to guide them or advise them as to the ability or the capacity of a person of that description. To this extent we are willing and pleased to get

into it, but it is really a matter of concern to the local people.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, of the hon. Minister then, at what age is an individual cut off assistance from the department—one attending school? Is it 18?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. member if he is talking of mother's allowance cases?

Mr. Newman: Yes, mother's allowances.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, mother's allowances, as the hon. member probably knows, have been amended. This was announced some time ago. Last year, I guess, the amendment was made in this Legislature that a child was qualified as long as he attended school and the principal of the school stated that he was a proper subject to be at school. The age limit for a beneficiary was dropped as long as he was in a secondary school and was living at home.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister, I understood it was 18, and I had some concern over it being detrimental to the education of the youngster, but this is good.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to say a few words about children's aid societies. I have been for many, many years associated with the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa and I know of the problems of the children's aid societies.

There are 55 societies operating through the province of Ontario, some of which have been operating for over 50 years. This is an amazing record when one considers the obstacles they have had to overcome, because of totally inadequate financing. For many years, their main function was to find foster homes for children committed to their care as wards. This was what was expected of social agencies and the society was assured by law of funds for this work.

In recent years, the concept has changed. Today the emphasis is on keeping a child in his own home with its parents to protect him from becoming neglected. This concept is acknowledged and accepted in law for The Child Welfare Act requires that a children's aid society must have among its objects the protection of children from neglect, but it—I refer to the Act—ignores completely the necessity for providing the funds with which to employ staff to do this work.

The child who is damaged by removing him from his parents can be maintained by

the society and funds for his maintenance come from the taxpayers. To finance a programme designed to make separation unnecessary—and this is surely best for the child—the society must rely on free will offerings from private sources. The government does subscribe some to this great work but the amount is so minute and insignificant, that it is hardly worthy of recognition.

A society with ten workers and a budget of roughly \$150,000 may qualify for about \$7,000. It is not only in the interest of economy but more important still in the interest of our most important asset, the children of our province, to plead for an immediate revision of the present system of determining the grants so that every society would be assured of obtaining from the provincial Treasury an amount sufficient to provide workers capable of giving the services the community needs.

Community needs are not being met now, nor will this be possible until our legislators adopt a more realistic attitude to the whole field of welfare. It could well be economically suicidal to continue as we have and until some action is taken to properly and adequately finance the services needed, we can expect the problems to increase and the cost to continue to increase.

There seems to be evidence, Mr. Chairman, on the part of the present government of a desire to eliminate or replace these societies which have been providing noteworthy services to every corner of this great province. A perusal of the legislative debates of Ontario readily establishes this. Press reports indicate that employees of this public welfare department have been responsible in more than one area of Ontario for creating unrest and disunity and discontent among the people and—if we are to believe our newspaper reports—this is still going on. And if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, to quote you from this article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of March 3, 1964, which is entitled, "Welfare Row in the Nickel Belt." I am not going to read this entire article but let me just take one paragraph, which says:

Rightly or wrongly some officials of the local children's aid society regard the plan for consolidation as the government's first step toward taking over the children's aid society itself.

Now I am sure the hon. Minister and his advisors have seen this article in the *Globe and Mail*.

Involved in this row, I think, are the International Nickel, the local welfare unit

and, of course, the children's aid society. Mr. Chairman, this is truly indicative of the government's attitude toward welfare. Its one purpose seems to be to control and to reduce costs. If needs are to be met these services must be maintained, and if services are to be maintained costs cannot be reduced. We need to direct our efforts towards making it financially possible for children's aid societies to expand their services in order that these may be met, for to ignore needs, or to refrain from attempting to meet needs can only mean greater costs in the long run.

The wellbeing of the children of Ontario is threatened because of present government attitudes. The only advocate a child has is our children aid society; any attempt to weaken this body or to force it out of existence will result in children suffering. We have what could be the best social legislation in the world. It is rendered useless and ineffective because the society required to effect the legislation is hamstrung because of lack of finances. As a result this fine legislation is little more than mere window dressing. We cannot adequately meet human needs by simply passing a law. We must give effect to our legislation as it relates to child and family services by making the necessary funds available to children's aid societies to do the job.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a breakdown and its effect on children is one of the worst blights on our Ontario society today. Worse still, little is being done to cope with the problem beyond what our children's aid societies are able to do on the little money they can beg from the public or squeeze out from the United Appeal funds. The need of our time is a truly independent, long-range examination of welfare in all its aspects with a view to determining needs and deciding how these needs can be best met.

Mr. Chairman, after this general statement may I ask the hon. Minister, through you, for an explanation of an item of \$20,000 for a demonstration project for preventive services to the city of Ottawa? I have just made a plea for local children's aid societies to obtain from the provincial Treasury an amount sufficient to provide workers capable of giving the services the community needs. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this sum of \$20,000, plus another substantial amount, should be granted to the city of Ottawa and county of Carleton Children's Aid Society, which is better equipped to render the preventive services than a newly organized group in the city's social service department.

Not only, Mr. Chairman, do I suggest an

increase in grants for preventive services to Ottawa, I feel that all societies in this province should get additional grants.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Racine: I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. members of this House, that over the years each dollar spent for preventive services has saved many dollars to this province and to the municipalities for the cost of caring for children.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the hon. Minister say that the Minister's committee will present its report within the next few months. At long last!

If I remember correctly, this committee has been appointed for over three years. I would like to say, however, that most people interested in child welfare in this province feel that this was not the type of committee that should have been appointed because of the danger of political interference. This leads me to think that this was the cause of the delay of the committee in completing its work.

May I also make a few comments on the adoption programme of this department over the past five years. I note with great interest the increase in adoptions during that period and I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister and his staff for this wonderful job done.

Now the hon. Minister mentioned the fact that a very complete programme of advertising in the newspapers of this province had brought on a very large increase in adoption. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to pay a tribute to voluntary organizations who have rendered a great service to this province in the last two years in respect of adoptions. I would like to praise the efforts of the Catholic Women's League, and La Fédération Des Femmes Canadiennes-Francaises, which have done such a tremendous job in reducing the number of Catholic children in the care of children's aid societies. I read in one of the Toronto newspapers that the Catholic Children's Aid Society of Toronto has not at this time any surplus of adoptable children. This is, Mr. Chairman, a tremendous improvement, because some years ago there were a number of children to be adopted by that society.

I can assure you also, Mr. Chairman, that the conditions in the Ottawa and Carleton county society have been considerably improved and are getting to a stage comparable to that of the Toronto society.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we owe a debt of

gratitude to these two organizations and I would suggest to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that these organizations be requested to carry on this work as a continuing project for the years to come. May I also suggest to the hon. Minister that an amount should be put in the estimates to cover the cost of pamphlets in both English and French in order to stimulate this programme of adoption.

In closing may I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that there is a need for a much larger number of qualified social workers in this province, and I only repeat what has been said by many of my confreres in this House. It seems to me that it is the responsibility of The Department of Public Welfare to see that facilities are created so as to permit the training of a much larger number of people to do the job in the welfare field.

However, I feel the grants mentioned in the estimates for the Toronto and St. Patrick schools of social work are very inadequate and I would suggest the entire programme of grants be reviewed in order to give these schools a larger amount that would permit them to do a more thorough job of preparing social workers so badly needed in this province.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to reassure the hon. member, as well as every hon. member of this House, as well as every children's aid society in Ontario. I said that two years ago, I repeated it last year and I repeat it now. It was never the intention of the department, and surely not my intention, to ever do away with the children's aid societies. They have done too much, a great job in this province, for us ever to do that. I can assure the hon. member that at least as long as I am Minister the children's aid societies will not be disbanded.

However, there might have been some who thought so, due to the fact we were going into the larger units that it would affect them. I thought it would really help them, and that they could help too in that particular sphere. So I can assure the hon. member that no such thing was or is contemplated.

Now the hon. member spoke about the protection services. I think this is the thing that is here now and it is really the thing for the future. As a matter of fact, I trust the report that will be submitted to me from the committee will have this as the feature of it, because I believe this is the best way of dealing with the problem we have in respect of children.

I did not get exactly what my friend meant by the committee being a political committee; it seems to me as I look at the names of those on this committee, that I cannot very well agree. I think we have a lot of experts, as for instance—if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give their names. The chairman is Mr. Charles Foster, the former commissioner of the civil service commission; Rev. Swithun Bowers, OMI, director of school of social welfare, St. Patrick's College; Mr. W. J. Griffiths, board of education, Port Arthur; Mr. Eric Hardy, consultant to municipalities; the hon. Charles McTague, former supreme court justice; Prof. John Morgan, school of social work; Mr. R. A. O'Brien, editor of the *Whig-Standard* of Kingston; Mr. J. C. Saddington, vice-president, Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies and Mr. R. J. Smith, commissioner of welfare housing, Metropolitan Toronto; Miss Bessie Touzel, executive director, Ontario Welfare Council; Mr. R. J. Whittington, director of Chatham Children's Aid Society; Mr. C. A. Whitman, former welfare administrator of Belleville, and Miss Doris E. Young, director of Welland Children's Aid Society.

I thought, Mr. Chairman, that this was certainly a well versed group and I can assure the hon. members that never at any time have I told them what I wanted. I am quite sure that they know their objectives were to study child welfare legislation, to study actual practices in the whole field of child welfare with specific attention to the children's aid society and to recommend to the Minister any legislative or practical changes on any matter relating to child welfare. It can be imagined that their field is completely open and I am quite sure that the knowledge of these people has been added to by all the people who have been before them. They have received many, many briefs from organizations, public and private, and I am sure all these organizations are at least concerned about the responsibility of child welfare. I am sure their treasury of information is great and that we can look forward to their recommendations. As I said, they were appointed in 1961, and that will be three years next May.

I would like to make a statement in respect to what my hon. friend has mentioned, Mr. Chairman, in respect of the city of Ottawa. I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Ottawa East will be pleased that we are making available to the social services of the department of the city of Ottawa, the sum of \$30,000. As a matter of fact, he has expressed that pleasure. This grant will be

for the purposes of a pilot project in which specialized services may be rendered on behalf of children for the prevention of child neglect. You will know that in a city as large as Ottawa, many cases come to the attention of the municipal social services department and in the nature of their work the staff has knowledge of these families and they benefit more or less from constant preventive services. Miss Amy Leigh—I hope I pronounce the name right—one of Canada's finest ladies in this field, when reporting on her study of the Ottawa social services department made the following remark and I quote:

In many cases known to our workers it is apparent that the children are not receiving the parental care, nurture and guidance from their parents to which they are entitled, either as human beings or in law. Our workers should know and work more closely with their families, spotting as early as possible the kinds of factors that could lead to neglect and delinquency and endeavour to prevent the family situation from deteriorating. This kind of service is not only time-consuming but requires knowledge and well developed skill.

This whole matter, Mr. Chairman, was discussed within our department along with Her Worship Mayor Charlotte Whitton, Miss Amy Leigh and the new welfare administrator for the city of Ottawa, Mr. Godfrey. It was agreed that the programme as presented by Miss Leigh would be a desirable venture for a one-year trial period. The amount of the grant that we are making available is to be met by the city of Ottawa, in acquiring specialized staff to deal with the necessary services for children and families who come to the attention of the social service department. I am certain that the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa will work with this group and that a favourable relationship will develop in this process of augmenting those services for children which are now carried out by the society itself.

I should just say in passing that the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa with almost 100 members of staff is responsible for the expenditure of upwards of \$1.5 million yearly with 92 per cent of that coming from public taxing sources. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that as to the expenses of the children's aid society, between 90 to 100 per cent of them came from public taxing sources. A per diem rate of \$2.91 is required to provide for a ward of the society. There are between 1,100 and

1,200 children in care, most of whom are placed in foster boarding homes. I am anticipating that the report from our advisory committee on child welfare will deal with the prevention services in particular. In the meantime this pilot venture in the city of Ottawa should be productive of good results in harmony with the work of the children's aid society. Also, the acquisition of special staff by the city of Ottawa for work in this area should go a long way toward relieving the need, as raised by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) the other day, for counselling services to families.

I should just repeat that in my view the whole community is responsible to a degree in giving what services are needed whether to a children's aid society, governmental unit, the churches or other private organizations, all of whom have knowledge of the families and the problems relating to children and their proper care.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my good hon. friend from Ottawa East appreciates that this is a pilot project and we hope that the results of it will be favourable and we can go from there. But I can assure the hon. member again that as long as I am standing here the children's aid societies of Ontario will remain children's aid societies.

Mr. Racine: I appreciate very much the answer that the hon. Minister has given to me. Now I still disagree about the opportunity of having this pilot project in Ottawa because I think that this is duplication of work by two bodies. I mean the children's aid society at the present time in Ottawa and in other areas is doing a very good job of prevention with the little amount of money that is being given by the department, by the municipalities, and I would say as a matter of fact that the largest amount that is being spent in Ottawa by the children's aid society comes from the community chest of Ottawa.

Now I am referring, Mr. Chairman, to the amount of money spent for preventive services. And I have here the figures of the amount of money that is being given by The Department of Public Welfare for 1963 for preventive services and it is \$34,211. Now the city of Ottawa provides the sum of \$12,000, county of Carleton, \$2,100, and the city of Eastview, \$1,000, which makes a total of a little less than \$50,000. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I have not got the total figures, but I would say that the preventive budget of the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa for 1963 amounted to somewhere in the vicinity of \$165,000, which means that

the public of Ottawa, the contributors to the community chest, have contributed well over 70 per cent of the cost of preventive services.

And I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate the fact that the total budget of the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa is close to \$1.5 million. Now, of course, we must appreciate the fact that the amount payable for the wards is statutory, we have no choice about it, we are just agents, the judge will make a child a ward of the society and the children's aid society will have to assume the responsibility for that child, will spend the money for its care and eventually will send the account to the municipality and the municipality in turn will get reimbursed for a certain proportion of it. But the point I would like to make is that we are not—and this is not only my feeling, Mr. Chairman, this is the feeling of anyone I have met over the years who was interested in children's aid society work—spending a sufficient amount for preventive services.

Going back to the pilot project in Ottawa, I appreciate the motivation behind this grant but I still feel that it is a duplication and that the children's aid societies, in Ottawa and other areas, might have done a better preventive job if they had been given that money.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that at this moment I can assure the hon. member that this is the information I have—and I think it is right—that from private sources, in the overall picture, preventive or otherwise, it is eight per cent. The rest of the society's funds—92 per cent—comes from public sources.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, as my friend, the hon. member for Ottawa East has said, the advertising programme carried out for the children's aid societies this year was quite successful. I understand, though, that the hon. Minister ran out of money and had to abandon the programme.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Whoever gave the hon. member that information misinformed him.

Mr. Troy: Well, it is very unfortunate, because she is a very fine social worker. I believe it was a Miss Charleston; is there a Miss Charleston in the hon. Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that there are two more advertisements going in in the next few weeks. There will be two this week, sir, and the programme is continuing. I can

assure the hon. member that we will not be stopped because of lack of funds; I do not think that is quite correct.

Mr. Troy: The hon. Minister will admit though that there was a hiatus anyway?

Mr. Thompson: I wonder: would the hon. Minister be good enough to clarify for us the grant to the retarded children, The Retarded Children's Act? Could he tell us just what he does with that grant; what is the purpose of it?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That subsidy is in the operation and maintenance and cost of the homes for retarded children; as you know, this is a new Act which was passed, I think, during the last session of Parliament. Is that what the hon. member wanted to know? This is not for capital monies, it is maintenance.

Mr. Thompson: Maintenance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes. There is one home, as you know, in the city of Toronto. The only thing I can say about others is that I am advised that others are developing; but what is in actual existence right now is one in the city of Toronto.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. Could I ask: Is the situation this? That a home is built for retarded children by the municipality, then it applies to the department for maintenance grants? Would the hon. Minister mind explaining it to me?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, this is a home built by private organizations. It might be an association of parents and teachers, or a social service club, or a group of people who are organized, or form themselves, into a legal group, so to speak. It is handled on the same basis as other charitable institutions.

Mr. Thompson: And why are these groups building homes for retarded children? Why are voluntary groups building homes for retarded children? Is it because we do not have government-sponsored homes for them, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think I can remember when this was passed, explaining to the best of my ability, which was not very good I suppose at the time in committee, that these homes were a sort of residential centre. As you know, in the province of Ontario, in some places, there are classrooms for retarded children supported by the local board of The Department of Education. Then there are

these groups of boys and girls who could be taught something, if it is only a way of tying their shoelaces. They can be taught something and should stay at home. Others cannot stay at home and cannot go anywhere; medically speaking; they have to be sent to an Ontario hospital.

There was the in-between group, those who could not stay home because of family conditions. They could not stay at home, because of other conditions, but at the same time they could be taught something. These homes would be more or less like a residence for those children who could not stay in their own home but could learn something—a sort of a school residence. That was sponsored by the parent groups in the different municipalities.

There is no restriction as to whether it can be operated by any municipality or by any group, as long as they can get together as such. It is really the local branch associations which operate day schools for retarded children. As well as the day school, this provides a residence also for these children.

I hope I have made myself clear on this.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I appreciate it. The point I am making is: How many municipalities have such homes?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: So far I am advised, Mr. Chairman, and I stated it just a moment ago, the city of Toronto is the only place where there is one. We have had discussion with some other municipalities, but there is definitely no other in operation, except the one in the city of Toronto.

Mr. Thompson: I would suggest that there must be a real need for this type of home. I know, for myself, that in my own riding, the problem of getting retarded children into Orillia. It is only through the good services of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) that, in two cases, it has been possible to get a situation alleviated for a family and have the unfortunate child placed in Orillia.

I understand this is, unfortunately, a widespread situation. These are not children who would go to Orillia; but there are children—I am sure there are many such cases—who cannot possibly stay in the home and yet are not ready to go to the institution.

I feel that this is a real social need. It would seem to me that if the only such operation which is getting help from you is the operation in Toronto, then there should be a very real question asked. Why are there not, in other municipalities, applications for such

help from you? Could you tell us if you have had applications from other municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can say is that the legislation is there, and we try to encourage it; but, certainly, I cannot force it on the people there. I can say that, in my own area, my own home town, there is now a group discussing this very seriously. They might have a home in the next year or so. It is my sincere hope they do. The Act is there, and it is available to any of these groups which want to use it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, through you: Is the grant to an employee, or to the children's aid society for an employee, at the level of \$100 a month at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: For prevention—

Mr. S. Lewis: For prevention.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: For protection, yes!

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes. And has it been that way since 1956 without change?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, Mr. Chairman!

Mr. S. Lewis: In view of the fact of the very cogent case placed before this Legislature by the hon. member for Ottawa East, and in view of the desperate needs in this area—not to mention the rising cost of living—does it not make sense for the government to revise such contributions to the children's aid society once in an eight-year period?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As I stated a moment ago in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that this would be a feature of the report I hope to get, and my recommendation would be forthcoming.

Mr. S. Lewis: We will look forward to the recommendation in the next session.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Do we always have to get something in?

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask the hon. Minister—regardless of the submission of the report, I am sure we are all inclined to feel that it is too late—can this Legislature expect a specific increase for children's aid society work?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can say to the hon. member for Scarborough West is that I hope I can do

that as well as he expects, because I believe, along with him, that it deserves being looked at.

Mr. S. Lewis: May we know?—I would like to follow it through, Mr. Chairman, because I am fascinated by this point—might the hon. Minister inform the Legislature where the delay lies? I again refer you to the report of your department, page 13: there were 186 children studied and only one out of six, I believe, were placed in permanent foster homes. One out of every three could anticipate being placed in five or six homes.

The committee has been sitting for three years, and for three more years we have been allowing irreparable damage to the lives of young children. One of the problems is that the children's aid society does not have enough money to function. One therefore asks, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the hon. Minister's own study already completed, on the basis of his own sentiments, on the basis of what is likely to be contained in the advising committee report, why can we not now have the increment? Where is the impasse?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The only answer I can give to this, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this is an all-encompassing report.

Our committee has been sitting for two years, or two-and-a-half years. What is the matter with it, why has it not reported? I am quite sure that it is because it might have to take the time to hear these presentations. These people are not sitting every day in the week. They sit once a month and hear these representations and then they have to study and digest them and, I suppose, make their recommendations. I am hoping that it will be an all-encompassing thing.

The hon. member is asking me why I do not do this and why I do not do that. If I had intended to do these things on my own I would not have had that committee; but I want to have a good picture. As far as irreparable damage is concerned, I never believe anything is irreparable in this way.

Mr. S. Lewis: I had not intended to intervene again, but I shall now intervene because if the hon. Minister does not think that there is irreparable emotional damage to young children moved time and time again from foster home to foster home, then I suggest to you that something is profoundly wrong in your thinking.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I have been one of the first ones to deplore that.

But then as I have said again and again, I would only hope that all is not contingent on the department in this regard. After all, we have many good public bodies like the children's aid societies and that sort of thing. I am not blaming the children's aid societies any more than I would be blaming any other group in this matter, but this is also a very pertinent question. I do not believe there is completely irreparable damage, to use that expression, but there is one place where I agree with you, it could cause damage, that is true. I hope we will find something in that report which will not only guide the department, but will also guide the children's aid societies and other people dealing with children.

This is one aspect, I agree with you, that is very deplorable.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to clear my statement about the committee. I have not said, and I did not intend to say, that this was a political committee, but I said that I deplored the fact, and I am not the only one that does, of the type of committee. I think another type of committee might have performed much quicker and brought in a report much quicker than it did, because on that committee I had several very close personal friends and I do not want to let anybody think that I implied those people were appointed because of their political faith.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister just one question and perhaps this might be answered in the report of the committee. What is being done about the placing of hard-to-place children? And I think you know what I mean, Mr. Chairman, I mean children of mixed racial origin and other children, maybe crippled children. Now I know those children are very hard to place and perhaps the considerable amount of money that we have to spend for the upkeep of children in this province comes from those children, that particular class of children.

Now, if I could make a suggestion to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps we should think in terms of giving a grant to a family that would adopt that kind of child. From my experience in the past, sir, those children have been placed in foster homes and the people have been very happy to accept those children. Now, what I mean is that it might be possible to reduce considerably in this province the number of children that are thus placed, if the adopting parents were given a grant from the department for a period of time, in order to reduce the number of those children.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Chairman, my only answer to this is that all our advertising has been slanted to that very point, the hard-to-place children. The other idea that the hon. member has expressed is certainly an idea but at the same time it seems to me that if I should adopt a child, I want to assure the children's aid society, and I am sure the children's aid society would request, that the child has got a good home, that it should be maintained properly with all the amenities of life, whatever those might be.

Now, I am not suggesting that the idea is wrong, but I would not like to receive something to do what I consider is my bounden duty to do.

Mr. Racine: Well, I would like the hon. Minister to give it a thought, Mr. Chairman, and I think his advisers, his professional staff, might find a lot of value in this suggestion.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, under The Department of the Provincial Secretary, I brought up the question of birth certificates for children who were adopted, children who were born in England, and I did not get anywhere, but I understand that the director of the department of child welfare feels along with others, that just a simple amendment to the regulations would serve the purpose. You do not have to worry about getting in touch with the British authorities, all you have to know is as long as the Minister has a certificate to show that a child was born at such and such a place on such and such a day, whether it was England, Ireland, Scotland or Wales, it is just a simple matter to issue a certificate in the name of the adopting parents as is done in this province already for children born in Ontario. Would the hon. Minister discuss that with his director of the child welfare branch and also, then, with the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko)?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a point I wish to raise, perhaps you will not wish to call it for the present, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: It is now six of the clock. I will now leave the chair and we will resume at eight of the clock.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the hon. Prime Minister, will there be a Budget debate tonight?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Chairman. When we complete these estimates, I would like to take some of the bills that are in the committee stage tonight.

I want to get them through the committee stage, third reading stage and I would like to get Royal Assent to some of the bills that have been fully processed before we rise tomorrow. So this evening—

Mr. MacDonald: He is suggesting we will not get through these estimates tonight.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I am flexible. I will be ready whenever you finish.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister, is it the intention to sit tomorrow morning?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. My intention is to sit at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon and I would think the Lieutenant-Governor will be available at approximately 5 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 24, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, continued 1957

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1983

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

(continued)

On vote 1802:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I will bow to the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) who wanted to continue a point, if he can gradually incline himself toward his seat, which I believe he has now accomplished.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I brought up a problem to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) with regard to adoptions of youngsters who are born in other lands, particularly in the British Isles.

Now, as you know, sir, The Department of Public Welfare has carried on for some time, a series of advertisements naming youngsters for adoption and it has been before the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko), but it went nowhere with him and I understand from someone who is very interested that the director of the department of child welfare feels that an amendment can be made to the regulations. All that is necessary is that the place is known, and to have a certificate certifying the birthplace of the child and its birth date, and then a birth certificate can be issued in the name of the adoptive parents.

I know that the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) is quite concerned about this problem and I think that if the hon. Minister can get together with the members of his department, particularly experts in child welfare, and with The Department of the Provincial Secretary, particularly the branch of vital statistics, that such an amendment can be made. I do not think it is too serious a problem, according to my best information.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the law of Ontario does recognize the adoption here of a child coming from the British

Isles. Unfortunately, the vice versa does not exist and we have made requests to have that passed but so far we have not been successful.

Mr. Troy: I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, even to take it up with the authorities in the British Isles; you have the certificate in front of you that says that the child was born at a certain place at a certain time. It shows the names of the real parents, certainly the mother, and then that certificate can be issued just as now, I understand, in Ontario, the child is allowed to have a birth certificate in the name of the adoptive parents.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I will certainly look into it again but I am told the problem is really the English law and not the law here.

Section 77 of The Child Welfare Act reads thus:

Every person heretofore adopted under the laws of Ontario and every person adopted under the laws of any other province or territory of Canada or under the laws of any other country shall for all purposes in Ontario be governed by this part.

Which we recognize.

Mr. Troy: I see that, sir. Perhaps with the amount the hon. Minister has been granted for travelling expenses, he might go across to the British Isles and clean this thing up.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to renew a subject that we were on a little earlier this afternoon, when we were discussing the irreparable emotional and psychological harm to children. In fact it was the hon. Minister himself who admitted it to be deplorable, in which case I suggest that his department or his ministry is subject to deplorable practices because wherever one turns in the child welfare area, one finds a pattern of neglect. Neglect, not consciously on the part of the people administering the department, neglect not consciously on the part of children's aid societies, but neglect with respect to the finances available to do the job.

I want to demonstrate yet another aspect of this. In the very field of emotional disturbance we were discussing, Mr. Chairman, institutional care for emotionally disturbed children is estimated to be running as high as \$6,500 a year for treatment. I am quoting now from the needs and resources study for Metropolitan Toronto. Now the per diem cost that the department subsidizes under The Children's Institutions Act runs as high as \$4 a day and as low as \$2 a day, and at the very top amounts to no more than 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the cost to service emotionally disturbed children.

I reminded the hon. Minister last week that there were 44 such institutions looking after such children apart from the children's aid society. I simply ask the hon. Minister how does he justify the financial grants made in this area, let alone the area of children's aid societies, when coping with emotionally disturbed children.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am not disagreeing with my hon. friend in this respect except that I would like to point out that most of these cases are children's aid cases where they are paid 100 per cent. For the others—I suppose I did not mention that—the \$4 that you mention is correct but that is also being adjusted to a higher amount. Exactly when it will be set up I cannot tell you at the present moment, but it is being adjusted and looked at right now. As far as most of the cases are concerned, they are under children's aid supervision.

Mr. S. Lewis: I want to pursue two points, Mr. Chairman. Suppose it was adjusted beyond the wildest expectations of this Legislature and it was doubled to \$8. We would then be providing something like \$2,920 a year for care for emotionally disturbed children which is estimated to cost \$6,500 a year. So the government will still not be contributing even one-half the cost—and that is at the upper limits of the scale. At the lower limit of the scale you still would not be providing one-quarter of the cost and yet the hon. Minister described the harm done emotionally and psychologically to children as “deplorable.”

I suggest that there is some kind of inconsistency there, in the thinking of the hon. Minister. I want to go further. The hon. Minister constantly says that the children's aid societies receive 100 per cent. Since the three divisions under The Children's Institutions Act—I think they are divided into A, B and C categories; there is one, I believe, under a D category—come within the pur-

view of The Department of Public Welfare, could you tell me, sir, how many children are in those 44 institutions? You probably have that figure.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do not know whether I mentioned the 44, but if I did, I made a mistake, it is not 44 but 21.

An hon. member: The hon. Minister told me there were eight institutions for emotionally disturbed children.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I have the number of institutions; there are 12, eight and one. The one is for highly emotionally disturbed children. There are 21 altogether.

Mr. S. Lewis: Perhaps the hon. Minister could explain to me—I am reading from the *Ontario Gazette*, November 2, 1963, Children's Institutions Act, Regulations. There are four schedules involved. Under schedule one there are 23 homes. Under schedule two there are 12; under schedule three there are five; under schedule four there is one. My mathematics frequently are not excellent but I count that as 44.

The degree of emotional disturbance varies, I fully recognize that but I do not think that is the point at issue. All these homes look after young people with some kind of social disturbance or another; I wonder how many young people are looked after by these 44 institutions presently registered under the regulations of an Act within the hon. Minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Schedule one here deals with the organizations as such and then the institutions operated in two, three and four schedules.

Mr. S. Lewis: I will balance it and eliminate schedule one. Could the hon. Minister tell me how many children fall within schedules two, three and four? As you know, forms are filled out in triplicate, answering some 25 questions every month for renewed grants so the department certainly knows which children are looked after. Has the hon. Minister a figure?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I have not got that figure but I can get it for the hon. member if he wishes to have it. But I do not have it here with me now.

Mr. S. Lewis: I will say to the hon. Minister that, frankly, I am amazed. It makes debate rather difficult because my suspicion, Mr. Chairman, is that when there are as many

problems of emotional disturbance as industrial society produces, an accelerating number—whether it is under my estimate of 44 or under the hon. Minister's estimate of 21—working under an Act administered by the department, then obviously we are dealing with a large group of young people who desperately need trained psychiatric and social care, and who are receiving a per diem allowance from this government which simply is not sufficient. I would certainly appreciate knowing precisely how many young people are being thus discriminated against.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will try to get these figures as soon as I can. If I can get them tonight I will, but I do not have them with me right now.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, if I could follow up on this again. I have listened with much interest, and I congratulate my hon. colleague in that he got some form of information from the hon. Minister. What seemed to be rather amusing was that he got different information from that given to me by the hon. Minister, when I asked the same question on the estimates on March 18, 1964.

I asked the hon. Minister how many institutions catered to the emotionally disturbed child. At that time the hon. Minister told me there were eight. I then asked what kind of staff there was; and after a great deal of difficulty the hon. Minister told me he could not get information on that. I am afraid, sir, that I have no alternative but to say, when a Minister comes with his estimates, when he fumbles around and tells us he does not know the number of institutions to which children—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): You said that last night.

Mr. Thompson: I said the same thing last night, and I will say it again and again about this government. It seems to me there is a complete indifference to the civil rights of the people, in connection with their welfare. If the hon. Minister of Mines wants to sit there cynically, and laugh and joke at this kind of situation, I say the hon. Minister is welcome to continue doing it; because, with another election coming, this kind of arrogance is going to be considered by the people of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I am coming again to this: When a Minister comes into this House—I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.

Robarts)—and we ask him about the institutions for which he has an Act which is meant to govern their standards, when we ask him for the number of institutions, we get two different replies from the estimates. We ask him for the number of qualified staff and he is unable to answer. Then when we ask for the number of children, again he cannot answer. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that his hon. Minister is inadequate.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why did not the hon. member vote for the non-confidence this afternoon?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am informed there are between 800 and 900 children there. About 90 per cent of them are under child welfare, under the children's aid society.

Mr. S. Lewis: What is the figure?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Between 800 and 900. It varies between 800 and 900. At the moment I would suggest it would be about 835 to 840.

Mr. S. Lewis: Out of the 21 institutions?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Twenty-one institutions. Then we have now got a figure of 840 children, each needing, on the average, \$6,500 worth of highly specialized care per year and being provided, by this department at the uppermost limit, with \$1,420 and at the lowest limit, \$710. I say to the hon. Minister: I am not interested in pronouncing on his adequacy or inadequacy—I think our group made that clear in its motion this afternoon. But I say to the hon. Minister that this is an intolerable situation which cannot be allowed to continue. It is not enough to give us assurances that reports will be coming down. It is necessary, even if by order-in-council, to do something about it, and to do it now.

Vote 1802 agreed to.

On vote 1803:

Mr. Thompson: I recall, when we had asked questions about the day nurseries branch in the estimates last year, that when we looked at the sum which was being given by the government to the running of this branch—and I notice that this year it is \$290,000—we asked what kind of standards are demanded by the government when they

give this grant to the day nurseries branch. I again ask the hon. Minister, because we did not get an answer last year: what kind of standards, with respect to staff, is required before grants are given to the day nurseries branch?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would point out—if the hon. member will allow me to tell him first of all—that I do not know if he asked this in his question, but I remember it was asked last year. In Toronto there are nine units, plus the co-operative nursery at Regent Park. It seems to me I recall, last year, that I said the standards were set out in the regulations. I do not know if my hon. friend would wish me to read these regulations here.

Mr. Thompson: Let me specify more. I am asking with respect to staff. What kind of qualifications must the staff have in connection with day nurseries?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: All right. A supervisor of a day nursery shall be a person who (a)—and this is written in the regulations—is sympathetic to the welfare of children; (b) has a specialized knowledge of and adequate experience in preschool methods of child guidance; and (c) is suitable in point of age, health and personality to occupy the position.

Additional supervisory staff, with specialized knowledge and adequate experience in methods of child guidance, shall be appointed. The number of staff in each day nursery shall be set out as it is set out herein in the columns, in the schedules shown as 2, 3, and 4—for the times set out in those columns, for the number of children respectively, and their ages as set out in column 1. Would the hon. member care to have the schedule also?

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that very much, sir. Could the hon. Minister tell me if any of the day nurseries, to which you give grants, falls below the standard of staff set out in the Act?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: You will understand, Mr. Chairman, that we do not give assistance to all these nurseries. We license them and supervise them. I am referring especially to those where we share half the cost with the municipalities; those are the public ones as we know them.

Mr. Thompson: My question is: In connection with your staff, are any of them not up to the staff requirements that you require?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am assured, Mr. Chairman, that the person who deals with that,

and inspects those day nurseries, says they are well staffed; and that the people in there are proper, fit and experienced people to be in those particular places.

Mr. Thompson: As far as you are concerned then, sir, all of them have staffs which are competent and up to the standards according to the Act?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As far as I am informed, yes.

Mr. Thompson: I asked you, sir, in connection with day nurseries: Is it your policy to promote day nurseries or not, in industrial centres?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Oh, yes, very much so.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask you how you promote day nurseries? The policy? Could you tell us how you promote that policy?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There are many ways you can go into that, either from the departmental point of view or in relation to the staff who work in the different welfare offices in the city and in the different areas—the cities, the towns, the villages—whoever may take advantage of that opportunity.

At the same time, we also meet regularly with the supervisors we have in the field—in the 17 regional areas we cover—plus the field workers that do that work. This, I am sure, is recommended and dealt with, through the different private groups in the city and in the town. As far as newspaper advertising is concerned, I do not think we have any in that respect.

Mr. Thompson: Then could I ask, sir, how many—in view of this aggressive approach you are taking to promote day nurseries—could you tell us how many you gave grants to last year and how many this year?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As far as I can see from what I have here on this year and last year, I do not think there were any additions.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): After all that aggressive programme I thought you would have made progress.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I might tell my hon. friend that we are one of the very few areas in North America where you have this programme and I think it is working pretty well.

Mr. Singer: No, but the hon. Minister was telling us what an aggressive programme he has, how progressive he is and his depart-

ment is. We would have thought, quite innocently, Mr. Chairman, without trying to embarrass the hon. Minister at all, that there would have been a substantial increase.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The hon. member is starting to get tired!

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister will have his turn, Mr. Chairman. I do not think it will come until after Easter, but we are waiting for him. We will get him later. Tonight, we have got the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

I would like to know what progress you are making?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I might advise the hon. member for Downsview, and I appreciate his question, this is strictly a programme which is initiated by the municipalities, which we help by paying 50 per cent of their costs. I am not establishing the projects, but the municipalities are.

Mr. Singer: I thought you said you were giving policy leadership?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. Singer: Well, you are not giving leadership if you are not making progress.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I just make a final point on this, sir?

I appreciate the conflict you had in your opening remarks on the estimates. You say you had a question with respect to day nurseries, that these day nurseries may cause mothers to give up their responsibility in the home. You said in your opening remarks, sir, that you thought establishing day nurseries might mean that mothers might leave their homes, put their children into the day nursery and neglect their homes. Obviously, sir, from your remarks tonight, you have resolved that problem in your own mind. You have decided on an aggressive policy to promote more day nurseries.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I am a firm believer, I think I stated that in my opening remarks, I still believe that the home is the best place for any child.

I do not know what my hon. friend means by promoting this. We are. I do not know how better I can promote it than by telling the municipalities that we pay 50 per cent

of their costs and all they have to do is to establish these day nurseries where they are needed.

I wish to correct one figure, however, Mr. Chairman, that I gave a moment ago. I do not know what the number was, but the total number of day nurseries that we have now is 30.

Mr. S. Lewis: Thirty day nurseries under provincial subsidy?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Those are the public nurseries, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, I suspect a quiet little basic attitude crept out when the hon. Minister said that he thought the best place was in the home. I do not think that anyone here would deny that that may be valid. But unfortunately, there are other factors involved.

In his departmental reports, I am sorry to bring the hon. Minister back to that so often, but in the report from his deputy Minister, the deputy Minister points out that 30 per cent of the work force are now women—692,000 in the work force in Ontario. He also points out, and I quote him now:

These day nurseries provide an essential service; and even greater facilities, particularly in the public field, seem to be desirable.

Now there is the recommendation from the department, but we find that in a full year between 1963 and 1964 not a single day nursery has apparently been possible, although it seemed to be possible by the department. Then on page 100 of the needs and resources study of Metropolitan Toronto you have, after a careful analysis of the needs of mothers to deposit children during the day when they are at work, this paragraph:

The lack of day care services for children of working mothers and incapacitated mothers, particularly in areas outside of the city, was emphasized as a most serious problem by public departments, child placement, and family counselling agencies.

Now I say to the hon. Minister that his programme may not yet be comparable to the trade crusade, but it does not even begin to be comparable to the most modest methods and efforts that are necessary to bring day care nurseries into existence.

In Metropolitan Toronto, out of 33 nurseries in operation, either public or private, only eight of them have any provincial

subsidy whatsoever, because unfortunately the promotion of which the hon. Minister speaks is apparently non-existent. Moreover, the balance between the city and the suburbs is completely out of kilter. There is a vastly greater number of children in the suburban areas with very few day care nurseries under provincial subsidy. There are smaller numbers in the city of Toronto, and yet there are a larger number of day care centres under provincial subsidy.

Not only is there an overall lack but there is a totally disproportionate weight of service offered from area to area. I suggest to the hon. Minister that his contention that they are doing something about the promotion of day nurseries is completely without foundation.

I want to go one step further, Mr. Chairman. Again, it is without foundation on the basis of his own department. It is inconceivable to me how we stand here day after day on the welfare estimates and hear words from the hon. Minister completely contradicting the words of his own specialists and his own consultative agencies.

Earlier this afternoon we mentioned Miss Elsie Stapleford who is head of day nurseries in the province. In a *Toronto Globe and Mail* article on January 31 of this year, Miss Elsie Stapleford is quoted as saying that the United States has had successful results in attracting and maintaining married nurses by a day nursery programme and she spoke to a Mrs. Bowskill, who was later quoted in the same article, a private day nursery operator who also wished to promote this programme.

So far, they have gotten nowhere, nowhere at all. The department has not been of any use to them whatsoever and apparently the hospitals have not agreed with them. It strikes me as something of an anomaly, with the critical nursing shortage in the province, that the hon. Minister cannot see this as a way of solving the problem.

We had a lengthy debate under the estimates of The Department of Health on the nursing shortage. Here, in conjunction with his hon. colleague, is one of the hon. Minister's answers: "Day nurseries in hospitals would provide ways and means of attracting married nurses back into the profession. It has been accurately estimated by Miss Stapleford, no less an authority, that it would take \$12,000 a year, including staff and space, for 25 children."

Where is the promotion, I ask the hon. Minister, that the department has been making? Where are the plans the hon. Minister has?

And what about day nurseries in industry, which is an integral part of the United States day nursery programme? Where is the promotion? What plans does the department have?

How can the hon. Minister come forward time and again and discuss programmes, suggest they are adequate and run directly counter to his own departmental assessments? I say it is a continuing anomaly that is totally unacceptable to this side of the House.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under the day nursery branch. About six months ago I had a request from the priest of St. Angela's Italian Roman Catholic church in my own community for information as to the setting up of a day nursery. Now the Italian community is fairly large and as a result the good priest thought it would be in the best interest of the community to set up some type of facility where the working mother would have some place to put the children for the day. I was in contact with the deputy Minister and he most kindly did accommodate me with the information.

However, I still understand that there are no grants made available at all to a church organization running a day nursery. Now, they may have proper staff, they may have proper facilities, but because they are a so-called private group, am I right in assuming that there are no grants available to them?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No grants. Just to the public nurseries.

Mr. Newman: Well, would this not be a good place where grants could be made available? Here a facility in a much needed type of service is being rendered not only to the working mother but to the community at large, and I think that the department should give serious consideration. It is a religious organization, it is not a money-making organization. Were it a private one interested solely in what it could make out of the operation of a day nursery, I could understand the retention of grants, but here you have a church organization that is doing probably the best type of work you could possibly imagine in the day nursery field and I think the government should seriously consider some type of assistance to them. This type of work among the church groups should be encouraged.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, what is the attitude of the department in this regard: In adoption

procedures, what is the primary factor that should be followed?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, there are many. I suppose one is through the courts, one is through agreements with the children's aid society and, as the hon. member knows, a probation period exists which works both ways, for the child and for the parent. I guess the final order is made after the investigation of the parents. Age is also a factor and there are many factors which are involved in this for the protection of the child. The adopting parent is given that certain limit of time to make up its mind if he will adopt a child and I suppose to consider the health, either the mental or physical health of the child. I do not know what else the hon. member would like me to tell him, but adoption is finally concluded by a court order.

Mr. Troy: Well, apparently the hon. Minister has skirted around the point entirely.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member is speaking on vote 1802.

Mr. Troy: I am speaking on child welfare.

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 1803.

Mr. Troy: Oh, pardon me, I am sorry. I have been in another nursery then.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): I have a question, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) have told us about the housing development proposed for the Thistletown area.

Could the hon. Minister tell us whether or not any day nursery is proposed for the housing development in Thistletown if and when the development is completed? I am thinking more of the need for a day nursery for working mothers among the people who will be living there.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am not aware, Mr. Chairman, that we have any proposal from Thistletown at the present time. I would suggest—and I agree with the hon. member that it would be a very good idea—that the hon. member contact us in regard to this matter. There is one nursery I think, at Regent's Park.

Mr. Braithwaite: I will pursue it a step further then. I did not hear the last part of the hon. Minister's answer.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Pardon?

Mr. Braithwaite: I did not hear the last portion of the hon. Minister's answer. The location that he has in mind.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I said if we receive a request from there I am sure we will go along with it. If there is a request, we certainly will go along with it.

Mr. Braithwaite: I thank the hon. Minister very much. I will make certain a request is made.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the hon. Minister's advisory committee is going to be making some reports on the day nurseries aspect of child welfare, too. Am I correct?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: This is a good question. I only hope that they do because they have the whole gamut to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, with the hon. Minister I hope that they do, too, but in that connection then, may I raise this question going back to this committee and its all-important approach to the various aspects of children's needs? There is no vote at all in this year's estimates for the work of this committee. What is the explanation for that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The only explanation I can give to the hon. member for York South is that there is only one meeting left and we felt there was no necessity to have anything in the estimates for this particular vote. The only thing to be done now is the writing of the report. The committee will not be sitting any more.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the committee's work through or is the money through?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, no, the money is not through, the work is through.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the hon. Minister says the money is not through. At the end of the year there is at least one more meeting, they have a very important job of producing the committee's report and there is not another vote. Can the hon. Minister comment or give any explanation for that kind of situation?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The only thing, Mr. Chairman, that I can answer is that there was no request for any other monies to be spent. The report is now being put into book form and into recommendation form and that is all there is to do. There is nothing to do any further, there are no discussions to

be had any more. Just the fact of writing the report.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment on what the hon. Minister has said now that I have gotten this far. He said there is one more meeting. I am not in a position to argue whether there is one more meeting or not, but there is certainly the writing of the report, which would seem to me, after the meeting, is going to be one of the most important aspects of the committee's work and yet we have no more money in this vote.

After three years one is almost forced to come to the conclusion that this department is frustrating rather than assisting the work of this committee. Indeed, I will go one step further, from sources that I have every reason to believe are reliable, it has been put in just these terms: That the money is cut off though the work is not finished. Now, what does the hon. Minister say to that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: My information, Mr. Chairman, from the chairman of the committee—it has never been shown to me that there was any frustration anywhere, and this matter of the last meeting here was just to finish what had been commenced and handed over to the department for purposes of revision. Certainly the chairman would have advised me if it had been a fact that there was anything—

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon, who is the chairman?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The chairman is Mr. Foster, C. J. Foster.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. I just reiterate I have every reason to believe that my information is correct, that the money is cut off so the job is not finished. Indeed, the report is not yet written. Now, if this is co-operation on the part of the Ministry in getting a report that he himself has led us to believe he is almost desperately waiting for so that he can frame his policy, it strikes me as being a very strange kind of co-operation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in this research and the statement of the hon. Minister that the work of the committee is over. I would be most interested if he could give us tonight some of the statistics which the committee has advised him about day nurseries. He told the hon. member for Etobicoke that if there was a request from Thistletown he would be very happy to co-operate in establishing a day

nursery in Thistletown. He also said, as I understood it, that there was one in Regent's Park.

What are the criteria? Do you have an analysis of economic levels, of income levels? Do you have an analysis of family size, or income earning ability, or the fact that the husband and wife are employed? What sort of statistics has your committee advised you about, insofar as day nurseries are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the only thing that I can say, in answer to the hon. member for Downsview, is to read to him section 2 of The Day Nurseries Act:

The council of a city, town, village, or township may by a by-law provide for the establishment of day nurseries for the care and feeding of young children. A by-law passed under section 1 may provide for the establishment of day nurseries directly by the municipality or by an organization named in the by-law and approved by the Minister; but in either event in order to qualify for a grant under this Act the council of the municipality must be responsible for the efficient and satisfactory operation thereof, and for furnishing such reports and other information as required.

Mr. Singer: I thank the hon. Minister for refreshing my memory as to the provisions of the Act, but I think most hon. members are familiar with the provisions. But I had understood the hon. Minister to say that substantial research had gone on, and I would like to have him relate that research to the Act, and tell us what the result of that research has been.

An hon. member: I would like to know what research has got to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Research was made, Mr. Chairman, by the municipality. They are the ones who pass the by-laws. If they feel that there is a need to do something a proposal is submitted to us. They show us the need, and that is all we have to know.

Mr. Singer: But the hon. Minister was telling us that he has devoted substantial dollars to research, and that he is advised as to the district into which he should go. I wanted him to relate the results of that research to these centres.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is what we do.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I give up.

Mr. S. Lewis: I, like the hon. member for Dovercourt, am becoming more and more

puzzled by the proliferation of study and research which seems to have no definition.

In the deputy Minister's report it says, under day nurseries expansion—and I appeal for an explanation:

A study will be commencing shortly which will give greater understanding in creating additional facilities, particularly in areas where women represent a high percentage of the work force.

A study will be commencing shortly!

I take it, since this is brought in under day nursery expansion, that this is not the study of the Minister's advisory committee on child welfare. It must be a separate study; and, if so, has the study begun? The report was for 1961-62. If the study has begun, when will the report be given? If it has begun, who are the personnel engaged in the study? And which study?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Proliferation—that is a good word, too.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I stated a moment ago to the hon. member for York South that I did not know that was in the report. I hope they have a look at it, too. As I say again I do not know why the hon. member insists upon pinpointing a department of research, as such, in The Department of Public Welfare. This research is carried on daily, if I may use that expression, by the head of each branch of the department and, indeed, by all members in this respect.

Any findings which are made are related immediately to those concerned; and I am sure they are acted upon. That is one of the reasons why there are amendments made to the Act at times, and one of the results of the study is the introduction, as you may recall, of the amendments to the Act which provided for day nursery care to be extended to school children, especially in the area where there are working mothers.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am sorry to pursue it, Mr. Chairman. I take it then that this is a separate ongoing study within the day nurseries branch of the department. Am I right in thinking that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: You are right in thinking that.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right. If that is so, is it a study in the vernacular only, in the sense that there will never be a report, or is it study, which is what study implies; a study

in which some substantive material will be produced?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There is no study, in regard to what you say, from which a report will be brought forward; but, as I stated a moment ago, there is a continual study. If it is found that there are reasons for amelioration, that is done, but as for a study which will bring forth a report upon a certain specific area, there is no such thing.

Mr. S. Lewis: There is no such study. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, nonetheless the study within the day nurseries branch indicated that children up to the age of nine should now be covered—so I gathered from the amending legislation he introduced this session.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Has not the continuing study in the department suggested the day nursery facilities should be extended?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am sorry, but up to the present moment this has been done for children up to the age of nine; which we believe, at the present moment, at least with the results that we have, is the age to which it should be extended. That was the recommendation to the study made for us by those who are in the field, and who understand it. Do you mean we should go further, to the age of 10, 11 or 12, or what?

Mr. S. Lewis: I am now referring to facilities themselves—day nursery facilities—greater provincial subsidization, greater provincial promotion, and a greater establishment of these day nurseries. I appreciate the amending legislation, and I commend the hon. Minister on it. It was desperately needed. But I think an even greater need is the need for more day nurseries. I am curious about the ongoing study features of any of these departments, frankly, Mr. Chairman.

For instance, under salaries, in the day nursery branch, there is an item of \$29,000. Can I ask the hon. Minister how many people that embraces?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Six people.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, then we have six people to administer a major government branch throughout the entire province; am I correct in that? I think one draws three obvious conclusions, Mr. Chairman: First, it is impossible to do adequate promotion with six people in this kind of a project; second, it is impossible to have adequate ongoing research with six people at the centre; and third, Mr.

Chairman, it is impossible for the government to persuade us that the day nurseries branch is taken very seriously when this, in fact, is the condition.

Vote 1803 agreed to.

On vote 1804:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in knowing—could I ask this question just at the start, sir? Does the hon. Minister believe that his staff should have the highest possible qualifications, and be given every opportunity of training?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister does. Thank you. Could I ask then, under the field service branch, what facilities are offered the staff in order that they can get such training?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, there is naturally what we call in-service training for staff. But I would like to read what I have here. Field workers have to be carefully chosen; we find some who prove quite unsuitable, or who will not remain. They have to have good health, alertness and a deep sense of responsibility. Applicants for the position are first required to write an aptitude test which serves as an effective preliminary screening. Following this, the candidate writes a three-hour examination, which over the years has proved its worth in selection of the right person. When these necessary barriers are passed, the candidates take a six-week training course, sir, at departmental expense. This course includes further examination and reports. The new field worker is then assigned to a regional office on a probationary basis, and supervised for a time by a senior member of the staff, and at the end of this training period we know the person well, and the person knows the job.

I might add that there are no hard-and-fast age limits. Persons over 25 have, of course, acquired the more mature attitude desirable but we feel it is usually not advisable for those over the age of 45 to start in this work.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Now what about the question of the hon. member for Dovercourt?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The civil service commission decided that senior matriculation is the minimum degree of education for prospective field workers. If advertising in the area to be served fails to locate a suitable person with senior matriculation then the junior matricula-

tion is acceptable. Those are the educational standards they have to start with. I hope that answers the question the hon. member put.

Mr. Thompson: I thank the hon. Minister very much for his answer. I now ask again my question—what facilities are given to the existing staff? Perhaps that was not my first question. I appreciate the answer the hon. Minister has given to me. I would put it this way: In the past year how many of the hon. Minister's existing staff has had the opportunity of a leave of absence in order to go to a school of social work?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that in the past year there were two who made application for that.

Mr. Bryden: How many applications were granted?

Mr. Thompson: I think that is a good question. How many applications were granted?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that is all we had. Now if my hon. friend will wait a second I will get a different answer. This year I understand we have four in rehabilitation and one in field services.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. Minister what proportion of his staff are graduates of the school of social work?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: How many of the staff are graduates of the social school of work?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I should have said that in French.

Mr. Thompson: No, sir, I appreciate that. I understand.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Would my hon. friend accept the figure for the whole department?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Then with the bachelor degree—we have 28; that is, one in the main office, two in child welfare, 11 in field services, one in general welfare assistance, one in home for the aged, three in finance administration, four in rehabilitation, five in welfare allowances. Of those with bachelors plus social work degrees—there are 17. Of other postgraduate degrees—there are 10 persons, and with social work diplomas—five.

Mr. Thompson: The total then, sir, that have degrees is 17. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Bachelors plus social work degrees make 17. Other postgraduate degrees, 10; and social work diplomas, 5; bachelor degree only, 28.

Mr. Thompson: That would mean, sir, about 60 professional staff?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: About 60 professional staff.

Mr. Thompson: Sixty: And what is your total staff, sir, for your complete department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Total staff on the department?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There are 613 presently and I have 12 vacancies.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, it seems to me again—I just raised the point because of the numbers that have been given to us by the hon. Minister—he has over 600 of a staff, and 60 whom he is calling professional, and in the way of encouragement he has only two. I think I am correct in that; I want to be fair. There are two who are attending a school of social work. I would say, sir, that those figures speak for themselves, that really the hon. Minister is not giving encouragement to get a high professional staff.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that we expect 30 more from the two schools this year.

Mr. Thompson: Does the hon. Minister expect that 30 will come into his department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I would think that would be a great infusion of qualified people coming into the department but I would say this: as well as the people coming in, it would seem to me that the hon. Minister also has a job to do with people who have had practical experience, to give them the opportunity of an academic background.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister as to the qualifications? Is facility in languages also a necessary qualification?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I beg the hon. member's pardon?

Mr. Troy: Facility in languages—is this a necessary qualification for a field worker?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I can say this from personal knowledge, that it is one of the deep worries we have in this respect, if the hon. member has the bilingual aspect in mind, French-speaking and English-speaking. All I can say in this respect is that we do the best we can to obtain bilingual persons but there are not too many.

Mr. Troy: Well, then, when possibly the hon. Minister might not have one with his senior matric but with qualification of language—if he has junior matric, would he be accepted?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am sorry, I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. Troy: On another wavelength? No, I say, sir, you say the qualification is senior matriculation or grade 13. Now if an applicant does not have grade 13 but does have grade 12 and the very fine qualification of speaking the language of many of the people in the area in which he is going to serve, would he be accepted in lieu of the grade 13 qualification? For example, we have a young man who is a French-Canadian speaking French fluently; in many sections of northern Ontario in relief work it is most important that he should have fluency in that language. He has not senior matriculation but is a graduate of grade 12; would the academic qualification be overlooked and such a person be hired?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Personally, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate a person of that description because he would be very useful, but naturally he has to be certified first of all by the civil service.

Mr. Troy: In metropolitan areas like the city of Toronto and its environs, do you also seek personnel who are fluent in many languages? This is a polyglot area; are these people sought out, too? Italians and Germans and Hungarians and Swedish and Finnish? Are these people sought out, too?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, we have quite a few on the staff and we always welcome them because they are very useful people.

Mr. Troy: Could the hon. Minister accept qualifications from the European—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As I stated a moment ago these qualifications are not, naturally, decided upon by myself.

Mr. Troy: No.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The civil service certifies these people and they are recommended to us as being able to do whatever job they can.

Mr. Troy: But is no direction given by the department of the hon. Minister to the civil service commission in that regard because the department needs people who can speak other languages?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Oh, yes. We ask for them.

Mr. Troy: In the field service branch in 1963, a Mr. M. L. Donlevy is listed in the travelling expenses. In what region is Mr. Donlevy? Is he still employed?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Donlevy was in Parry Sound but he is now with the children's aid society.

Mr. Troy: Did he resign?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, he transferred to the children's aid society.

Mr. Troy: He resigned. I know he changed, but I wonder what was the cause for the change. I understand he was a very active and a very well qualified worker. I wondered why he is out of the hon. Minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that it was a matter of his own choice to go to the children's aid society.

Mr. Troy: Not under pressure, but under other circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do not know what my hon. friend means by "other circumstances." I repeat, it was his own choice.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to the matter which was discussed a moment ago—the qualifications of the present staff. I am quite prepared to recognize that experience is a great trainer but I think, in this day and age, we must also realize that professional qualifications are important. It would appear that the number of people in the department with full professional training is negligible. It is about 20. I would suggest that a person with a bachelor of arts degree is not a fully, professionally trained person, but rather a person with the prerequisite for professional training.

In a department with 600 employees, to have approximately 20 professionally trained in the work to which the department relates seems to be a very small number indeed. I am sure that there are a great many people in the department who have the capacity to

benefit from further professional training. It would appear, from the figures the hon. Minister gave us, that there cannot be very much encouragement to them to improve their qualifications.

One or two each year apply for and get leave of absence to pursue training. I would like to know if the hon. Minister has in his department—and if not, if he is prepared to consider—a policy whereby staff in the department would be given leave of absence with full pay, or close to full pay, in order to pursue further training. After all, when people are working in a government department they are usually people with considerable responsibilities. They cannot just throw up their jobs, go without pay, and try to live for a year or two while they improve their qualifications. I know of other departments in the country where a great deal is done to encourage people to go out and improve their qualifications. They are paid while they do it by the department, on the valid assumption that their value to the department will greatly increase on their return.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would be prepared to make any comments with regard to that matter.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I agree with my hon. friend's thinking. We are satisfied that that should be done. As you know, I have to deal in this respect with the civil service, and I understand that they are taking that into consideration. I am sure I do not disagree with the hon. member's thinking in that at all because, as you know, not only in Ontario but right across the American continent, there is a great shortage of social workers. I agree with the hon. member that the steps which should be taken in that respect have to be vigorous, also encouraging, to whoever takes a social work course.

But it seems that not enough of us are prepared yet to take that course as much as we should. Are we deficient in providing enough incentive in the way of money to do this? That is one matter that I am sure—

Mr. Bryden: This is a matter within the hon. Minister's own control, within his own department. I am suggesting that, in the hon. Minister's own department, he has not done so—and I judge he has not. He should adopt a policy of providing people with leave of absence, with pay, for specified periods of time to pursue specified courses of study—and, I would say, on a substantial scale. The hon. Minister should be prepared to put perhaps \$200,000 into his budget for that purpose each year.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, is this vote 1804, field services branch? Would this be the proper place to welcome to the House, tonight, members of the young Conservatives of St. George riding?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I think that should be under general welfare assistance.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Having extended a welcome to people who certainly never worked in the field, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, may I just pursue my answer to the hon. member for Woodbine? I understand there are arrangements whereby persons are paid almost at the full rate of salary while attending courses of study—and that is \$350 a month at the present time. That is also under review by the civil service commission.

Mr. Bryden: I am sorry. It is difficult to hear the hon. Minister. Did he say this policy is now in effect, or it is being considered?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, it is coming into effect—it is in effect, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Bryden: It is something that is quite recent then?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, \$350 a month.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, has he or the deputy Minister any percentage figure in mind, to reflect what would be considered an adequate number of professionally trained people in the department? By professionally trained, one means a degree of social work—20 per cent, 30 per cent, 50 per cent—which percentage should we be striving for? If memory serves me right—I cannot give the source of this—Ribicoff, when he was Secretary of Education, Health and Welfare in the United States, suggested that one should be aiming at 60 per cent fully trained professional people, in order to have welfare operating at even minimum efficiency.

Is there any agreed-upon figure in the minds of the people in the field?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, all I can say to this is that the percentage you speak of—we cannot even get it from the schools. But we take every available person we can get from these two social work schools—one

in Ottawa and one in Toronto. But to give you a percentage; no, I cannot give you that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Why I ask the question is because a little quick mathematics shows that, in The Department of Public Welfare at present, only three per cent of the people are adequately trained. Three per cent in a government department of this kind in the middle of the 20th century! I am sure it disturbs the hon. Minister, as much as it disturbs anyone else in this House. I wonder if, in view of that, are there any intermediate training programmes, or intermediate training inducements, from the department for field workers and field staff?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As I stated a moment ago, outside of that naturally there is always in-service training; and I understand, also, that Ryerson Institute is coming into this picture now. I have hopes. As you have stated, you will agree with me that it is disturbing to you; it is disturbing to all of us. It is disturbing right across the land, because social workers are so short in numbers.

In the past several months, I might add, there has been an important development. The Department of Education was most helpful, and put us in touch with the Ryerson Institute of Technology. We have consulted with the principal of Ryerson and he was entirely receptive, I might say, to the idea; and willing to undertake this type of training. We are therefore planning to establish a two-year course where persons will learn public welfare administration in theory and in practice. The graduates, I am sure, will be well prepared to fill these important positions in welfare services, where a trained person is needed though the special skills of a graduate social worker are not really required. We have high hopes the vocational training course at Ryerson Institute, will transform the picture of staff personnel in the years ahead. This is very important, I think that this school has come into the picture because I presume we will get a lot of help from there.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister what is the salary scale offered for field officers in the department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I notice here that I have a figure that the salary varies from \$3,600 to \$4,400.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I suggest Mr. Chairman, that one of the difficulties is—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is a "field worker, number one."

Mr. Bryden: Yes, well what would be the duties of a field worker, number one?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Field workers, number two, \$5,000.

Mr. Bryden: What would be the duties of those two categories of field workers?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, while the House is waiting for the answer to that question, I have here a clipping from the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, March 19. It is a story from the British Columbia bureau of the *Globe and Mail*. I hope the hon. Minister would read it, if he has not at this point. I think the story adds a little bit of witness to the enunciations presented in regard to the attitude of the department by my hon. colleague from Scarborough West last Thursday. But another point that stands out in the story, involves the group of social workers who were suspended from their job with The Department of Public Welfare because they publicly criticized and offered opinions of the inadequacies and the attitude of the department. Several were reinstated after they agreed they would no longer make their criticisms publicly but would confine it to government channels. Now I do not suggest that this department or the hon. Minister would place these restraints upon any of the field workers or the social workers but I am led to believe through my experience through service to my constituents that they are under the illusion that they are under certain restraints. Now these are the people that really know what is going on and what is really needed in regard to public welfare. I feel they can give the first-hand story at any time through practical experience in field work. I would just ask the hon. Minister if he would tell us what his attitude is, what would his disposition be of the opinions of field workers in regard to the attitude of the department or the adequacies of the department in regard to public welfare?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: First of all Mr. Chairman, I must tell the hon. member for Woodbine that right now I cannot provide him with a complete answer, except that the difference between two and one is between those who come into the department with some experience, and those who do not. The main difference is in the area of people who have specialized already in this field, who deal with such things as placement services, guidance services, counselling and so forth. Those who begin, after having passed the first tests, I imagine would be in the first category. However, this is all I can apparently give him

here tonight. It is not very satisfactory, I appreciate that, but at the same time if he will be patient with me, I would like to give a complete picture of what is meant by one and two.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think what the hon. Minister has said is sufficient for general purposes, at any rate. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he considers that a high-school education is sufficient basic training for the sort of duties he has just described for a social worker, or a field worker two: counselling and placements and such things as that. I am not now talking about people who are now engaged in the work in the department. They have undoubtedly supplemented their basic education by practical training, but I am thinking of people coming into the department who perhaps would come into the number one category and ultimately work up to the two category. Does he think that is sufficient basic training? Is he satisfied with the educational requirements that the civil service commission has laid down?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say to this is based on my personal experience in dealing with these people. Basically the present education requirements, I would think at least for the first group would be satisfactory to start in this particular field, if they have any kind of experience in business management and ways of reporting matters and also in dealing with people. As a matter of fact, I am quite satisfied that my hon. friend from Woodbine has met some workers throughout his experience who maybe had less qualifications in education, but certainly have high qualifications in dealing with people, and that should also be considered.

At the same time, I do not suppose we would be frank if we should say that we are satisfied with qualifications which are not always the best that are available and that is about how I can put it. We try to do the best and the civil service has decided upon these specifications, at least for the time being. I must say we have received satisfactory service, maybe not to the extent we would like to have but the best that can be expected. But with the material we have I think it is going pretty well.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister that the civil service commission has got him and his department in a vicious circle. Obviously you could not require any higher basic qualifications with the salaries you are offering. Taking the two

categories, the total ranges from \$3,600 per year to \$5,000 per year. You could not recruit, I am certain, people with an ultimate expectancy of \$5,000 per year, people who had any training that could in any way be considered to be of a professional or sub-professional type. You are in the position where you cannot demand higher qualifications because of the money you are offering. On the other hand, I have no doubt the civil service commission takes the position that they will not offer any more money because the qualifications do not merit it.

I think it is time that the hon. Minister and the department started to have a bit of a battle with the civil service commission with a view to moving up salaries in this area quite drastically. As a matter of fact, I am shocked to hear that the Grade 2 field worker has a top salary of \$5,000 per year. This is one of the difficulties in this whole field. The hon. Minister says that there is a tremendous shortage of social workers. We know there is a tremendous shortage of trained professional social workers, and why? Because the pay that is offered in this field in most cases is disgraceful.

To get basic qualifications as a social worker takes six years' university as a rule. Four years for your B.A. and two years for your professional training. That is simply to get the basic requirements to call yourself a social worker. In other fields, people with approximately six years of university education can look forward to salaries as they reach maturity and the peak of their profession, anywhere from, I suppose \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year and up. And depending on what fields they are in, what professions they choose, it may go a long way up. Yet in this field, in an important area of service in the field, the province of Ontario is offering a top of \$5,000 a year. We are never going to get a requisite number of trained professional people in this department if we take this sort of approach to the salary question. We just cannot compete against the remuneration in other professions as long as we take the attitude that a field worker is a sort of a highgrade clerk or in that sort of category as far as salaries are concerned.

So I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he should be taking this matter up quite vigorously with the civil service commission. I believe that in other departments, too, the civil service commission is taking an unrealistic attitude to the salaries required for professionally trained people, but I think in this department it is worse than perhaps any other department in the government. Yet it is vital that in this department we should

get a substantial and rapid increase in the number of qualified people.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, one thing that I think must be clear in staff training is, training for what?

Mr. Chairman: Staff training comes under vote 1805.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, I am thinking of the field service where we have the field service branch. We are on 1804?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. I am thinking of the field service branch and I agree that really comes under 1805. But under the field service branch, it seems to me that these are the people who are going out into the field and this is where you would get the statistics on the kinds of problems that they are facing. And I would like to try to catch the hon. Minister's imagination on this. I say this because south of the border, the President of the United States, who is now deceased—President Kennedy—looked at this very large problem, the problem of welfare. He thought he was going to take a new look at it and he declared that there was going to be war on poverty. The first thing to be done was to find out, what is poverty? And they had, what the hon. Minister suggested, they had research on this, and they defined—and this will come as a shocking revelation, I think, to all of us—in a country as affluent as the United States, they found that they had over 9 million families who are earning less than \$3,000 a year. And they decided that that would be what they would call poor families. And then they decided they would analyze why these families were poor.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Not enough money!

Mr. Thompson: Yes, they were without money, but they decided they would also go further and if I could on that point—the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is a logical man, Mr. Chairman, and he raised a logical answer to this, but you have to dig a little deeper. Why are they without money? They found that there were several reasons for this. They found that one of the reasons was that they suffered from poor health. The other reason is that the breadwinner is injured. The same basis in a way, but they pointed out the breadwinner has been the person who is suffering from poor health. And then they found another reason is that

they do not have proper education. And these are the three basic reasons why these people are poor. And what are they going to do about it?

They now know the cause of their being poor, so they decided they are going to concentrate no longer on just the fact of taking money from the more wealthy and giving it to the poor, because that just perpetuates the situation in many ways. And I would like to say as well in connection with welfare that I agree that most of the people in our province do not want to be on welfare, but also there is no question there are some people who are prepared to be on welfare, who will take advantage of any hand-out they can get. There are those kind of people. But what I would say is that in the department's field service, similar to the way they are doing in the United States, let the field service people convene, having explained first of all how many poor there are.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that he does not know in this province. I suggest to him he has not said what the standard of poor is. I suggest to him that he has not found out what the causes of poverty are. Because if you find the causes are similar to those in the United States, when the hon. Minister goes to Quebec in a few more weeks, he would be fighting for a medical insurance programme and he certainly would not be advocating the patchwork programme which he is, when you find that health and the lack of health is one of the reasons why the people are poor. And I would suggest also that as in the United States one of the reasons is lack of educational facilities, then you would be thinking far more of correlating the field service with schools. The hon. Minister would, as Walter Lipton has written about the new ideas to fight poverty, which are being carried on in the States, and saying that one of the ideas is that they are going to get better top-notch teachers in congested poor areas.

Now, coming back to the field staff, I raise two things. One is, I commend the hon. Minister that he has this attitude about research, and I would hope that he would start to correlate the facts that his field staff could give. The second thing: I would strongly urge that one of the hon. Minister's top people—and I can think of no better person who has shown his dedication through the years, than the deputy Minister, Mr. Band—should be sent down to the United States, should go to this group that are under the President's office. They have made a study, the annual report of the council of economic advisors, and they have set up this war on

poverty. I think that Ontario always wants also to have new ideas and I suggest that Mr. Band should be sent down to see how they are doing the job and then come back, sir, and translate that into the programme of the department and have the field staff follow through on it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Dovercourt has expressed some very valuable views and I think they are worthwhile looking into, and I can assure him that I will do exactly that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member for Wentworth East mind very much repeating what he said before so I may be straight on it?

Mr. Gisborn: It would be a pleasure. I referred to a story in the *Globe and Mail* of March 19. It was a story from the British Columbia bureau of the *Globe and Mail*. I said I hoped that the hon. Minister might have read it; and if he has not, I think he should read it. It gives a little more witness to the principles enunciated by my hon. colleague from Scarborough West in regard to the attitude of —

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who is it written by?

Mr. Gisborn: Ruth Worth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: — to the criticism of the department and its attitude by my hon. colleague from Scarborough West. What the story tells is that several of the social workers in the department of welfare in B.C. were fired or suspended for publicly criticizing the department, or stating opinions in regard to the attitude of the department and the inadequacies of the department in regard to public welfare. Several were reinstated, I understand, when they agreed that they would no longer publicly give their opinions or criticisms of the department but would confine them to departmental channels.

Now I do not mean to infer that this hon. Minister or his department would place these restraints upon the social workers; but in my experience I am led to feel that the social workers, or field workers, are under the illusion that there are certain restraints on them. I say that these people are the people who really know what is needed in the field of public welfare. They gain it from practical experience; they know where more money is needed, they know where more psychological approach is needed and their opinions should be well listened to. So I put the question

before the hon. Minister: What would be his disposition to field workers or social workers publicly stating their opinions and their attitudes towards the department, in regard to public welfare?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, the only comment I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I do not know that I have seen any public servants making criticism such as was expressed in British Columbia; but I see no objection at all. When any public servant is sincere in his statements, and if the criticism is constructive, I do not see why a man or woman should be chastized for expressing these ideas because I would think he or she would be sincere in doing so. If it is not for the sole purpose of criticizing, and it is constructive, I see no reason why it should not be welcomed. As a matter of fact we do discuss these things quite often within the department, especially with workers who are constantly in the field and under the supervision of the different districts. I think, at convention meetings, these things are brought out and rather welcomed. That would be my attitude.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, just a small point on this vote. The hon. Minister has explained to the House the requirements for those in the field who administer the various programmes of the department. Is the complement right up to the level that it should be at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I thought, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned a moment ago that there were 12 vacancies. We are short that many.

Mr. Nixon: I missed that, sir. The point I wanted to make was that it seems to me that when these people in the local areas go on vacation, and if for any reason are off the job, such as by sickness, their work simply piles up. Those of us who deal with them on a local level find that they sometimes get in the position where they cannot deal with pressing problems for a considerable length of time, although they are doing their best and, on the whole, doing a good job in that connection. I was wondering if the department had any plan whereby qualified people would act as floaters, and could move into a district when this situation develops?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: We do have it in certain areas, and it is a good idea to have what the hon. member calls a floater. Unfortunately, sometimes this causes some difficulty, but generally speaking it has worked pretty well. I agree sometimes that there are peaks which

are difficult to overcome, but I understand also that in this House there are 108 very alert members. Any cases which may come to their attention, which would be delayed for one reason or another, either through the field worker or the person himself not having received any news, we try to deal with them directly. Sometimes, I think, the co-operation in this respect is made available to as large an extent as possible.

But I appreciate what the hon. member has said, and I am sure peaks sometimes occur; as for the floater he mentions, we have that. I can appreciate the fact that maybe we should have more of those but it is pretty difficult, because we just cannot afford anybody at all; they have to be very, very expert in doing it.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there may be an extension of welfare work among our Indian bands are there any now whose racial origin is Indian, in the field service department? Also, are any preparations being made to recruit more?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that we do have, Mr. Chairman, some Indians in the department. I understand there is one now graduating who is going to Moosonee in the very near future; and one who is accompanying him, who has the title of anthropologist. We are gradually getting more and more—and we look for them because we think they are the proper people to deal with, this particular group.

Mr. Troy: What does the hon. Minister mean by looking for them?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I mean that we are trying to find some suitable persons who will study, and have educational qualifications and all that, to enter that field. That is what I mean by that.

Mr. Troy: Well, then, in the high schools which many of these young Indians attend, are the guidance personnel informed that the department is looking for such types, and suggesting to these young students that they seek a career in the hon. Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can say to that is that naturally, from high school, strictly speaking, they are not as mature as may be expected; but we do promote the idea that they should be counselled when these young men or women are at a point where they can make up their minds what they intend to do later on in

life. The civil service commission, I understand, has advertised and does advertise province-wide for Indian development officers.

Vote 1804 agreed to.

On vote 1805:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister to specify the purpose of the vote of \$40,000 for staff training? How is that money used? I believe the appropriation last year was exactly the same amount, so presumably there is a continuing programme and I should like to hear some description of it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: First of all I would like to mention the bursaries to students of social work, which are matched by the government at Ottawa.

The total cost in that respect is \$61,850, of which the federal share is \$20,616; our share would be \$41,234, which is about 60 per cent. That is for bursaries.

Mr. Bryden: What has a bursary got to do with staff training within the department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: To students of social work.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am all for bursaries, Mr. Chairman, but I do not understand how bursaries would be involved in a programme described as "staff training". I would take it that would apply to the staff already employed by the department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am sorry—it was given me—I am advised that this is for salaries, travelling expenses of trainees, plus costs of supervision—that is, the in-service departmental training of these people.

I do not know if you follow me. This is for salaries and travelling expenses of trainees who are trained within the department itself.

Mr. Bryden: Do you have, shall we say, a special category of trainee, a person who is regarded as a "learner" within the department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: These, I understand, are strictly in the field staff, where they are under constant supervision of the supervisor or the director, locally, of any given area.

Mr. Bryden: How would they relate to the field worker 1, and the field worker 2 categories?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is what I would call the probationary field worker, that would be number 1.

Mr. Bryden: I trust that they do not get a lower wage than the starting rate for the field worker 1?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Oh, no. That would be the number 1 we explained to you a moment ago. You mentioned, a moment ago, number one and number two; that would be the number 1.

Mr. Bryden: The number 1, in effect, are trainees; they are people who are learning the job under pretty close supervision?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right; trained in the field.

Mr. Bryden: Then what does this item of \$40,000 cover?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Supervisor, \$6,600—I have here—for salaries and travelling, \$33,400. The course is six weeks; there are seven on a course, and seven courses a year.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, yes, I see. I remember, a little earlier that you said you gave these people a course of training, and this is the money that covers this.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1805, the hon. Minister in his introductory comments last Thursday spoke at considerable length and with great emphasis on the importance of the larger units of administration, particularly at the county level. He noted, as was done in the annual report of the deputy Minister, the work which had been done in Peel and Wentworth—I believe the only two counties where this has been completed.

The thing that interests me, Mr. Chairman, in view of the importance which the hon. Minister quite rightly attached to a larger unit of administration to permit a modern professional approach, is what proportion of this estimate, dealing with administration, is directed toward assistance in the creation of these larger units of administration? How many dollars, for example?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that does not come under this vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Where does it come, so I may say if I am wrong, that I am sorry?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As I think I mentioned in my opening remarks, there were no monies for such expenditure. We were providing them with staff which are paid like regular staff, under possible vote number 1, and we

furnish them. I think it is senior member of the staff who goes there, establishes the area and instructs or supervises some field worker who is appointed by the county itself, or by the local area, for a period of at least six months. That is not a hard and fast rule. If it is needed for a longer time, to establish the unit completely and get it running well, then it can be provided further. But I have no specific monies under the vote, or any vote, for that particular purpose.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, that clarifies the picture I was seeking. The hon. Minister has stated there is no money available, that you provide staff and advice for such periods as is necessary to get it going.

I just want to draw to the hon. Minister's attention—here, for the umpteenth time tonight, we have evidence of the fact that this department is paying lip service to what the hon. Minister himself says is an extremely important development in welfare administration, and yet they are doing virtually nothing in terms of the amount of money that is being spent. For example, in the Statutes RSO 1960, you will find on page 1461, The Welfare Units Act—the statute under which one can establish this kind of a development; and you will find in section 5 that where a municipal unit is established there shall be paid to the municipality establishing it an amount:

—equal to 50 per cent of the cost of administration of welfare matters under this Act.

In other words, there is a statutory clearance for 50 per cent of administrative costs. If you look in the regulations you will find you have all the details with regard to the implementation of that statute.

The hon. Minister, in effect, says that he has nothing in his estimates as a vote to implement this statute. In other words, one can come to no other conclusion but that the statute is a dead letter. The hon. Minister does not seek to implement this statute in any vigorous way, so that this very enthusiastic discussion on both reports, and the hon. Minister's statement with regard to the role of larger units of administration in welfare, means nothing in terms of actual fact and actual action. The hon. Minister, by his own admission, says he has no designated vote in his estimates.

I do not know what comments the hon. Minister can make in light of that kind of a situation, if I have it accurately assessed.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, the only thing I can state, Mr. Chairman, is that I have no

estimates on the vote in respect to participating in administration costs.

Mr. MacDonald: What does it mean where it says here, for example, in the statute that I quoted to you: Chapter 428, The Welfare Units Act? Is this not a reference to the establishment of larger units of administration?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The establishment, I am advised, of the consolidation of welfare services comes under The General Welfare Assistance Act. Is that what you have here?

Mr. MacDonald: This here.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, it is not the same thing. What is the title of the Act the hon. member has there?

Mr. MacDonald: The title of the Act? The title of the Act is The Welfare Units Act.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, that is inoperative, I am advised. The establishment of consolidation of welfare services comes under The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the hon. Minister now saying that the money necessary for the development of these larger units is down in the next vote? General welfare assistance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The establishment of the consolidation is under The General Welfare Assistance Act. There are no monies supplied under that Act for the establishment of these county units. I am not stating to you, sir, that this matter is not to be considered; but at the present time there is none. We provide just services.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this the Act I have referred to—did I understand you to say this is inoperative?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we might clean up the statutes if it is inoperative.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I agree with you it should have been done.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I was away out of my seat for a moment, but I think I follow it. If this Act is inoperative, then under what jurisdiction does the sentence at the bottom of page 14 of the deputy Minister's report fall, where it says that the organization and development of the county of Wentworth is being guided by a senior officer of the department in collaboration with the welfare committee of the county council?

Obviously some monies are being set aside for county consolidation. Where and how?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The people there from the main office receive salaries which are paid by the department. For instance, I have here a Mr. Anderson, who is \$8,200; Mr. Ralph, I understand, is \$7,500. These are gentlemen who are paid by the main office, or by The Department of Public Welfare, to go and work to establish large units in the different counties. Once the unit is established, these gentlemen return to their former occupation, or will go further to establish another county whenever that is requested. But money such as my hon. friend was asking—no.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, may I ask the—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: We do not pay for the administration.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask the hon. Minister: How do they establish a county unit if the Act is inoperative?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That I stated a moment ago. The establishment of county consolidation of welfare services comes under The General Welfare Assistance Act instead of the Act which was mentioned before.

Mr. S. Lewis: And they are paid out of main office, not out of The General Welfare Assistance Act, so there is really no relationship between the establishment of the unit and the Act under which they fall?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I stated main office, but I stated immediately after that the department itself pays for that. It does come under The General Welfare Assistance Act, but if I mentioned main office I really meant the department itself.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on this, the hon. Minister unwittingly misled me, and now I have misled him, and I do not want him to get into a disastrous position. We both came to the conclusion that The Welfare Units Act was inoperative and he agreed with me that he should have it cleaned up and taken out of the statutes altogether. Before he moves to do that, I just now had drawn to my attention that back in 1801, the first vote, the main office, there is item nine: Administration of northern units. You are administering all your northern units under The Welfare Units Act, so you better not clean it out of the statutes or you will likely be neglecting the north.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: With reference to what we are discussing, that is what I meant.

Mr. MacDonald: I would suggest to the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I appreciate it.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sure you must appreciate it or you would get even more chaos in your department than you have got now, in the circumstances under which you operate it. However—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I might say that I had forgotten that, at the beginning of my estimates, a correction was made. There was a typographical error here—and maybe we are not so far wrong after all, both of us—so that now instead of reading The Welfare Units Act, it should read The District Welfare Administration Boards Act, 1962-63.

Mr. MacDonald: So it really is inoperative?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I had forgotten the amendment or I would have stated it before this.

Mr. Troy: I have a question, Mr. Minister, but you did not say that is a typographical error.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a highly appropriate word.

Mr. Troy: Sir, I am looking at the public accounts in the department, under general welfare assistance. Checking through the cities I find the city of North Bay got welfare assistance of \$15,000—

Mr. Chairman: Order! We are on vote 1805.

Mr. Troy: You are on “general welfare”? Pardon me. I am inoperative in that regard.

Vote 1805 agreed to.

On vote 1806:

Mr. Troy: Sir, in the 1963 accounts I find the city of North Bay with general welfare assistance of \$15,502.88. I am looking at other cities of comparable size, and I find them much larger. In fact, the town of Sturgeon Falls has general welfare assistance of some \$82,000. Would you make some comment, Mr. Minister? What does it mean to say the city of North Bay, of 23,000-odd or more, has a general welfare assistance of less than one dollar, in fact about 60 cents

per capita? What does that mean? That there are very few people on relief; or does it refer to the operation of the department in this city?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is that there are fewer people on relief; that is why there is less paid. The economic condition, naturally, must be better in certain areas than others. That is why their relief is less. If my hon. friend would like me to give him some figures here.

Mr. Troy: I see the city of London is \$612,000, that is about a \$3 per capita amount.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Apparently, Mr. Chairman, North Bay must be very light because it is not in the first 40 I have here.

Mr. Troy: Yes, I say so, sir; it is only \$15,000 and other cities are: Eastview \$165,000; London, I say is \$600,000.

An hon. member: They have a lot of coffee parties there.

Mr. Troy: I just wondered: Is it more difficult for North Bay to get assistance from the department, or is it more difficult for those on relief to get relief from the welfare officer in the city of North Bay? What do you say?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I would not think so, Mr. Chairman. I think, because North Bay is very fortunate—

Mr. Troy: Which one do you not think so, sir? Which part of the question?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on this vote I would like to make a few suggestions to the hon. Minister; the first is concerning the Canadian vocational training programme. The programme, a very valuable programme, generally gets quite a large number of its students from individuals on welfare, or receiving general welfare assistance. However, one of the drawbacks is that once the individual enrolls in the programme, his welfare assistance is almost automatically cut right off. If it is the intention of this government to encourage individuals to take that retraining programme, I think some consideration should be given by this department to not completely cut off the welfare assistance of the individual taking the retraining. If we continue following the policy of cutting them off welfare, then there is no inducement to the individual to take the retraining.

He gets the idea, "Why should I bother

retraining myself, I am better off accepting general welfare assistance?" That is not too common, but it is a condition, or an attitude, which does prevail among some individuals and I think it is the type of attitude we should nip in the bud as quickly as possible.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister, with the individuals taking the retraining programme, that some consideration be given to some general welfare assistance as an inducement. He will come along and say, possibly, that the individual still gets some type of welfare assistance because the retraining programme may not supply him sufficient funds for a proper standard of living.

Another suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Minister is about individuals who have been injured during the course of their work and are on total disability pension; today, that total disability pension from workmen's compensation is so small that it has to be supplemented quite often by welfare assistance. I think the hon. Minister should talk to the workmen's compensation board, or to The Department of Labour, and attempt to induce them, for anyone who is totally disabled, to see that, at least both their hospitalization premiums and their medical premiums are covered by some vote of this department.

It is a bad enough penalty to be totally disabled, let alone for the individual quite often to have to worry as to where he is going to obtain the funds to pay for his hospital premium and medical insurance. With the new increase in hospital premiums, it is only going to cut into the amount of money the individual has left after he gets workmen's compensation.

The reason I mention this is that I have had two cases in the last two weeks; one where the individual was getting only \$75 a month workmen's compensation, the other \$37.50 and having to pay both the medical premium and the hospital insurance premium. I would like the hon. Minister to, first, comment concerning my suggestion on the retraining; and second, on the payment of hospital and medical premiums by this department for those who are totally disabled, or sometimes partially disabled, and over 45. They may get a partial pension, but who is going to hire them when they are partially disabled? Would the hon. Minister comment on that now, please?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The comment I might make on that, Mr. Chairman, is that what my hon. friend possibly means is the fact that we should add to whatever is paid by the

federal government; that, whatever sum is paid to these people, we should add to that.

In the other matter of hospitalization, I am advised that the municipalities pay for this in some cases. Not in all cases, but in some cases they do. When it comes through I am advised through The Department of Municipal Affairs in this matter.

I understand, and I think what my hon. friend has said, it is very useful. At the same time this is a matter, again, wherein a general discussion should be held at Ottawa to see what can be done. This is an area, I am quite satisfied to think—especially in industrial areas like the city of Windsor or the city of Toronto, or the like—where many of these people are able to obtain certain monies for certain things they do while they are having this rehabilitation, plus what they receive from the federal government to help them get along.

I am not saying my hon. friend—. I think the suggestion is a good one and worth looking into.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister for his kind remarks. Another suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Minister is on the consideration by his department of including, in welfare allowances, bus transportation. If not direct payment for transportation, say, to the welfare office, then possibly some sort of an identity card so that the individual receiving the general welfare allowance may be able to ride on the transportation system in the community at some type of reduced fare.

If I refer to my own community I can say that it costs the individual 20 cents to go down town and 20 cents to go back home. That is 40 cents the individual has to pay for transportation alone; and if he has to make two trips in the course of one month to the welfare office, he spends 80 cents—which, to an individual on a minimum amount of welfare, is a substantial amount of money. Some consideration should be given to including transportation of the individual when he is going to collect his welfare.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, under this matter of general welfare—pardon? Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up the question asked by the hon. member for Nipissing in regard to the welfare paid to various municipalities. It would almost seem that the amount paid depends pretty well on the toughness, or lack of it, on the part of the local welfare officer. I wonder whether the hon. Minister

has attempted in any way to set any kind of standards, or whether the amount that is paid, and the purposes for which welfare is paid—although I know they are delineated to some extent—are being standardized in any way?

I have another question to which I would like the answer—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: In reply to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, the standards and the scale of payment are set out in the regulations and are followed pretty closely, I understand, by the welfare workers in the different cities and towns. It happens quite frequently that, through a request, our own men will meet with the town or city supervisor and discuss these matters with them. We always encourage them to give as much help as possible and we are certainly not trying to go the other way.

But, as the hon. member says, these things happen in the local municipalities; but we do provide the services of our own people to go and discuss it with them and try to arrive at a better arrangement if possible. We cannot dictate, naturally, to the municipalities as to who is deserving or who is not. But we can certainly help with those who do receive help, to show and instruct them with the experience acquired by our own people and, at the same time, to try to arrive at the regulations and the standards which are set out. That service, as I am sure the hon. member knows, has been done before. We try to accomplish that, and I can assure him that any instructions received from us in respect to that go up instead of down.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if I may follow this up? I understand then, that what really happens is that if there is any real variation from year to year which is not consistent, perhaps, with population changes, the hon. Minister's department scrutinizes this. And if something startling happens, they move in and try to assess the situation with the local people to arrive at something which may be right. Is this, in effect, what happens?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I can assure the hon. member for Yorkview that, when these things happen, we are aware of it very quickly. They let us know, and we send people out to discuss these matters, not only in the general sense, but also in individual cases. It is done quite frequently. I have reason to believe that many individual cases have been straightened out in that particular way. Also the general outlook, I am sure, is discussed and looked at at the same time; not only with the supervisor there; it might even go to the

smaller municipalities, at least those I know of, and even go to the council itself to look upon it and perhaps advise their field worker or the supervisor.

Mr. Young: Does the hon. Minister have some record of staff having done this over the past year, so that he knows that in A or X number of cases the municipalities were approached by the staff and that kind of advice was given?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I could not say, Mr. Chairman, that we have an actual record, in numbers, of what is done. But, upon request from either offices or individuals—and I am sure I have done that many times myself, not as the Minister but strictly as a person in the area. I have received a complaint from someone and our man, or one of his field workers, goes down there and interviews the clerk, if he is the man, or else their field worker or the supervisor, to see what solution can be arrived at for the individual case. If it is a case which has a general purview of the state of welfare in the area, then that also is discussed. But to give the hon. member the exact numbers of that, I could not do, because I do not think we have that kind of record.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks in regard to the general welfare assistance because I think the payments being made in the province of Ontario, to families on welfare, and to single men, are a shame. I know that each time these estimates come up we go into the subject of the niggardly payments which are made.

I recall, for example, reading not so long ago how a single man who was on welfare tried to get by. I believe in Toronto that the payments made to a single man for a 15-day period is \$28. I do not know how anybody can live as a human being today in the city of Toronto for 15 days on \$28. As I recall this story which was told, if a man could obtain a room for \$7 a week—and it would be a mighty cheap room at \$7 a week—it would mean that, after paying rent of \$14, he would have \$14 left for 15 days for food, for clothing, for haircuts, for all these things which are needed in order to live.

Certainly, such a welfare assistance programme as we have in the province of Ontario is a skin-and-bones affair. It is something that might possibly keep the body alive but would certainly crush the spirit. How in the world is a man who is out of work going to be able to even buy a newspaper to find out where jobs are available, when he has about \$1.86

a day on which to live? Especially in a large city, he needs transportation. I know that the welfare department say that if a man has a car it has to go before anything is done for him.

If we are going to get a man back on the payroll, back paying taxes, he should be treated as a human being, and the present programme in the province of Ontario is a shocking disgrace. Time and time again this has been brought forward, and the hon. Minister has sat through these estimates and through these discussions, just as he sits here tonight and as he sat today, knowing little about his department. And I think, on the record of the department, it is obvious he cares very little about the welfare here in the province of Ontario.

Because we do not pay a decent amount to people who do need welfare assistance a lot of the private agencies here in Toronto under the United Appeal, who normally would do counselling work, are having to do really welfare work. Many of these agencies are supplying food where their funds were meant to supply counselling or give training. Today men who are receiving welfare under our assistance programme get by on \$1.86 a day because they go to the Scott Mission. If it was not for the private agencies, there would be absolute chaos here in the welfare set-up in Toronto and in the province of Ontario.

A lot of people will probably say—and no doubt the Tory view is that people on welfare are bums. I think Arthur Meighen was of that view and R. B. Bennett, and probably the gentlemen over there are following in their footsteps.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is a lie.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): What kind of a statement is that?

Mr. Trotter: But let us remember this, that in Canada—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, I do not like that.

Mr. Trotter: Would the hon. Minister of Mines sit down? We have to put up with this Tory administration and the record speaks for itself. The people on welfare, here in the province of Ontario, are living on \$1.86 a day. And I suggest the hon. members should do something and keep their mouths shut.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Trotter: I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: On a point of order, is this type of language to be permitted to be expressed in this House?

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would say that if mouths are open that should be shut, then it is quite legal that you should say, "Shut your mouth!" That is what is causing the trouble here tonight.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is a great statement, coming from the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, you know that the hon. Minister of Labour should be ashamed of himself, being in the front ranks of that group over there when the average working man, if he is on welfare, ends up getting about \$1.86 a day to live on. And remember this, Mr. Chairman, I say to the hon. Minister of Labour, that it is the labouring class which is the first hit. If it is inflation, they suffer from inflation; if there is unemployment, it is the labouring man who is the first fellow who has to live on \$1.86 a day. I would think that the hon. Minister of Labour would be trying to set a fire under the hon. Minister of Public Welfare to do something about these niggardly welfare payments which are being made. It is the working man who suffers the most here.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, my objection has nothing to do with what the hon. member has just described. There has been no one in this House more sympathetic and interested in the problem being debated. My objection has to do with the manner in which it is being debated.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare has served in three Cabinets, or under three Prime Ministers, maybe it is four, and the record of his administration is shocking. And if today, under this so-called affluent society where there is so much wealth, a single man on welfare has to exist on \$28 for 15 days, there is something very much the matter.

We in Canada, Mr. Chairman I believe, of our national income, spend about 8.5 per cent. There are only two countries worse than we are in the western world, or the so-called advanced countries. One is Japan, it is the lowest; and the other one is the

United States, which has the largest income per capita, an extremely wealthy country. But in countries like Western Germany, 20 per cent of the national income is spent on welfare. Even in France it is about 18 per cent. And these are prosperous countries; they are free-enterprise countries and certainly there is relatively very little unemployment.

But let us remember, despite all the complaints made by some particularly Tory quarters that we spend too much on welfare, that we are the third lowest of the advanced countries. We should take a very strong look at what we are doing for our welfare cases, because I am convinced of this: that the vast majority of people on welfare would rather have their self respect by working and paying taxes, than being slowly destroyed in spirit by the way we treat them.

After all, if a man on welfare can be put back to work, he is back paying taxes; but if his spirit is destroyed he is going to be on welfare for the rest of his life and it is going to cost the government about \$670 per year. If he is, at age 40, on welfare and becomes a perpetual welfare case, he is going to cost the province of Ontario over \$20,000—plus \$100 to bury him when he has to be put away in a casket. I think the welfare funeral is about \$100.

Mr. Thompson: What about his children?

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is going to Quebec, and I hope he speaks loud and long on a welfare programme which needs to be improved, not only in the province of Ontario but across Canada. I feel sorry in this respect that we have got such a weak Minister. I fear he will not speak up, but it is time he got down to work to see to it that we in this province got away from the skin-and-bones treatment of our indigent people. We have certainly fallen down; we ignore completely what research has pointed out in so many other countries. Even in the United States, where they do not spend as much in the national income as we do, possibly because of their great wealth, they have now started a great war on poverty. It is time that we did the same and I wish to heaven that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare would get busy.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Scarborough West.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I believe you have given me—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, he has been on his feet 15 times.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: I caught the Chairman's eye, Mr. Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, he is the spokesman.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do you want me to sit down, sir?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the hon. members opposite, and the hon. Minister of Mines, that when the hon. member for Parkdale talks about \$1.86 a day he is talking about the affluent policy of the department, the opulent administrations of the department. This department gives \$1.86 to the working man, which is criminal enough; what the department does under general welfare assistance to a mother with children is unbelievable. A mother with six fatherless children in this province receives \$35.40 a week. That, Mr. Chairman, averages out to 84 cents a day per child—and not a penny left for the mother. One asks what kind of general welfare assistance one has in Ontario, and one says it is a mockery of all human decency.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Any baby bonus?

Mr. S. Lewis: It may be that the hon. Minister has problems in acquiring extra funds from federal sources; it may be that the hon. Minister has problems convincing his Treasury colleagues to give him more money. Whatever the reason, there is no human or moral justification for submitting children to that kind of degradation in this society. That is precisely what is being done.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Is the hon. member suggesting that is the total amount?

Mr. S. Lewis: That is the total amount—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No baby bonus?

Mr. S. Lewis: That is the total amount given under general welfare—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am analyzing for the hon. Minister of Mines. Suppose, Mr. Minister, that one added other increment; suppose one brought it up to \$1.50 or \$2.00 a day for children who are fatherless. I submit to the

hon. members of this House that somewhere there is conscience lacking. Nowhere can it be justified. However the figures are combined, a decent human standard will never be achieved. And something is profoundly wrong with a psychology and mental attitude which is prepared to permit it.

But it goes further. What intrigues me—and I made this point during the opening remarks and I want to make it again—is that a mother with six fatherless children, under general welfare assistance receives less money than a mother with six fatherless children under mothers' allowance. I would like the hon. Minister to explain to this House somewhere along the way how he can permit that situation to continue. How is it that children who are fatherless, under one grant, receive less; and children who are fatherless, under one grant, receive more? Again, what kind of psychology of mind does it reveal which would subscribe to that baseness of attitude? And when one looks at the family budget under general welfare assistance, Mr. Chairman, what does one see?

The hon. members of this House go to the deputy Minister with individual constituent problems. The deputy Minister handles them in a way for which every member is exceedingly grateful. But one wonders whether members have made an analysis of the individual breakdown, and what it shows? Heads of families—on the basis of pre-added budgets of the department—receive \$31 a month for a three-room shelter allowance on unheated premises.

Are we living in Canada or are we living in some kind of social barbarism? Twenty-five dollars a month for one room; \$40 a month for six rooms; and all unheated. You make pre-added budget grants for unheated premises. Surely, Mr. Minister, if The Department of Public Welfare is operating as it should, there should not be any grants made to unheated premises because they would not allow unheated premises to exist. When a family is in that condition, in the middle of winter in this society, the department should move the family or make it possible for them to be moved, not make picayune grants for unheated premises.

Then when you add in everything: rent, fuel, food, all of the various aspects of the pre-added budget, what do we have? The head of the family, with three children, can receive from \$75 to \$90 monthly for fuel, rent, food and all other accessories—maximum.

I say to all the hon. members in this House: There is something somewhere profoundly

wrong. There is a malaise at the soul of this department and there is no excuse for it; there has to be a variation. If the hon. Minister is running into difficulty doing it, then the hon. Minister had better take his Cabinet colleagues aside and give them a quiet talking to about the human aspects involved. We spend a great deal of time in this Legislature honourably discussing highways, honourably discussing public works, honourably discussing tourism, honourably discussing transport. We spend a lot of time on statistical data and mechanical details. We spend all too little time on the human beings represented by those statistical pieces of information.

Mr. Trotter: He is not even listening to you.

Mr. S. Lewis: So when you take aside the veil, what do you find? Eighty-four cents a day for fatherless children; \$31 a month for three unheated rooms. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is something that should not be tolerated in a civilized province, and I sincerely hope that when next year the general welfare assistance comes through there will be some fairly dramatic renovations.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to an exceedingly well-educated young man, who has never known want, speak on the terrible cases of welfare which have not been given any help. I would ask this House, Mr. Chairman, if this young man, who has been to college and had a fine university training, is in a position to know. Has he had any experience which would teach him what want actually means?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. S. Lewis: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Well, you people always shout everybody down.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. S. Lewis: My point of order, Mr. Chairman—and I say it quietly to the hon. Minister of Mines—is twofold. First, I am a representative in this Legislature and as such have, as I am sure the hon. Minister himself has, vast numbers of human beings, in serious want, approach me as a member to attempt to do something for them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this is a point of order. I have in fact had some very real familiarity with want.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member from—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Chairman, the point I was coming to was this: I have had experience in my riding which really has something to do with welfare. While I am speaking—I am not reading from a paper or a book. I happen, sir, to be president of the Golden Age Haven in the city of Port Arthur. I also have spent many years in welfare work and I will tell those on the opposite benches something. I was chairman of relief in the city of Port Arthur, as a councillor and alderman, in 1934 under the Hepburn government. You know what a government that was; we had soup kitchens in the city of Port Arthur and there was no other means—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Chairman, there was no other avenue of welfare in that whole city at the time and I was the one who set up the soup kitchens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): On a point of order, what does—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: You are scared to listen—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: It is on the estimates; that is what the point of order is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Well, I certainly appreciate this courtesy from the Opposition benches. I have sat here since something like eight o'clock. Mr. Chairman, it may be all right for them but the public will give them their answer when election time comes; so I am not so worried now. I want to thank the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, for the policy he has put before this House tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! Please give the present speaker the floor. Please continue.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: And I want to congratulate him for the great old age haven—Mr. Chairman, surely we can have some order here from these gentlemen?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I wish you would hush.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, our Dawson Court in the city of Port Arthur is one of the finest homes for the aged there is. A similar one is in the city of Fort William. And not so many years ago, I am telling you, there was nothing available in those cities under a Liberal government.

This government has always had a humanitarian approach towards the underprivileged and those who are in want. Two years ago I defied anybody in this House to bring a case of anybody who was hungry and in want in this city, and said this department would look after them. We did not find one case. You will also remember about that time, a TV programme which was sponsored on a TV station in Hamilton, and which was proven false. Tonight we have heard many statements which are absolutely false as far as welfare is concerned in this city; because this department of welfare, the minute it is brought to their attention that people are hungry or in need, looks after their wants. This government is one which has done that throughout the years. I want you to understand that, because the people know it. They know that when you are talking the way you are, you are simply talking unfair politics and you are more interested in that than you are in the welfare of anybody in this province.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am going to go to the order paper in order to deal with some bills in committee which I would like to give third reading. When we have completed that, if there is time in the proceedings of debate, we will come back to the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare.

Of course, there is no night session tomorrow night.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, before you take the motion, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if The Police Act will be one of those items dealt with at the labour and municipal bills tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, sir.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.40 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Fifth report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans	1987
Tabling report, Mr. Davis	1987
Town of Cochrane, bill respecting, reported	1988
City of Waterloo, bill respecting, reported	1988
Board of education for the city of London, bill respecting, reported	1988
Town of Smith's Falls, bill respecting, reported	1988
Riverdale Hospital, bill respecting, reported	1988
Brock University, bill to incorporate, reported	1991
Township school area of the township of Erin, bill respecting, reported	1991
City of London, bill respecting, reported	1992
Town of Thorold, bill respecting, reported	1992
Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, reported	1992
Resolution re Bill No. 40, concurred in	1992
Gasoline Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	1992
Resolution re Bill No. 41, concurred in	1992
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	1992
Reformatories Act, bill to amend, reported	1992
Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964, bill intituled, reported	1992
Energy Act, 1964, bill intituled, reported	1992
Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	1992
Anatomy Act, bill to amend, reported	1993
Mining Act, bill to amend, reported	1993
Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act, 1949, bill to amend, reported	1993
Maternity Boarding Houses Act, bill to amend, reported	1993
Nurses Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	1993
Resolution re Bill No. 58, concurred in	1993
Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported	1993
Radiological Technicians Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	1993
Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	1993
Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act, bill to amend, reported	1993
Marriage Act, bill to amend, reported	1993
Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, reported	1993
Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, reported	1993
Resolution re Bill No. 81, concurred in	1994
Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963, bill to amend, reported	1994
Milk Industry Act, bill to amend, reported	1994
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, reported	1994
Farm Products Grades and Sales Act, bill to amend, reported	1994
Resolution re Bill No. 92, concurred in	1994
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	1994
Resolution re Income Tax amendment Act, 1964, concurred in	1995
Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	1995
Resolution re Bill No. 94, concurred in	1995
Hospitals Tax Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported	1995
Gasoline Handling Act, bill to amend, reported	1995
Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, reported	1995
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act, bill to amend, reported	1995
Corporations Act, bill to amend, reported	1995
Lillian Frances Massey Treble Trust, bill respecting, reported	1999
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, reported	1999
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, reported	1999
Université d'Ottawa, bill respecting, reported	1999
City of Barrie, bill respecting, reported	1999
W. F. Thomas Foundation, bill respecting, reported	1999
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, reported	2000
Township of York, bill respecting, reported	2000
Ottawa Community Chests, bill respecting, reported	2002
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, reported	2002
Assumption University, bill respecting, reported	2002
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, reported	2002
Notice of motion No. 1, Mr. Roberts	2002
Third readings	2003
Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor	2007
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Roberts, agreed to	2008

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1964

The House met at 2.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Harley Central School and in the west gallery, Deer Park Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's fifth report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 4, The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964;

Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that when this House adjourns today it do stand adjourned until a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister can indicate to us—does this mean that there is some possibility the House will not resume until later than the sixth or seventh?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we will not resume before April 14. Whether we will resume then or sometime later depends upon events in Quebec. I do not know how long this conference is going to last or what might come from it. I will give the hon. members all the notice possible when we will resume, but I can assure him that we will not be resuming before April 14.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond): Have representations been made to the hon. Minister regarding assistance in settling the dispute between St. Joseph's Hospital and Miss Jean Cranstoun, secretary of the committee for the advancement of professional nurses?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I was advised that no such representations have been made to me.

Mr. Young: Would the hon. Minister countenance a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I hear the question first, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Young: The question is this: In view of the importance of bringing harmony into the nursing profession in Ontario, does the hon. Minister not think it important that the good offices of his department might be offered in order to settle the dispute now raging in the nursing profession?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to put any resources of my department at the disposal of the dissident parties if they seek our assistance.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I beg leave to table the report of the Ontario College of Art for the year ending May 31, 1963.

I had intended to deal with this at some length in my estimates before the hon. members of the House. I wish to inform them that the bill establishing Ryerson Polytechnical Institute will be proclaimed to take effect as of April 1 of this year.

I had hoped we might deal with this at some length, and we shall do so during the course of the estimates, but I wanted to tell the hon. members that the bill will take effect as of April 1.

Clerk of the House: The 60th order. Committee of the whole House. Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

TOWN OF COCHRANE

House in committee on Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the town of Cochrane.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr1 reported.

CITY OF WATERLOO

House in committee on Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the city of Waterloo.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr4 reported.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, CITY OF LONDON

House in committee on Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of London.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr5 reported.

SMITH'S FALLS

House in committee on Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the town of Smith's Falls.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr8 reported.

RIVERDALE HOSPITAL

House in committee on Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the Riverdale Hospital.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the amendment of which I have given notice. The notice is item 13 under other motions standing in my name at the bottom of page 12 of the order paper.

I move that section two of Bill No. Pr9 be amended by striking out clause (c) thereof and substituting the following:

(c) eight additional members appointed by the Metropolitan council, all of whom shall, except as provided in section 3, be members for a term of two years and until their successors are appointed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment or two to explain my proposed amendment.

Under the bill as it now stands, the board of Riverdale Hospital will consist of 13 members. Two of these members will be members of the medical staff. In addition, there will be the president of the women's auxiliary. Furthermore, under clause B there will be two members appointed annually by the council of the corporation of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto; and then finally, under clause C as it now stands, there will be eight members, a majority of the board, who will be elected by the board itself.

There is only one variation of that. In the first instance, under section three these eight members will be appointed by the Metropolitan council, but after the initial appointments, the election of a majority of the board will rest in the hands of the board itself.

When this matter was before the private bills committee I said that what was proposed here was to establish a self-perpetuating oligarchy; and I think that what I said then is equally true now. We will have a board responsible for the administration of a public hospital that will, in the main, elect itself. It will be accountable to nobody. It will in no way, not even indirectly, be accountable to anyone, because it will simply elect its own members, apart from the first five members whom I have mentioned. As far as the eight members—the majority of the board, the controlling voice on the board—are concerned, it will simply be a board that will re-elect itself in perpetuity.

I think this is a bad principle in any kind of law. I think it is a particularly bad principle with regard to the institution that we are now discussing, that is, Riverdale Hospital.

Riverdale Hospital was constructed entirely out of public funds—federal, provincial and municipal. Its operating costs will, no doubt, also be paid entirely out of public funds, primarily out of the funds of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. Undoubtedly that is where it will get all, or most, of its operating revenues.

I would imagine that if it should happen that the hospital gets into a deficit at some time in the future, which is not likely because

of the way our hospital plan operates, it would come back to the Metropolitan council for a grant to bail them out.

So this is a public hospital, constructed entirely out of public funds, operated entirely out of public funds, but accountable to no public body, except that two of its 13 members will be appointed by the Metropolitan council which was responsible for the construction of the hospital in the first place. As a matter of fact, it is provided in the bill that only one of those two may actually be members of the Metropolitan council, so that out of a board of 13 members the Metropolitan council will have not more than one of its own members on the board, and it will not be able, after the board has been set up and operating, to name more than two out of the 13 members of the board.

Under my proposal, Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment that I have put forward, the eight additional members who constitute a majority of the board will all be appointed by the Metropolitan council. They will be appointed for two-year terms and it is provided in my amendment that to begin with half of them will be appointed for a one-year term so that there will be rotating terms for the eight members. That, I think, is an infinitely more satisfactory type of provision than what we have here now.

The board will be accountable at least to the extent that its members are appointed by the Metropolitan council. I think it is time we abandoned the old practice in this province of setting up boards to administer important public institutions and not holding them, even indirectly accountable to the public. For that reason I think my proposed amendment is a sound one and I think the sponsor of the bill and the House should accept that amendment.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, as the proposer of the bill, I would urge all hon. members not to support the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Woodbine.

We had a very good discussion on this point in the private bills committee, Mr. Chairman. I have much more confidence in the members of the Metropolitan council and the members of the board of directors of the Riverdale Hospital than my hon. friend. I often think that we owe a great debt of gratitude to these volunteer hospital workers, these men and women who serve on the boards of our great hospitals throughout the province. They serve without remuneration. They spend many hours of their time for the public good, and I know that this will be carried

through in administering the affairs of the Riverdale Hospital.

Now the purpose of the bill is to create an incorporated body to administer and operate the hospital on the same basis as prevails in all other general hospitals in this Metropolitan area. At present the board of management is a committee of council, that is a committee of the Metropolitan Toronto Council and weaknesses of this type of management have been exposed now that the structure is gradually being filled to capacity.

I have a letter here, Mr. Chairman, from Mr. William R. Allen, QC, chairman of the Metropolitan council and I think it would be a good idea to have the hon. members know the feeling there. I quote:

The proposed Act includes provision for the appointment of the original members of the board of the Metropolitan council and thereafter for the appointment by the Metropolitan council of two of the ten appointed members. It was the express intention of the Metropolitan council to divest itself of the responsibility of operating the hospital and it will not be making current or operational grants. It would be unfair to those serving on the board that they should be subject to the influence of the council responsible for their appointment but with no current financial participation. The board could not be considered truly independent as are all other hospital boards in the Metropolitan area, if council were to retain the power to appoint the members.

It is believed that the interests of the Metropolitan corporation is adequately protected by the two members who will serve on the board after appointment by the council.

And this memorandum is signed by William R. Allen, QC.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that we could undertake to have the board look into the feasibility of encouraging hospital membership so that the public might have a broad representation. When this comes about the board could be nominated and proposed by the members at large, which is done on all general hospital boards. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the concern of the hon. member about having so many members, that is elected members of the council, on this board because I think we have proven in Metropolitan Toronto that they can be very well and efficiently operated by a good representation of elected people together with volunteer directors. I would therefore urge that this amendment be not accepted.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for High Park has never been noted for his logic and I think the statement he has made now is about as illogical as anyone could conceive. He ended up by saying that the interests of the Metropolitan council are adequately represented when they have two out of 13 members of a board. He quotes a letter from the chairman of the Metropolitan executive. Mr. Chairman, I would say that if Mr. Allen thinks the Metropolitan council should abdicate its responsibility, that is its business, but I do not think it should be permitted to do so. I do not think it should turn over an institution for whose financing it has been responsible entirely to a board on which it has practically no influence at all. The hon. member for High Park has suggested that this is the type of administration we have set up for all public hospitals in the city of Toronto. That is not entirely true, but it is close enough to be accepted. I will not quibble with him about it.

I would suggest to the hon. member that some of the things that have been happening in hospitals in this area indicate that we ought to be reconsidering the type of organization we have. The total lack of accountability, I would suggest to the hon. member, is one of the reasons for the maladministration which has become all too apparent in hospitals in this area—a total disregard for the public.

I do not think we should allow this sort of thing to continue. I am suggesting when we are now setting up a new hospital altogether we should take another look at the unsatisfactory practices we have had in the past and consider ways and means of improving them for the future. As a matter of fact, I would concede that my proposed amendment is by no means entirely satisfactory, but it is the best I can do within the terms of this bill.

Even under my amendment, the board will be quite independent. The talk about independence in Mr. Allen's letter is a complete red herring. These people will merely be appointed by the council, but for the term of their appointment they are entirely on their own. I think even that is unsatisfactory, but there is certainly no question as to their independence. It is just their method of appointment I am concerned about. At least I think the responsible public body should have the power of appointment of the majority of the members.

I believe, and I have suggested previously in this House, that we should look into the whole question of hospital administration; and more particularly the method of appoint-

ment and the responsibility of boards of trustees, boards of governors, boards of management or whatever you want to call them. I think we should do that, but when we are setting up a new board let us not perpetuate the errors of the past.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am in considerable doubt as to the advisability of this bill at all. I am not sure that a better method of administration would not have been to continue what we have had in the past where a committee of the council ran the hospital. I have no doubt there has been a lot of pressure from the medical profession to take this public institution out from under public control, and that is why we have this bill before us. As I say, I cannot revise the whole bill, but I can at least move an amendment to indicate the direction in which we should be moving if we want to do anything about the problem of hospital administration in this and other areas. At least my amendment, although it is not entirely satisfactory, does indicate that direction.

Mr. Cowling: In the space of about five minutes, which is pretty good for the hon. member for Woodbine, he has indicated that the members, the hundreds, probably thousands of volunteer people that serve on hospital boards in the province should all be wiped out because they are not doing a very good job.

And then on the next question, he condemns the doctors of the province for their part in what they are trying to do.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for High Park purported to quote what I said. It was about as accurate as his quotes usually are. I said no such thing about the members of hospital boards throughout the province. I said merely that we should reconsider the whole method of hospital administration as it is now enacted in various statutes of this province.

Mr. Cowling: That is what I was getting at, Mr. Chairman, if I could just finish on that point. The hon. member proposes that we have a great big investigation of all the hospitals in the province which is—

Mr. Bryden: I did not say that.

Mr. Cowling: Well, the hon. member practically did then.

An hon. member: Make your own speech.

Mr. Cowling: I am making my own speech and I really do not need any help from the hon. member. I will get along all right. I

have not had a chance to make many speeches at this session because the hon. member has been making them all. So give me a chance; that is all I ask.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the hon. members should not vote for this amendment because in the first place it has been proposed by the Metropolitan council of Toronto and I think that those gentlemen are a little closer, maybe, to this picture than some other people in the House. They propose that this is the way they can see the hospital operated on the best possible terms. Quite frankly, I agree with it.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, if I could just add what our party, after our caucus on this amendment, feels.

We, sir, feel that in a sense this is a little bit like "Alice in Wonderland." I say it is like "Alice in Wonderland" because the whole subject of independence of hospital boards is really a lot of mythology. As has been pointed out so distinctly by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), the hospital boards have been emasculated a long time ago by the overpowering influence of the Ontario Hospital Commission—

Mr. Cowling: Let us stay right on this.

Mr. Thompson: I am, because I am referring to the fact we are discussing the composition of the board. We have had instances about the independence of this particular board. As far as we are concerned, we agree wholeheartedly with the amendment of our hon. friend from Woodbine. We want to see these boards enlarged and we think its principles are sound.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment say "aye".

All those opposed to the amendment say "nay".

In my opinion the motion is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment, please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 23, the nays 64.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Sections 2 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr9 reported.

BROCK UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill No. Pr10, An Act to incorporate Brock University.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I do not have an amendment to move to this section of the bill. I merely want to state a point of concern now. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has left the House.

My concern is simply this: I suspect that we in this Legislature, and the government in particular, will be making a profound mistake if in the incorporation of universities from this point forward members on the administrative staff and teaching staff at the university are specifically excluded from boards of governors.

We face a period in higher education expansion where the problems of staff are becoming ever more important, and where the feelings of university professors in particular are being expressed through their associations and through various briefs and representations to government. And it seems to me that whereas in the early stages there was some justification in an absolute separation between the senate and the board, that justification has now gone, particularly with boards of governors now invariably passing judgment on academic policy by the mere fact of the manner in which grants are made within the university structure. The university professors have expressed in the last while in many provinces across Canada, and increasingly in Ontario, a great concern about representation on boards of governors and I think it is worth the contemplation of the government. I do not wish to express it in the form of an amendment, but I express anxiety at this point.

Sections 8 to 30, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr10 reported.

SCHOOL AREA, TOWNSHIP OF ERIN

House in committee on Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting the township school area of the township of Erin.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr12 reported.

CITY OF LONDON

House in committee on Bill No. Pr13, An Act respecting the city of London.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule A agreed to.

Schedule B agreed to.

Bill No. Pr13 reported.

TOWN OF THOROLD

House in committee on Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting the town of Thorold.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedules A to D, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr16 reported.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 27 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

every purchaser of gasoline shall pay to the Minister for the use of the Crown in right of Ontario a charge or tax at the rate of 15 cents per imperial gallon on all gasoline purchased or delivery of which is received by him,

as provided for in Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE GASOLINE TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 40 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

(a) every purchaser shall pay to the Treasurer a tax at the rate of 20.5 cents per imperial gallon on all fuel received by him; and

(b) every registrant shall pay to the Treasurer a tax at the rate of 20.5 cents per imperial gallon on all fuel used by him to generate power for the propulsion of a motor vehicle,

as provided for in Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I ask my hon. friend how does this tax compare with that levied in other provinces for this fuel?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, it is less than the amount levied in the province of Quebec. I am not entirely certain with respect to the fuel tax of the other eastern provinces. I expect that it is less. The fuel tax, if I am correct in my information, is 21 cents in Quebec.

Resolution concurred in.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 41 reported.

THE REFORMATORIES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Reformatories Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 42 reported.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 47, The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 60, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 47 reported.

THE ENERGY ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 48, The Energy Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 48 reported.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT CLAIMS ACT, 1961-62

House in committee on Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, 1961-62.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 49 reported.

THE ANATOMY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Anatomy Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 50 reported.

THE MINING ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 51 reported.

THE ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT, 1949

House in committee on Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act, 1949.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 55 reported.

THE MATERNITY BOARDING HOUSES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Maternity Boarding Houses Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 56 reported.

THE NURSES ACT, 1961-62

House in committee on Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Nurses Act, 1961-62.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 57 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

the real and personal property, business and income of the Ontario Mental Health Foundation and of the Dr. C. K. Clarke Institute of Psychiatry are not subject to taxation for municipal or provincial purposes,

as provided for in Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-61.

Resolution concurred in.

THE ONTARIO MENTAL HEALTH FOUNDATION ACT, 1960-61

House in committee on Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-61.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 58 reported.

THE RADIOLOGICAL TECHNICIANS ACT, 1962-63

House in committee on Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Radiological Technicians Act, 1962-63.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 59 reported.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-62

House in committee on Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-62.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 61 reported.

THE ONTARIO-ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 63 reported.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 77 reported.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 78 reported.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

On section 1:

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection five of section five of The Ontario Municipal Board Act, as enacted by section 1 of Bill No. 80, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

5. The Public Service Act, 1961-62, except sections 4 and 5, applies to members of the board.

Actually, this is only a correction of the previous wording. It has the same intent.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 80 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

the monies required for the purposes of The Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963, shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,

as provided in Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963.

Resolution concurred in.

THE MUNICIPAL WORKS ASSISTANCE ACT, 1963

House in committee on Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 81 reported.

THE MILK INDUSTRY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Milk Industry Act.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 82 reported.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

On section 1:

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, in compliance with an

undertaking which I made in the committee on agriculture, I would move that in section 1 on page 2 of the bill, subsection 3, clause (c) be removed and the following substituted therefor:

requiring producers of the farm product to pay licence fees to the association.

There are other amendments. Shall I move them now, Mr. Chairman, or do you clear that; then we move the others? They are all in the same section.

Then on page 3 of the bill as printed, we would move that subsection 4 be inserted as follows:

Where the Lieutenant-Governor in Council makes regulations establishing a programme under subsection 3, every producer of the farm product shall be deemed to be the holder of a licence for the production of the farm product.

This, I believe, was agreed to in committee the other day. This would require then, sir, the renumbering of the present subsection 4 to 5 and 5 to 6.

We would move the complete deletion of (d) of subsection 5, the new subsection 5.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 83 reported.

THE FARM PRODUCTS GRADES AND SALES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 91 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

every corporation as defined in The Corporations Tax Act shall pay to Her Majesty for the use of Ontario the taxes imposed,

as provided by Bill No. 92, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 92, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this bill, as I take it, is made necessary by federal legislation. That is, it is needed to dovetail your own statute into the federal legislation.

I have been reading the explanatory note on section 1 and I would appreciate it if the hon. Provincial Treasurer would give us a little bit of elaboration.

I take it this relates to capital costs allowances and to companies with a degree of Canadian ownership. I take it that they are to get preferred treatment in that respect. Is that the situation?

Hon. Mr. Allan: This enables companies that qualify under the 50 per cent Canadian ownership to get accelerated depreciation on capital expenditures and it coincides with the provisions of the federal Act.

Sections 1 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 92 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

where an individual whose chief source of income has been farming or fishing during a taxation year has filed an election in accordance with subsection 1 of section 42 of the Federal Act for the year of averaging, the tax payable under Part II of The Income Tax Act, 1961-62 for the year of averaging is an amount determined,

as prescribed in The Income Tax Amendment Act, 1964.

Resolution concurred in.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-62

House in committee on Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 93 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

a purchaser of admission to a place of amusement shall pay to the Treasurer for the use of Her Majesty in right of Ontario a tax on the price of admission as prescribed in The Hospitals Tax Amendment Act, 1964,

as provided in Bill 94, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE HOSPITALS TAX ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 94 reported.

THE GASOLINE HANDLING ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Gasoline Handling Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 95 reported.

THE PHARMACY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 96 reported.

THE ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 97 reported.

THE LILLIAN FRANCES MASSEY TREBLE TRUST

House in committee on Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the Lillian Frances Massey Treble Trust.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, I am holding Bill No. Pr18 and calling Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of matters about which I would like to ask with regard to section 5.

First of all subsection 1. As I understand, it had previously been prohibited for a life insurance company to invest in the shares of another insurance company, and this prohibition has been removed. Would the hon.

Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) be kind enough to explain the reason for this change in the Act?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, up until now a life insurance company has been prohibited to invest in other types of insurance such as fire, accidents and that type of thing. The tendency now is for insurance companies, from an operating basis, to be able to participate in all types of insurance.

The insurance companies incorporated federally have had this ability for a number of years, so that Ontario corporations have been handicapped until now. In trying to find out the history of this prohibition, I was unable to discover the reasoning why it had been put in. It goes back many, many years and there was no one able to explain to me why it had been prohibited in the first instance.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I could at least speculate as to the reason. I think the reason probably was that the Legislature at the time wanted, to some degree, to prevent undue monopoly in this field by preventing life insurance companies from gobbling up other types of insurance companies. It would seem now that it is a wide open field. It is open season. The big fellows can go and grab the small ones by buying up their shares, getting control over them and thus creating greater concentrations of financial power within the community. Heaven knows they are big enough right now!

I would imagine that was the reason for the prohibition. I am somewhat concerned to see that the prohibition has now been removed. I would imagine that if a life insurance company wanted to get into other types of insurance, it would not have to invest in the shares of other companies. It could presumably get its charter amended. I am not quite sure what the law is on that, but it could have a general line of insurance business. The possibility of some of the big ones moving in and taking over the little ones is not a prospect that I think is particularly inviting to the public. It is the public that will suffer if we get excessive concentration in this field.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think this is in the interests of the public, because it is an ability of the insurance companies to participate in this thing and, of course, invest their funds. There are limitations in the Act as to the total number of shares that they are able to invest.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, is there a limitation with respect to other insurance companies? I take it there is, or does the limitation that is referred to in the next subsection apply to all of their investments?

I notice, Mr. Chairman, if we can get on to that point, that under subsection 2 of the bill the limitation on the insurance companies is relaxed quite substantially. They were previously limited to ten per cent of the total shares in any one company and now they are permitted to go up to 20 per cent.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): That still would not give them control.

Mr. Bryden: I submit that it could very easily give them control. I think anybody, with even the relatively limited knowledge that I have of corporate structure, knows that you can frequently get control if you have a concentrated holding of shares. The American Telegraph and Telephone Company controls Bell Telephone and I think it holds about two per cent of the shares. Now, admittedly, this is a huge company.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You picked the largest company.

Mr. Bryden: I quite agree, and two per cent of the shares of Bell is quite a significant holding. Still, if there is one shareholder with a concentrated block of 20 per cent and all the other shareholders are scattered all over the country and no one of them holds more than half a per cent, I think 20 per cent might quite easily mean control. I think we should reconsider this provision.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will speak to subsection 2. Here again, the insurance companies which are incorporated federally have the ability to invest up to 30 per cent and my understanding from Mr. Gordon's Budget speech is that consideration will be given to increasing that in order to facilitate, indeed encourage, life insurance companies to invest their funds in Canadian activities. Representations have been made.

Now we have not gone even up to 30. We have gone up to 20, which we feel is a reasonable figure. But I have asked that I be kept advised of what occurs in the field of federal life insurance companies to see what happens there, because I do not think we should handicap our Ontario incorporated life insurance companies in this field as compared with federally incorporated life insurance companies.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister certainly makes an argument when he says that the

companies with Ontario charters should not be discriminated against as compared to the companies with federal charters. I can see his point there, particularly since, I would imagine, the Ontario companies are smaller than the federally chartered companies.

We cannot do anything about the federal law here, but I think this is a dangerous trend. The fact that the federal government has embarked upon it is, in my opinion, no argument. There have been few men more confused in this whole area of ownership and control than Mr. Walter Gordon. I do not think he knows what he is doing.

It is not appropriate here to debate his various measures, but he is terribly concerned about what he conceives to be American control. I am concerned about that too, although I must say that any measures he has proposed would have no significant effect on American control at all.

However, there are more things in the world to be concerned about than American control. I think it is time we started to develop a concern in this country about insurance company control. All of these large financial institutions, which are getting larger and where control is getting more and more concentrated, I think pose a threat to the community as a whole, in terms of the economic power they can exercise; whether they are American or Canadian, I do not care.

Under this clause, I submit to the hon. Minister that it is possible for insurance companies, if they see fit, to acquire control of other types of enterprises. I think that is a bad thing. I complained some time ago about the possibility of mining companies acquiring control of a public utility. I think this whole question of mergers, of holding companies, of further extension of control into more and more areas, is a question to which we have given inadequate attention.

An insurance company is a type of institution which, if you give it the freedom of action, can very quickly extend its tentacles in many directions through the economy. It is a company that accumulates other people's money and then puts it out for investment. But it, not the people who put up the money, has the control.

I submit to the hon. Minister that this clause requires much further consideration. I would have hoped that instead of following along after what the federal government was doing, he would take the matter up with the federal government to persuade them of the error of their ways, and to persuade them to develop some concern about the whole problem of control of our economy and not

to be completely mesmerized by only one aspect of the problem, namely, the aspect of American control.

I would suggest that this section of the bill, Mr. Chairman, should not be concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, again the hon. member has made reference to some fuzzy thinking. I think he might reconsider his own thinking, because the purpose of this is to enable life insurance companies to invest their funds and to give them more freedom with their funds.

We are not just following the federal people. We gave this consideration in the light of our own requirements. We think it is a good thing and it will inure to the benefit of both the insurance companies, who wish this, and, we hope, to the corporations in which these insurance companies will now be able to invest their funds to a greater degree.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but it is more than an investment. They are entitled to invest in common shares, and common shares are normally the voting stock, the stocks with which one can control.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Equity! Equity!

Mr. Bryden: But they also give control if you have enough of them. It is not the investment feature I am concerned about, it is the control feature.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, the investment feature is the ownership of equity—

Mr. Bryden: There are lots of types of investment that do not—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I know, debentures and bonds, and that is what you will be complaining about on another occasion, that our people invest in bonds, that they have the biggest proportion of their money invested with the areas of least return because they do not invest in common stock. If the equity were—

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister always contrives to muddy up the water when one tries to pose—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Who stirs it up?

Mr. Bryden: I am not talking about our people investing in stocks or bonds or common shares or anything else. I am talking about insurance companies, which have wholeheartedly—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: But they have vast aggregations of capital and, as I say, under the hon. Minister's proposed legislation, they can use other people's money to acquire control of other companies; and this is what I think is objectionable. It is not the people whose money is being used who have control, it is the insurance company which has the money in its hands. This is the dangerous feature, and this now permits insurance companies to get 20 per cent of the common shares. I think that is a dangerously high percentage.

Walter Gordon's proposal, I may say, is insane. The big companies, incorporated under the federal laws, can move in and take over 30 per cent of the shares of a company. It is quite possible that they will get control of quite significant companies in this country.

Sections 5 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before we leave section 8, I understand that previously if a company had been in default in filing its annual returns for three years, it was in danger of losing its charter, and now that period has been reduced to one year. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there is actually any practical effect in this amendment, in that as far as I have ever heard no company ever lost its charter if it went for 20 years without filing annual returns.

Is there going to be any tightening up of the administration so that, in fact, they will lose their charters? I would say three years would be satisfactory, if anything was ever done about it. I never heard of any of them ever losing their charters. Charters have been revived after 40 years.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am amazed. I have finally heard the hon. member for Woodbine publicly confess that there is something he has never heard about; something about which he knows nothing. We have cancelled almost 25,000 charters for this. Where has the hon. member been?

Mr. Bryden: Well, how was it that charters for race tracks were—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Read the *Ontario Gazette*. The hon. member said he had never even heard of one. In the last three years alone we have cancelled 10,000 charters.

Mr. Bryden: Well, how do they get revived after 40 years? That has happened under the hon. Minister's administration.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Let the hon. Minister answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member acknowledge that he knows nothing about something?

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is apparently trying to establish himself as the chief clown of the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a question has been asked. Is the hon. Minister going to answer the question? How does the hon. Minister explain the fact the charters were revived under his administration?

Mr. Chairman: Order! The discussion has nothing to do with the bill, in my opinion.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, it has. I was asking the hon. Minister as to the practical effect, if any, of this proposed change in the law. Now the question he has just been asked is to test the accuracy of the answer he gave us. He gave us one of these typical sort of answers.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Bryden: We are in doubt—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order. The hon. member cannot back out of his ignorance that way.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: We are in doubt, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not it conveys the true picture. We think a further question is in order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Such abysmal ignorance!

Mr. Chairman, every lawyer in this House—the hon. member there—realizes that maybe he is going to have to tighten up some of the practices in his law office, as a great many law offices have been.

We cancel regularly for failure to file. We cancel regularly for failure to file annual returns. Last year we cancelled 3,000. In the last three years we have cancelled, I would say, about 11,000. More in the last three years than probably in the previous three years. We cancel them regularly.

Mr. Bryden: Is it indicated on the file when they have been cancelled?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I have drawn files where returns have not been filed for several years and the charters have not been cancelled.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Read the *Ontario Gazette*. I will send the hon. member a copy. I signed a cancellation yesterday, I think, of several hundred corporations for failure to file.

But the important point is not what the hon. member is raising. The important point is this, and I bring it to the attention of the hon. lawyer members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are lawyer members back here, too.

Up until now a corporation is in default after the first year and we begin, or the department begins, to write letters requesting that they be filed. It is almost what is known as a hounding procedure, as some of the hon. members are aware. This will mean that after the end of one year they will be in default and we will be empowered, after having notified the directors in accordance with the Act, that we propose to do this unless they file. If they do not, then we will be in a position to cancel after one year.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the hon. Minister permit a question? In view of past practices, where they have been revived after 40 years, can we get a commitment from the hon. Minister that after one year they would be notified when the charter is cancelled—that there is absolutely no possibility of it being revived?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If the hon. member will read the amendment, he will see that there used to be a time when one could apply within three years for a reviver. Now we have reduced that period to one year. I bring to the attention of the hon. member—he knows this—that in the course of cleaning out our files we have gone back and we have almost gone through all our files. It is an uphill task to keep our files updated and the purpose of this section is to assist the department to do that.

Sections 8 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 79 reported.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct a statement I made in speaking to Bill No. 92 this afternoon. I stated that 50 per cent Canadian ownership was neces-

sary in order to qualify for accelerated depreciation. I should have said not less than 25 per cent.

LILLIAN FRANCES MASSEY TREBLE TRUST

House in committee on Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the Lillian Frances Massey Treble Trust.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr18 reported.

CITY OF OTTAWA

House in committee on Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr19 reported.

CITY OF HAMILTON

House in committee on Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr23 reported.

UNIVERSITE D'OTTAWA

House in committee on Bill No. Pr24, An Act respecting Université d'Ottawa.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr24 reported.

CITY OF BARRIE

House in committee on Bill No. Pr26, An Act respecting the city of Barrie.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr26 reported.

W. F. THOMAS FOUNDATION

House in committee on Bill No. Pr27, An Act respecting the W. F. Thomas Foundation.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr27 reported.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

House in committee on Bill No. Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr28 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF YORK

House in committee on Bill No. Pr29, An Act respecting the township of York.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rules of the House, due notice having been given on the order paper, under motion 15, I would like to move that section 2 be amended by deleting the words, "exempt from taxation, except for local improvement and school purposes," and inserting, in lieu thereof, the words:

in any year make a grant of a sum of money up to an amount equal to the amount of taxes for general municipal purposes levied against.

Mr. Chairman, I think, in speaking to this amendment, the reason is amply clear. Tax exemptions of premises of this type are guaranteed for ten years under The Municipal Act as it stands at present. I think that this is right and proper, but I think any further subsidy for these types of premises should be by means of a grant from the municipality rather than as a tax exemption.

I think whichever way it is, tax exemption or grant, it is a subsidy. The tax exemption is a subsidy. The trouble is that it tends to be forgotten, because you do not have to actually pay the money out, it just is never brought in. I think a much fairer way is for each municipal council in each year to look at the situation and to decide if the cause is worthy and the grant should be made. The power is here then for them to make this political decision themselves. I feel this is a much fairer way for the people concerned.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, it may be of some use to the hon. members of the House to know that as sponsor of the bill, I find the amendment quite acceptable.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason the government finds

itself in the problem as presently presented is that there is no policy insofar as exemptions are concerned.

For instance, the Canadian Legion halls that are located in the city of Toronto are exempt from municipal taxation. York township comes in and says, "We want the same privilege." There is no reason in the world why, if the city of Toronto has it, York township should not have it.

The motion for this amendment was put forward before the committee on private bills. It was duly discussed and it was discarded. The plea addressed to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was, for once and for all, to determine government policy as to what exemptions there should be.

These exemptions should apply from one end of the province to the other and not just be limited to those particular municipalities who happen to gather in a favour by an application for a private bill.

This bill is extending, whether in its present form or in the suggested amended form, is extending the evil that exists. And it is going to continue, this evil is going to continue to be extended, because there is a complete and absolute lack of government policy in connection with exemptions from taxation.

If the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was taking a responsible position in connection with this particular matter, he would stand up and say, "it is government policy to exempt all Legion branches in the province of Ontario or no Legion branches in the province of Ontario." Or he would say "we will allow, by a provision in The Municipal Act, any municipal council to make a grant in lieu of taxes which will be reviewed every year, to any Legion branch." But none of those things is being said.

Mr. Chairman, over the years we have urged the government to have a consistent policy in matters of this sort and in other sorts. When the government refuses to do this, then they get into trouble. There is no logic whatsoever that there be one law for York township and one law for the city of Toronto, and no law for the township of North York or the township of Scarborough in regard to this particular matter.

I think the responsibility lies with the government to enunciate this afternoon, as this bill is here, what is their policy. Do they believe that all Legion branches should pay taxes, or no Legion should pay taxes? They should reflect that in the general legislation.

The discussions as to whether or not this should be amended is an academic discussion.

Perhaps the hon. member who moved the amendment thinks this is going to save face because, again, the onus is being somewhat transferred to the local council rather than being accepted by this Legislature. Mr. Chairman, if we are doing our job here in this Legislature we will enunciate the policy and it will apply all over province of Ontario.

The hon. member who moved the amendment is trying to have the best of both worlds. Let us not be unkind to York township, but let us not take a stand. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment has no validity. Perhaps even the original section has no validity, but some of us who voted for the original section did so, however, after having enunciated the principle that I am putting forth this afternoon.

Once and for all let us have a single policy that will apply to all parts of the province of Ontario in matters such as this one.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was a little slow in getting up to speak because I was hoping that some spokesman for the administration would have something to say on this matter.

The hon. member for Downsview has put before the government a case which has been put before them many times before. He has put it before them effectively, in my opinion, and it has been put before them effectively on many occasions in the past.

Mr. Chairman, we just simply cannot get any answer from them.

I think that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough North would be a sound amendment if it stood all by itself and was an amendment to general municipal legislation. But when one considers it in relation to the hodgepodge of provisions in private bills that have gone through this House, even in my relatively short experience here—I would hate to think of what the situation looks like in terms of the experience to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver)—but in the time I have been here we have put through tax exemptions for all sorts of different kinds of organizations; YMCAs in great numbers; and I can remember one for a recreation association in the city of Ottawa. As a matter of fact, the mayor of Ottawa battled it right down the line, but it went through anyway in the private bills committee and, as I recall it, through the House.

The rationale presented was that everything was fine if the municipality requested it and it was provided in the statute that this was an option of the municipal council—in fact, the term they used was that it was a matter of local autonomy.

Those words seem to have a certain magic with Tories. I do not know why, because they use them in ways that have no meaning, but they love to use them. That was the rationale that was always given to us, as long as it was optional upon the council and the council asked to have this discretionary power, then it was all right. Now it is being suggested to us that it is not all right for the council to have discretionary power in this field, even when it asks for it and that the discretionary powers should be of a somewhat different nature, namely, to make grants rather than to grant tax exemptions.

I believe that in terms of the benefit the Legion branches will be in exactly the same position whether the amendment is passed or the original section is passed, but surely the time must come when we have some sort of a policy on this matter of tax exemption.

Are we going to give local councils the discretion to give tax exemptions to certain classes of organizations? If so, let us do it in the general law. Are we going, as an alternative, to give them discretion to make grants? Well, let us cover that by the general law. But as it now stands, it is a mess that is becoming worse and more complicated all the time.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough North just makes the mess still bigger.

It provides still another approach to this overall problem. It may be the best approach, but the point is that no approach is good if they are all different. Personally, I do not imagine that I will succeed, but I am going to vote against the amendment just because I do not see why the Legions in York township should be treated any differently from any similar organizations in many places.

I suspect the amendment will carry since the sponsor himself has no objection to it, but I do think that this calls for a statement not only from the sponsor of the bill, but from a spokesman for the administration.

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Woodbine finds a good deal of merit in consistency.

If my memory is correct, I believe his leader, the hon. member for York South sponsored the direct progenitor of this bill in a

previous session—a sponsorship which failed at that time. I presume that the consistency which is regarded as being so virtuous in his devotion to centralized policies will lead the hon. members of his party at least to support this.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for Forest Hill; he has underlined the validity of observations of the hon. member for Woodbine. Since I sponsored the bill last year, obviously I should oppose this amendment and be in favour of what I sponsored last year. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Bryden: What about the hon. member for Forest Hill?

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I may be naive as a new member here, but I was led to believe, no one has told me otherwise, that this was a private bill. This is not a government measure and no one has told me I should or should not do anything specific on this. This amendment represents the thinking of some of us among the government backbenchers who sit on the private bills committee. We might have our own views as to what government policy should be in this regard and perhaps it would be something along the lines of this amendment.

I certainly see no reason why this amendment should not be moved. If we feel strongly against this principle of allowing tax exemption and are in favour of grants in lieu—and as I have said there is a difference; they are both subsidies, but the grants in lieu place the responsibility on the local council each year and I think this is where it should remain for all councils.

I feel, as a backbencher, that this is a good amendment and one, on a private bill, which I should sponsor, which is backed by many others and which, at least in this small regard, brings some kind of order to this situation. I think it is the right answer for helping any groups of this type and that is why I make the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment please say “aye”. All those opposed to the amendment say “nay”. In my opinion, the “ayes” have it.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 3 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr29 reported.

OTTAWA COMMUNITY CHESTS

House in committee on Bill No. Pr30, An Act respecting Ottawa community chests.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr30 reported.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

House in committee on Bill No. Pr31, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr31 reported.

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill No. Pr32, An Act respecting Assumption University.

Sections 1 to 29, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr32 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

House in committee on Bill No. Pr34, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr34 reported.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments and certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain resolutions and certain bills with amendments and certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: The government notice of motion No. 1 by hon. A. K. Roberts.

Resolved,

That,

Elmer W. Sopha, Member of the Assembly for the Electoral District of Sudbury, may bargain for and purchase from Her Majesty

the Queen in right of the province of Ontario, as represented by the Minister of Lands and Forests, under section 43b of The Public Lands Act, the public lands being the east half of the north part of lot 9 in concession V in the township of Burwash in the Territorial District of Sudbury, having an area of 66.4 acres, more or less, for agricultural purposes, at a price of \$132.80, being \$2 an acre, provided the letters patent therefor shall not issue until any merchantable timber thereon has been cut and removed under The Crown Timber Act, and his seat in the Assembly shall not thereby be vacated nor shall he thereby be rendered ineligible as a member of or to sit or to vote in the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that this is not the first such motion relating to the hon. gentleman in question. Is he slowly acquiring all the Crown land up in that area, or what is going on here?

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps that this would be a suitable place for him to go to pasture, if he had to.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading, upon motions:

Bill No. 1, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 3, The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): At every stage of this bill where it has been possible for a member to make comments, and also in the estimates, I have urged upon the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) the necessity of making adequate provision for inspection if this fine, new, shiny Industrial Safety Act is to mean anything. I have told the hon. Minister before that I object to window dressing. I am submitting to him that this is nothing but window dressing.

He indicated in committee of supply that in the coming fiscal year he intended to increase the inspection staff for the enforcement of this legislation from 51 to 59 inspectors. This would still leave the inspectors in the position where they have an impossible work load and cannot conceivably do the kind of inspection that is required. I suggested to the hon. Minister

at the time that he should aim this year at increasing his inspection staff for the purposes of this Act by 50 per cent, and should have a minimum objective in mind over the next couple of years of doubling that staff.

Obviously, my words have had no more influence on the hon. Minister or on the government than many other sound propositions advanced in this House. Therefore, in the hope that it might be possible to bring this whole matter home to the government, and to force upon their attention the fact that a safety Act is only as good as the instruction thereunder, and that the inspection in this field is totally inadequate, and that therefore this new Act will be totally inadequate because it has not got adequate inspection staff; I will move, seconded by the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn)

That,

the motion for the third reading of this bill be amended by striking out all the words after "that" and substituting the following: third reading of Bill No. 3 be deferred until after the government has placed before the House detailed plans for increasing, as quickly as possible, the safety inspection staff of The Department of Labour to the level necessary to make the bill meaningful.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to speak to this amendment?

Mr. A. E. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment, like the hon. member for Woodbine I feel that it is all very well to have a safety Act, but the essence of seeing that a safety Act reaches out into all the factories and industries of Ontario and assures the safety of the working man, is that we have adequate safety inspection. I, sir, have noticed in the past that there has been considerable delay in connection with the recruitment of safety inspectors.

I can think of an experience myself, just bringing this to a concrete example. I can think of an experience in which a man, who seemed to me perfectly qualified to be at least considered as a safety inspector, went through a process of delay in connection with his application. I do not say this is the responsibility of the hon. Minister, because it was going through a process among civil servants. He had applied for a position as safety inspector. I finally had to phone the deputy Minister, Mr. Tom Eberlee, who is a very able and dedicated civil servant, to find out whether the examination was still open or not. I was informed that an

examination at that time was still being considered and safety inspectors could apply. But I know there was a state of confusion about the whole recruitment in this case. The man finally learned that more openings would be coming later.

The very essence of this bill, sir, is that there is a staff. We must consider the amendment by the hon. member for Woodbine. I would say, sir, that as we are considering his amendment we see that certainly the bill, in the way it is written, is a most necessary bill; there is no question of that.

But our concern again is that this will indeed be just window dressing if the department does not have the staff to carry it out. We, sir, like the hon. member for Woodbine, realize that it is not enough just to have ammunition, one also needs guns to fire the ammunition. It seems to us, sir, that the hon. Minister has not provided himself with the guns. Therefore to show the need to get the guns, the need to get the necessary staff, we, sir, will go along with the amendment of the hon. member for Woodbine.

Mr. Speaker: Before anyone else speaks to this amendment, I would like to say that in reading over the amendment it is difficult to determine if it is in order. It looks like a sort of hybrid amendment or motion because it seeks to delay the bill. It does not name a certain time, therefore it is not a hoist motion, and yet it is not a reasoned amendment, in my opinion.

Because of this opinion, I shall rule the amendment out of order. I do not want to be unduly restrictive on this matter with the hon. member, but I think that he should have done one of two things. If he had wished to amend the bill by referring it to committee, that would have been a reasoned amendment; or to have moved that it be not now read a third time, but six months hence, or three months hence; that would have made it a hoist motion.

But this amendment just seeks to delay the bill, and therefore on that ground I rule it out of order.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act.

Bill No. 11, An Act to repeal The Slot Machines Act.

Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.

Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act.

Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill No. 17, An Act to amend The Dower Act.

Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Department of Energy Resources Act.

Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Department of Travel and Publicity Act.

Bill No. 23, An Act to repeal The Female Refugees Act.

Bill No. 24, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill No. 25, An Act to amend The Mental Incompetency Act.

Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.

Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill No. 30, An Act to amend The Killarney Recreational Reserve Act, 1962-63.

Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Trees Act.

Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Allan's) Budget address and considered it carefully. I have listened to the relatively small amount

he has had to say on this bill to increase the gasoline tax in the province. I do not think he has made out a case for this increase in tax. I would say that if he feels that he wants more money from highway users, he should look to other sources, as we tried to indicate to him when this bill was at its second reading stage. But I think the tax is ill-considered and unnecessary at this time. Therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Gisborn:

That the motion for third reading of Bill No. 40 be amended by striking out the word "now" and adding thereto the words "six months hence."

I do not think this one will give you any difficulty, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Moved by Mr. Bryden, seconded by Mr. Gisborn, that the motion be amended by striking out the word "now" and adding thereto the words "six months hence".

As many as are in favour of the amendment will please say "aye". As many as are opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

For the benefit of the members who have just come into the House, I would just like to say that we are voting on Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act—an amendment moved by Mr. Bryden, seconded by Mr. Gisborn that the motion be amended by striking out the word "now" and adding thereto the words "that the bill be read six months hence."

The amendment was negatived on the following division:

YEAS	NAYS
Braithwaite	Allan
Bryden	Auld
Bukator	Beckett
Davison	Boyer
Farquhar	Brown
Gisborn	Brunelle
Lewis	Butler
(Scarborough West)	Carruthers
MacDonald	Cecile
Newman	Connell
Nixon	Cowling
Oliver	Demers
Paterson	Downer
Racine	Dunlop
Singer	Dymond
Spence	Eagleson
Taylor	Edwards
Thompson	Evans
Trotter	Ewen

YEAS

Troy
Whicher
Worton
Young—22

NAYS

Gomme
Guindon
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
Kerr
Knox
Lawrence
(St. George)
Lawrence
(Russell)
Letherby
Lewis
(Humber)
MacNaughton
Mackenzie
McNeil
Morningstar
Noden
Olde
Pittock
Price
Pritchard
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Sandercock
Simonett
Spoonier
Stewart
Walker
Wardrope
Welch
(Scarborough East)
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yaremko—60

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the ayes are 22, the nays 60.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.
Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Reformatories Act.

Bill No. 47, The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Bill No. 48, The Energy Act, 1964.

Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Anatomy Act.

Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act, 1949.

Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Maternity Boarding Houses Act.

Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Nurses Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-61.

Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Radiological Technicians Act, 1962-63.

Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963.

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Milk Industry Act.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act.

Bill No. 92, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act.

Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Gasoline Handling Act.

Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Bill No. 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act.

Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the town of Cochrane.

Bill No. Pr2, An Act respecting the city of Owen Sound.

Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the city of Waterloo.

Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the board of education in the city of London.

Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting Huron College.

Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the town of Smith's Falls.

Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the Riverdale Hospital.

Bill No. Pr10, An Act to incorporate Brock University.

Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting the township school area of the township of Erin.

Bill No. Pr13, An Act respecting the city of London.

Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting the town of Thorold.

Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the Lillian Frances Massey Treble Trust.

Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Bill No. Pr20, An Act respecting the Ross Memorial Hospital.

Bill No. Pr22, An Act to incorporate the Masonic Foundation of Ontario.

Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Bill No. Pr24, An Act respecting Université d'Ottawa.

Bill No. Pr26, An Act respecting the city of Barré.

Bill No. Pr27, An Act respecting the W. F. Thomas Foundation.

Bill No. Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Bill No. 29, An Act respecting the township of York.

Bill No. Pr30, An Act respecting Ottawa Community Chests.

Bill No. Pr31, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. Pr32, An Act respecting Assumption University of Windsor.

Bill No. Pr34, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed several

bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Assistant Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill No. 1, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 3, The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act.

Bill No. 11, An Act to repeal The Slot Machines Act.

Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.

Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act.

Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill No. 17, An Act to amend The Dower Act.

Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Department of Energy Resources Act.

Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Department of Travel and Publicity Act.

Bill No. 23, An Act to repeal The Female Refugees Act.

Bill No. 24, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill No. 25, An Act to amend The Mental Incompetency Act.

Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.

Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill No. 30, An Act to amend The Killarney Recreational Reserve Act, 1962-63.

Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Trees Act.

Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Reformatories Act.

Bill No. 47, The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Bill No. 48, The Energy Act, 1964.

Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Anatomy Act.

Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act, 1949.

Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Maternity Boarding Houses Act.

Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Nurses Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-61.

Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Radiological Technicians Act, 1962-63.

Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Municipal Works Assistance Act, 1963.

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Milk Industry Act.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act.

Bill No. 92, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act.

Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Gasoline Handling Act.

Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Bill No. 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act.

Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the town of Cochrane.

Bill No. Pr2, An Act respecting the city of Owen Sound.

Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the city of Waterloo.

Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the board of education of the city of London.

Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting Huron College.

Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the town of Smith's Falls.

Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the Riverdale Hospital.

Bill No. Pr10, An Act to incorporate Brock University.

Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting the township school area of the township of Erin.

Bill No. Pr13, An Act respecting the city of London.

Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting the town of Thorold.

Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the Lillian Frances Massey Treble Trust.

Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Bill No. Pr20, An Act respecting the Ross Memorial Hospital.

Bill No. Pr22, An Act to incorporate the Masonic Foundation of Ontario.

Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Bill No. Pr24, An Act respecting Université d'Ottawa.

Bill No. Pr26, An Act respecting the city of Barrie.

Bill No. Pr27, An Act respecting the W. F. Thomas Foundation.

Bill No. Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Bill No. Pr29, An Act respecting the township of York.

Bill No. Pr30, An Act respecting Ottawa Community Chests.

Bill No. Pr31, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. Pr32, An Act respecting Assumption University of Windsor.

Bill No. Pr34, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

To these Acts the Royal Assent was announced by the assistant Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Assistant Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, when next we meet we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare, followed by the balance of the estimates of The Department of Travel and Publicity.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

This House stands adjourned until a day to be named by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

The House adjourned at 5.25 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 14, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Statement re hospital situation in Ontario, Mr. Dymond	2012
Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, continued	2020
Recess, 6 o'clock	2050
Appendix "A"	2051

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery, students from Bowmore Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. We are just in routine proceedings.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to bring up a matter I feel is almost of national importance. I understand this Legislature is scheduled to meet tonight and we do know that in Canada, hockey is our national sport. In view of the fact that the Canadian team and one from the American side is meeting tonight, I think that probably it is possible to re-schedule our sittings to leave the hon. members and other people a chance to watch or go to that game. That is not only the game tonight, but the other games that will be scheduled in days to come.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is feasible to rearrange the sittings but I feel that especially in view of tonight's game and the game on Thursday, we could rearrange our sitting schedule to suit those times. After all, the game of hockey in Canada, Mr. Speaker, is our national game and I think most of us would like to view this.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), which is somewhat more directly related to the business of the House.

I would like to ask him if it is intended to

proceed with the second reading of Bills Nos. Pr11 and Pr14 at this session of the Legislature.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the disposition of these two bills is still under consideration.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, notice of which has been given to the appropriate hon. Ministers. The first one is to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond): Has The Department of Health investigated the recent hospitalization of employees of Allied Chemical of Canada Limited, near Sarnia, because of the ill effects of phosgene gas? Furthermore, have complaints been raised from the public regarding dangerous air pollution? If so, what action has The Department of Health taken to investigate the situation and to remedy it?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The Department of Labour and The Department of Health have had the new Allied Chemical of Canada plant near Sarnia under close supervision during construction and since it commenced operation. There have been no incidents of health problems related to phosgene used in the process. One employee was found to be allergic to TDI—toluene di-isocyanate, a plastic chemical—and prior to operating, several outside maintenance men were under observation only as the result of exposure to this chemical when cleaning pipes.

One complaint was received regarding a "blow off" which occurred on March 23. A small quantity of gas was released into the air. No ill effects occurred to either employees or persons outside the plant. Such events have not occurred at other plants operated by this company and are not to be expected at this new plant now that it is fully in operation. Nevertheless close supervision will be maintained with the fullest co-operation of the company.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart): What action has The

Department of Agriculture or the Milk Industry Board taken with regard to the harassment by dairies of milk producers who use co-operative transport in the twin-city area of Kitchener-Waterloo?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): This matter is under intensive investigation by the milk industry board and a hearing with the producers, some of whom are members of the twin-city transport co-operative, and dairy representatives is scheduled for 2.15 p.m. Wednesday, April 15.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given: Can the hon. Minister indicate whether there is truth in the statement that certain employees at the Ontario Hospital in Whitby earn take-home pay of \$220 per month, and is the hon. Minister aware of any reported employee unrest at Whitby, Hamilton and North Bay mental hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In answer to the question, I would say yes. There are certain employees at the Ontario Hospital, Whitby, earning take-home pay of \$220 per month. These are junior or unskilled workers such as laundress 1, maid, typist 1, hospital aid 1, kitchen porter, and those in such classifications. In other words, those classes where the salary is less than \$3,000 per year.

In answer to the second part of the question, it has been indicated to me that there is concern and unrest, largely related to salary rates, at the hospitals mentioned. Since these are matters coming within the purview of the civil service commission, the complaints have been referred to that commission for study and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, as I undertook before the House rose for the Easter recess, I place before you a statement regarding matters as they affect the hospital situation in Ontario, with particular reference to the state of affairs within Metro Toronto.

As in former sessions, it had been my intention and I had arranged that the hospital services commission would appear before a meeting of the standing committee on health, and that the entire time of a meeting would be given to placing before the hon. members a picture of the entire hospital situation in the province.

Because there appears to be in the minds of certain hon. members, and others, the belief that the government has not provided adequate support for hospitals in the province and, particularly, for hospitals in Metro

Toronto, I believe it necessary to put before the hon. members certain facts pertaining to this subject. It may well be that much benefit could still derive from having the Ontario Hospital Services Commission appear before the standing committee on health for an even more definitive review of the entire hospital situation in the province.

I do believe it necessary to point out that the government has never tried to minimize the seriousness of the hospital situation here in Metro Toronto. I have consistently emphasized the maldistribution of beds in the province, and I have clearly stated that a shortage does exist in Metro Toronto. In the first few months of my incumbency of this portfolio, I said to a public meeting of the Ontario Hospital Association in the Royal York Hotel here:

With this year's construction, there will be five beds per 1,000 population across the province, but this large metropolitan area will still have an acute shortage problem.

I further stated at that time:

Now that municipal treasuries are relieved of the burden of hospital-operating deficits, municipal councils might be encouraged to review their policies of giving construction grants to hospitals and might scale them upwards.

In this House on March 7, 1963, I made the following statement—it can be found in *Hansard* at page 1470:

Now my hon. friend has pointed out there is a very grave shortage in Metropolitan Toronto, that the greatest shortage exists here of any place in Ontario. This, sir, existed much more widely in the province of Ontario on January 1, 1959. But the difference between Metropolitan Toronto and the rest of the municipalities of Ontario—where lives three-quarters of Ontario's population—is this: other municipalities have found their own financing and have gone ahead with the construction of the hospitals till today the only place where an acute shortage exists with relation to the rest of the province is in Metropolitan Toronto.

And as late as March 4, 1964, I said to this House:

Last year, and largely because of the need in Metropolitan Toronto, this government increased the capital construction grants to hospitals by 60 per cent to \$3,200 a bed and \$3,200 per 300 square feet of certain designated service areas. This, on a per bed basis, in the average hospital

building project, works out to \$5,500; and this, in the average case, is one-third of the cost of construction.

Some hon. members have already spoken of what government has done in the hospital field and some have proposed methods of dealing with problems which still exist. Most of these methods have already been studied and seriously considered by government because this matter was not gone into lightly nor was it forgotten when the Ontario Hospital Care Insurance Plan came into being.

I know of no other matter affecting the life and welfare of our people that has been given as much attention as has health and hospital care, except it be education. You will surely understand, therefore, that little that is known anywhere in the world about hospitals has escaped our notice and every scheme and plan for financing has been given much thought and careful study.

From the statements of some hon. members, and for that matter from newspaper suggestions as well, I gather they believe that government should build and therefore "own" general hospitals. This would mean, of course, that government would then be in the business of operating those hospitals. May I say emphatically that nothing could be worse for hospitals and for our people.

This is an opinion shared by many equally knowledgeable and much more deeply involved in the hospital situation than are we in the department, as evidenced in a statement made by Mr. R. R. Jessup, the immediate past president of the Ontario Hospitals Association as he spoke to the annual meeting of the Oshawa General Hospital board in Oshawa. His speech is quoted in the *Oshawa Times* of March 26, 1964 and I read an extract therefrom:

Addressing the gathering was Mr. R. R. Jessup of Sudbury, a stockbroker and immediate past president of the Ontario Hospitals Association.

"Voluntary hospitals," he said meant: "People working together for the common good.

"It points out in no uncertain terms to government and to others who would have us literally spoon-fed for the rest of our lives, that within reasonable limits we are quite capable of charting our own course; not only in this hospital business but in other areas which some people are already inclined to write off to the ever-widening cloud of bureaucracy."

It was, Mr. Jessup said, an accomplishment that voluntary hospitals had been set

up "without any measure of authoritarian direction."

Canadians, he said, had been able to establish a standard of hospital care which was second to none. No other words could say with greater clarity what the voluntary hospital system had given this country.

The advent of various government-sponsored medical insurance schemes had resulted in more people receiving the care they need—care which a few years ago they may not have been able to afford, Mr. Jessup noted.

Another product of . . . government hospital legislation . . . had been an elimination of annual deficits in hospital budgeting.

"They are now free to concentrate on updating their facilities and acquiring new modern equipment, to be used by our up-to-date physicians and surgeons who are themselves continually moving ahead with medical progress," he explained.

The government bill, Mr. Jessup noted, had been "conditional" stating Ottawa would share hospital service costs but not the sums needed for buildings, land or equipment.

"There are still those," he said, "who feel that the responsibility for the hospital's capital expenditures is still the responsibility of government. This, of course, is not true."

Traditionally in Ontario, hospitals have been built and operated by voluntary boards, by religious orders and sometimes by municipalities, and I believe that herein lies much of the strength of the hospital movement in our province.

Because government has always believed that this was a good method of providing hospitals, it began to support hospitals by capital grants in 1947, and has steadily increased these grants as resources were available.

Then government brought into being an insurance plan so that hospital-operating costs would be assured, and that our people would be spared the sometimes catastrophic costs attendant upon hospitalization. The insurance plan was never intended to pay for the cost of hospital construction.

When the Ontario hospital plan was being considered, this matter of hospital ownership was again reviewed and government's position was reaffirmed. On January 29, 1957 this was made clear in the press release dealing with the proposal for hospital care insurance of the Ontario government.

An extract taken therefrom, states:

A hospital care programme of this nature has two major objectives: the removal for the patient of the economic barrier to essential hospital care, and the solving of the financial problems of hospitals in the provision of high quality services.

In achieving this second goal, it is the firm belief of this government that local ownership, management, and control of hospitals are essential. It is the determined policy of the government of Ontario that ownership of hospitals shall remain a responsibility of local communities and charitable organizations.

As evidence of this stated policy and of government's intention to continue it, I would again point out to you the fact that government in 1958 doubled its per bed grant for construction; again in 1959, it further greatly increased those grants for construction, and only last year it increased those grants by a further 60 per cent.

Now, a good deal has been said, sir, of my reference to the number of beds per 1,000 population as if to infer there was something sinister in this method of calculation. This is a common and reasonable method widely used throughout the world. Some sort of yardstick has to be used, and this method—relating beds to 1,000 population—is the one most commonly used.

Here in Ontario, based on various well-known and widely-used formulae, it is believed that: for community hospitals, four beds per 1,000 population is an acceptable figure; for district hospitals, 4.5 beds per 1,000 population is an acceptable figure; and for regional hospitals, five beds per 1,000 population is an acceptable figure. Here the regional hospitals are those mainly in the downtown area which are connected with the university medical school.

But, in every case, the particular circumstances of the community, or district, are considered, e.g., age of population, special health considerations and other factors. The bed needs are then calculated and stated as the "weighted bed standard."

As examples of this method, I will quote the weighted bed standards for active treatment beds in certain places.

In Kitchener the weighted bed standard is 4.9 per 1,000; in Kingston the weighted bed standard is 5.1; in Lakehead the weighted bed standard is 4.9; in London the weighted bed standard is 5.1; in North Bay the weighted bed standard is 4.8; in Ottawa the weighted bed standard is 4.9; in St.

Catharines the weighted bed standard is 4.9; in Sudbury the weighted bed standard is 4.5; while, in Metro Toronto, it is the standard 5.0.

In this respect, it is rather interesting to compare Ontario with some other jurisdictions.

In the United States, there are at present 3.5 beds per 1,000 population, and there is a ceiling for federal aid. Assistance is provided to a top limit of 4.5 hospital beds per 1,000 population, and when this figure is reached, no further government aid is given. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the government of the United States, the nation credited with having the highest standard of living in the world, believes that 4.5 beds per 1,000 population is adequate, and this figure has been determined after some of the most careful and exhaustive studies of the question ever made by any government.

In England, there are 3.9 beds per 1,000 population, and the hospital plan for England and Wales is based on the assumption that an adequate service can be provided with 3.3 active treatment beds per 1,000 population.

I do not quote these figures in any sense to suggest that we in Ontario have aimed too high, but from them I am bound to wonder if our people are less healthy or need more hospital care than those living in the nation, which, as I have just said, is supposed to have the highest standard of living in the world. I have only cited these statistics because they are often put to me in the questions which more and more of our people are asking, when they view the steadily rising costs of hospital care; questions for which I have no answer.

With the inception of the hospital insurance plan, it was expected that some pressure would be exerted for admissions to hospital as is evidenced by a statement made by the then Prime Minister, the hon. Mr. Frost:

With the introduction of this programme, there will rest a responsibility upon every citizen, whether he be potential patient, hospital administrator, or physician, to work within the spirit of the intention of the programme, to see that essential care is provided to all but to make certain that costs are not necessarily increased by the provision of unnecessary care.

We have some reason to believe that our hospital facilities and accommodation are not being used as well and as properly as they ought to be. It is stated from time to time that some of our beds are occupied by patients who do not need them and should not be in them.

We have discussed this problem with the medical profession in Metro and have found the doctors, too, are most concerned about this. They have given much thought to this and are anxious to co-operate with hospital administration, OHSC, and the department to the end that a satisfactory solution may be found to this vexing problem.

We have heard much about hospital construction costs. These are high and appear to be rising as are most building costs.

The average cost per bed for Metro is \$20,000; deduct 15 per cent for furnishing and equipment, \$3,000; so actual cost of construction per bed is \$17,000.

This 15 per cent is deducted for furnishing and equipping hospitals because these are depreciable items and are paid for at the agreed upon per diem rate. Thus it cannot be expected that they would be paid for by capital grant and also at the per diem rate. It is often apparently overlooked that every hospital has what is known as "preferred income." This derives from private and semi-private accommodation, for which the hospital is authorized to charge over and above the rate allowed for standard ward care. Fifty per cent of this extra charge is left with the hospitals as preferred income.

This should not be scoffed at, or lightly brushed aside. In large measure, out of this income, over the five-year life of the Ontario plan so far, hospitals have reduced capital debt from \$68 million in 1958 to \$46 million at the end of 1962, and they now hold a total of \$16.7 million to their credit in operating account. In the average 300-bed hospital, this preferred income would amount to approximately \$58,500 in a year, 50 per cent of which is now left with the hospital.

Now, some facts concerning hospitals in Metro and in Ontario outside of Metro:

Total beds in Metro were 8,000 in 1959 and 10,950 in 1963. Total beds in Ontario were 31,530 in 1959 and 43,669 in 1963. Therefore, outside of Toronto in Ontario, there were 23,530 beds in 1959 and 32,719 beds in 1963.

In 1959, Metropolitan Toronto halted all capital grants for hospital construction. Since 1959, many counties and other municipalities have been paying capital grants to their hospitals and many of their representatives have told me they undertook to do this because the introduction of the Ontario hospital care insurance plan had relieved them of all responsibility for operating deficits.

As evidence of this, I shall place on the record of this House, as an appendix to this

statement, Appendix "A"—a complete statement of all grants paid by municipalities to their hospitals for construction since 1959, but a few examples are worthy of note.

Looking at counties first: the county of Peel since 1959 has provided \$4,210,000; Halton, \$3,214,000; Middlesex, \$1,350,000; Norfolk county, \$1,909,334; Ontario county, \$1,675,532; York county, \$1,360,000.

Cities and towns: Hamilton has provided \$10,217,000; Ottawa, \$4,323,000; North Bay, \$2,192,000; Port Arthur, Sault Ste. Marie, Kitchener, Waterloo, Peterborough, St. Catharines, Sarnia and Windsor have all provided in excess of \$1 million. Metro Toronto has provided \$2.3 million towards the construction of Riverdale hospital, which is a municipal hospital. North York township, by a vote of its people, set aside one mill yearly for ten years, and last year this amounted to \$1,679,000. Scarborough provided \$660,000; Etobicoke township, \$325,000; York township, \$75,000; Weston, \$25,000; the town of New Toronto, \$25,000.

In this same time provincial grants for construction have totalled \$63,847,000, and federal grants \$45,000,000. In addition, let me remind hon. members that each year since 1959 a special capital grant of \$75 per bed has also been given to every hospital. This has amounted to approximately \$15 million.

Then, too, the provincial government met by far the greater part of the cost of construction of Princess Margaret Hospital here with no municipal assistance. And this was one of the most costly hospitals ever built in the province of Ontario. It may not be amiss to note here, too, that in this same period of time the province has spent more than \$70 million on construction of hospitals for the mentally disordered, care for whom is also provided under the Ontario plan. All of this cost was financed by the province and, although this accommodation is eligible for federal grant assistance, not one dollar has been received from Ottawa for this purpose, the total federal allocation being turned over to general hospital construction.

Prior to 1959, for any hospital in Ontario, as well as those in Metro, to end the year without an operating deficit was the exception and, indeed, meeting these deficits was a heavy burden which steadily plagued every hospital board and many municipal councils to which boards had to turn to meet these deficits.

In the case of the Toronto hospitals, their operating deficit for several years exceeded \$1 million yearly, but, since the inception of the hospital care insurance plan, operating

deficits are the exception rather than the rule and, in addition, besides being relieved of this financial burden, municipalities were given unconditional grants to help them meet a large share of their indigent costs.

In order that the record may be right, Metro Toronto hospitals, by and large, do not service a greater percentage of their case load from beyond the geographic boundaries than do other comparable hospitals.

Comparing the hospitals associated with medical schools outside of Toronto with those in Toronto, we find as follows: Toronto General Hospital 26.8 per cent, Toronto St. Michael's Hospital 14.2 per cent, Toronto Western Hospital 15.1 per cent, Hospital for Sick Children—a unique hospital in the province—27.4 per cent. This is an overall average for the Toronto teaching hospitals of 21.8 per cent.

Queen's University, having an association with Kingston General Hospital, looks after 49 per cent of its case load from beyond its geographic boundaries, and Kingston Hotel Dieu Hospital, the other teaching hospital at Queen's, 39.4 per cent; showing an average for Kingston teaching hospitals of 44.3 per cent.

With regard to Ottawa University Medical School, Ottawa General Hospital takes 29.2 per cent of its case load from beyond the geographic boundary, and Ottawa Civic Hospital 14.8 per cent; making the average for Ottawa 20.3 per cent.

The University of Western Ontario Medical School—its teaching hospitals, London Victoria Hospital 32.4 per cent, and London St. Joseph's Hospital 25.5 per cent; with the average for London 28.8 per cent.

Thus it will be seen that in every medical school centre, except one, a greater percentage of their patients come from beyond their geographic boundaries than do those treated in Toronto teaching hospitals. These figures are taken from the official statistical information supplied us by every hospital, figures which will go into the public and official record.

The percentage of persons from outside the actual area cared for in the following hospitals is: Toronto East General, 3.4 per cent; Northwestern General, 3.9 per cent; St. Joseph's, 8.3 per cent; Queensway, 15.3 per cent; and Branson, 23.9 per cent; as compared with Hamilton, 16.5 per cent; Sudbury, 47.4 per cent; North Bay, 27.6 per cent; Cornwall, 34.0 per cent; Peterborough, 43.0 per cent; Windsor, 17.1 per cent; and Sault Ste. Marie, 14.7 per cent.

Here again, it can be seen that the hospitals

in Metro Toronto vis-à-vis comparable hospitals in other communities do not differ in respect of the percentage of their case load coming from beyond the geographic boundaries.

When we went into this hospital plan as a province, we believed we were going into a partnership. We were encouraged in this by the federal government stating it would give a certain grant "if the province would match it". This led us to believe partnership meant equality of effort, but Mr. Pearson, if he is quoted rightly in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of April 11, 1964, states his government cannot provide higher grants for capital construction costs.

I believe the government is justified in believing that its programme of steadily increasing grants, as the resources of the province become available, has been a good programme as evidenced by the fact that in the province, with the exception of Metro Toronto, there are sufficient beds. I believe the government can rightly take some credit for having provided valuable assistance to hospital boards in achieving their objective.

By increasing capital grants last year by 60 per cent, this government moved forward vigorously to assist Metro Toronto mainly, since here is the only real bed shortage in the province.

Certain proposals have been made by many people by way of suggestions for dealing with the problem of the shortage in Metro Toronto. I think it is fair to say that all of these proposals, and many others, have been considered very carefully on previous occasions, but I think it reasonable to mention some of them and give, very briefly, our thinking concerning them:

1. Convert student residences to hospital accommodation: This has been put forward on occasion. It is true as one editor wrote that I, two years ago, said in this House that these residences were outmoded and had no part in the present scheme of nurse education. Mr. Speaker, my opinion in this matter was not that of the majority. A great storm of protest followed in the wake of that statement, and it came from parents, students and teachers. It may be that, in certain circumstances, residences would not be necessary, but to take this as a generality would, I am now sure, do irreparable harm to our system of nurse education.

But these residences would not readily lend themselves to conversion to hospital rooms. The corridors and the doors are not usually wide enough to permit movement of hospital beds or stretchers, although I know that two

hospitals are now using part of their nurses' residence during extensive building programmes. It has been pointed out by the administrators in both cases that these are emergency measures only and should not be construed as anything else.

To change these residences would be very costly, if it were possible. It might be argued that ambulatory patients could be housed in these residences without too much alteration. The great majority of patients, when they become ambulatory, should be out of the general hospital.

2. What I had proposed to say about Sunnybrook Hospital would not altogether apply because of events that have transpired in the past few weeks making this situation most unclear. As of Friday, March 13, 1964, the federal director of treatment services told our commissioner for hospital services by telephone, in my presence, that 48 beds were available in Sunnybrook Hospital and that Wellesley Hospital was negotiating for their use. I can say too that the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, a few months ago, stated to me that on any one day, 150-200 "civilian" patients are under treatment in Sunnybrook Hospital—that is patients who have no other right to be, other than the fact they had served in the forces but had no entitlement to DVA hospital services.

I have had further correspondence with the Minister of Veterans' Affairs and I shall put this on the record.

This is routine correspondence, sir, and hardly worth taking the time of the House to read it. I shall put it in the unofficial record.

3. It has been proposed that this government should build general hospitals. Apart from this being a direct deviation and departure from the policy of government outlined when the plan came into operation and reaffirmed from time to time since then, I would say in my opinion, it would be a mistake and would do great harm to the splendid hospital movement we have built up in this province.

That this opinion is shared by others is evident in the statement of Mr. Jessup, read earlier. The entire statement I shall put on the record. Perhaps some hon. members will be surprised to know that the hospital movement in Ontario is the envy of many jurisdictions, and many agree with us that it is to be envied because of the interest and active involvement of great numbers of people.

This is not to say that I believe hospitals should be dependent upon charity for their

building. Indeed, many times I have stated that long ago the hospital movement needed an Egerton Ryerson just as did the schools in his day. I believe, and this government believes, in the "Three partnership method" of building hospitals. I sincerely believe the majority of Metro Council believe in this partnership, but the federal government has not shown evidence that it believes in an equal partnership.

4. Riverdale Hospital: It was rather disconcerting to learn that in this hospital there are 450 beds for convalescent care and none of them in use. The director now assures us he could put 100 of these beds in service immediately and the remaining 350 in two or three weeks following that time. These beds are not in use because of certain internal problems of administration and the commission has offered to help the administration clear these up. These difficulties have nothing to do with this government nor the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, nor are they caused by any shortage of staff.

Dr. McCracken, the director, has stated he expects no difficulty here. The problems lay with the Metro administration of the hospital, now removed since the passage of the Riverdale Hospital bill at this session of the House. This will mean 450 active beds can be cleared for patients. This should have been done before now if the administration had tackled the job. This is not, and never was, a government responsibility.

5. Associated nursing homes: Careful consideration has been given to the proposal that beds in nursing homes could be made available for convalescent care. These homes are not equipped to provide such care and, therefore, would do nothing to relieve the shortage, in this way. It may be that they could fit into the general scheme by providing custodial bed care thus indirectly relieving active beds and this is still under study.

To summarize then: The government has never assumed responsibility for building general hospitals, nor has it ever adopted this as a policy. It has provided assistance through grants, steadily raising these grants in keeping with available resources.

All of Ontario in 1959 faced a need for more beds in as great degree as did Metro Toronto.

Metro Toronto hospitals in no way differ in admissions from other comparable hospitals; indeed many other hospitals treat far more patients from beyond their geographic boundaries than do Metro hospitals.

How do we propose to deal with the problem? First: The doctors of Metro Toronto

have undertaken to co-operate in every way possible with hospital administration, OHSC and this department to do everything in their power to ensure that every patient in need of emergency treatment is cared for; and also that the best possible use is made of every bed. To this end, they have submitted certain recommendations to us which will be placed before the hospital administrators for their consideration and, we hope, their implementation.

2. Immediate use of 450 beds at Riverdale Hospital for convalescent care.

3. Use of Sunnybrook 48-bed unit by Wellesley Hospital. And further discussions, I may add, will be entered into with the Minister of Veterans' Affairs as soon as the federal government has crystallized its policy.

4. Home care plan throughout all of Metro Toronto that will be looking after 125 patients on any one day. This will be the programme in this first year, but it will expand to care for 250 patients on any one day in the second year of operation.

5. Continued use of beds in private nursing homes in Metro area for chronic care—as many as are needed for this purpose and to the greatest extent of their usefulness—keeping in mind, as I have already said—that this is definitely limited. All of this will have the effect of releasing about 1,000 active treatment beds in the general hospitals of Metropolitan Toronto.

I think it not amiss to point out that, with the exception of the home care plan, all of the measures already mentioned could, and should, have been undertaken by hospital and municipal authorities. Many hospitals complain about the time consumed in finding other necessary accommodation for certain patients who no longer need hospital care but do need nursing home or other such care. Doctors have complained about their difficulties in having convalescent and chronic care patients transferred to their proper facilities. The Department of Health, through OHSC, will now go thoroughly into these matters with the doctors and with hospital authorities in an effort to establish better exchange and transfer and a better flow of patients. Here again, the doctors have assured me of all possible help and co-operation.

6. As an incentive to boards planning expansion or new hospitals, to bring their plans forward to an earlier start, the government of Ontario will offer, in addition to the present grants, a loan up to \$5,000 per active treatment bed. This loan will be repayable over a period of years out of preferred income, referred to earlier. Those utilizing the

loan offered will retain only 25 per cent of their share of preferred income instead of the present 50 per cent—the remainder will be used to repay their loan. If the hospitals wish to apply other monies that may come to them on the loan, this will be possible and will liquidate the debt in a shorter period of time.

For Metro hospitals, taking \$20,000 as the cost of the average bed, help available will now be: To provincial grants, \$5,300—and we are using the figure of \$5,300 to allow for a full margin of error. Provincial loan of \$5,000; federal grant, \$2,700; Metro grant, recently announced, \$2,700, leaving approximately 20 per cent for the boards to raise. Many boards have signified that this is quite possible.

As a result of this offer, already nine hospital boards have assured me that they will begin construction sooner than they had planned—two are now enabled to begin immediately. Six more will be ready this fall and the remaining one will be ready early in 1965. All of these projects have been greatly accelerated since their planning called for a start 1967 and beyond. These will provide 1,955 new beds within 18 to 24 months after construction begins.

The situation now will be that 236 beds are now under construction for completion this year, and 773 beds are now under construction for completion 1965 and early 1966. Another 1,955 beds will begin construction fall 1964, for completion 1966 and early 1967, and there will be a further 160 psychiatric beds not included above.

One hundred beds are to be added to Downsview hospital by the Workmen's Compensation Board—making a total of 3,224 new beds by early 1967, within Metro Toronto.

Planning of a further 1,050 beds for 1967-1968 is in the discussion stage. If these are approved and go forward, in 1970 there would then be a total of 4,274 additional beds, more than enough to wipe out the deficit—3,930—as projected in the Calvin Report for that year.

Construction of so many new beds will call for greatly increased numbers of hospital personnel. Ways and means to increase facilities for nurse education have been under study and discussion with hospitals and the College of Nurses for some time. Planning based on these studies and discussions is now being undertaken with a view to having sufficient trained personnel available when they are needed.

I am quite confident, and this confidence is shared by the hospital people concerned, that the problem which has existed and still exists

here in Metro Toronto, is well on the way to solution.

I want to note at this time my appreciation to all hospital board members and administrations for their helpful co-operation so willingly given us at all times. Even at the risk of being considered biased, I wish to express my thanks to the medical profession—District 11 of the Ontario Medical Association—for their help and their very useful suggestions. I refer to those who have carefully considered the problem in depth and without carping criticism came forward and offered all possible assistance. I believe out of all our discussions will come a new understanding of the need for close co-operation of all involved in the establishment and operation of hospitals and the provision of high quality treatment services to our people.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the regular business of the House, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would clarify the question as to whether or not there will be a night session tonight and other evenings this week?

And while I am on my feet, I wonder if I might also ask the hon. Prime Minister if it is his intention to schedule an early debate on the crime report?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I had another announcement to make before the orders of the day and then I intended to deal with the business of the House. However, I will deal with this first.

I wanted to tell the House that the government has appointed two firms to deal with our pavilion, the Ontario pavilion which will be erected for the World's Fair in Montreal in 1967. They are a Toronto firm of architects, Fairfield and Dubois, and a firm of industrial designers, Stewart, Morrison and Roberts Limited. These two firms will start work immediately on the exterior and the interior of the pavilion which we will create at the World's Fair. The regulations of the fair permit erection of a building that can only remain for the duration of the fair, that is April 28 to October 27. Therefore in designing what we want to promote, the interests of this province, we really need people to design an exterior that will survive and be suitable for this period of time. But the interior design in this type of building is perhaps of more importance than the exterior design.

The theme of the World's Fair as established is "Man and His World." It is our intention to make Ontario's contribution one that will deal with the progress of the citi-

zens of this province and man's development in many fields such as industry, science, recreation and the arts. We intend to make this pavilion as reflective of our Ontario as it is possible.

We will of course, use our own designers in designing it. It will reflect, as I have said, the heritage of what man has created in this province. We will use, as far as possible, material that comes from Ontario and is distinctive. Of course the staff in the pavilion, when it is staffed, will be recruited from all parts of Ontario.

The Department of Economics and Development is in charge of the project and will work with The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Public Works.

In a more general way, I can tell the House that it is estimated that the World's Fair will draw about 35 million people during the six months it is in existence. If the hon. members just think of its location, on an island in Montreal in relation to Ontario and to our traffic arteries, and that it will draw from a heavily populated part of the United States, they can see the potential as far as the tourist industry of Ontario is concerned. That is, people coming up from the south, from the New England states, into Quebec to attend the fair and will be going home through Ontario via various circuitous routes—this applies to the midwest of the United States as well since we have exits at the Niagara frontier, at Detroit, Port Huron, Sault Ste. Marie. By then the causeway will be completed at Fort Frances and it appears to me as if this could give very large impetus indeed to the tourist business in the province of Ontario in our centennial year.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: On the other question: there is a night session tonight. I assumed this would be taken for granted. I believe I stated early in the session that we would have them on Tuesday and Thursday nights until further notice and I believe I have informed some people by telephone. If it is going to cause any great dislocation because hon. members have not known about it, I am flexible in the area, but we have plenty to do and unless it is going to cause some great dislocation, I would propose to proceed.

Hon. members will notice that the fourth order on the order paper should be altered. There is a misprint there. It refers to "Consideration of the Report of the Ontario Police Commission for the year 1963." That should read: "Consideration of the Report of the

Ontario Police Commission Report on Organized Crime." That is the fourth order on the order paper and it is my intention that this order be called on Thursday. We will have a night session Thursday night to provide whatever time is necessary to debate this particular order.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The seventeenth order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, just to make the record complete. We will deal with the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare first and then Information and Tourism, both of which departments have made a start; and following that will be Energy Resources Management, within which we will deal with the estimates of the water resources commission. Those are the three departments and the order in which they will be taken.

Mr. MacDonald: And Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, everything that comes under that department.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE (continued)

On vote 1806:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, before we complete consideration of this vote, which undoubtedly is one of the most important votes coming under the jurisdiction of The Department of Public Welfare, I would like to make some observations on a subject that I have referred to before in this House. I will try to avoid repeating what I have said on previous occasions, but the subject is important enough that I think it merits extensive consideration from the House.

This is the question of poverty, and I raise it particularly at this time because there is no question in the world that the people who receive benefit under vote 1806 are the dispossessed of the earth in this province. They are at the bottom even of the hierarchy of poverty. They are the ones at the very bottom of the heap, eking out a bare subsistence on inadequate allowances that are hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together.

We have reached the point in this country where we do not allow anybody to actually starve to death on the street, but we do

almost the next thing. We give them allowances that are so small that it is almost impossible to avoid starvation. It is very difficult for people such as ourselves who have never faced stark, blinding poverty—or I believe that most of us never have—to visualize the situation in which these people find themselves.

The newspapers of Toronto—and perhaps elsewhere but I am familiar mainly with those of Toronto—have, I think, done a useful service in trying to call attention to people living in poverty, and more particularly those at the bottom of the heap, those living on what we now euphemistically call general welfare assistance. We used to call it relief and I think the difference in the terminology is of no very great significance.

I have here an article that appeared some time ago in the Toronto *Telegram* by Mr. Peter Reilly, who at that time was a staff reporter for the *Telegram* and is now with the CBC. I will not read the article, but it was very provocative—one of the first in this field and it was headed: "The Good Life: Fact or Fable?"

A more recent story that came to my attention appeared a few months ago in the Toronto *Daily Star*. I do not have a copy of it with me, but I do not really need a copy because it made a very strong impression on me. It related to the case of an individual—a man, I believe in his forties or fifties, about my own age, about the age of many hon. members in this House—who through misfortune had lost his job, had used up all his resources and had to go on welfare. It was hard, really, to appreciate the traumatic experience of this man, who had always been accustomed to paying his own bills and looking after himself, to whom it became a real issue as to whether or not he could afford to buy a cake of soap, or whether he could afford to take a street car to travel a substantial distance looking for a job. These little things were big issues with him, because he had so little money on an allowance of \$55 or \$60 a month. He had to consider carefully if he could afford the price of a street car ticket.

This group in the Legislature has been attempting to bring the problem of poverty to the attention of the government. I do not know that we have had very much success to date, but we have been hammering away at it as effectively as we could all through this session and before this session. I was given the privilege by my hon. colleagues in the New Democratic group to make the first statement for our group on this general problem. I did so in the Throne Speech

debate back on January 27 and carried over on January 28. My leader, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), and others in the group have followed up on the problem. I will give fair warning, Mr. Chairman, that we intend to continue to follow up and to continue to bring the problem to the attention of the government until effective action is taken, not merely to deal with some of the worst manifestations of poverty, not merely to provide minor palliatives that prevent people from starving to death, but to get down to business to lick the problem of poverty and eliminate it in this province.

I was happy to note just before the recess, when we were dealing with this same vote, No. 1806, that the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) joined in the campaign which we have been trying to conduct of calling attention, and of repeatedly calling attention, to the problem of poverty. He made substantial reference to exciting new developments in the United States, in the form of the war on poverty first enunciated by the late President Kennedy and now being energetically prosecuted by President Johnson.

One point that appeared to have escaped the hon. member for Parkdale was that his American references were all to the federal government in the United States. He was proposing to the government opposite that they should take an example from the federal government in the United States and I would agree with him. I think there is much to learn from the programme of the late President Kennedy as amplified by President Johnson. But let us also bear in mind that we have a federal government in this country, and I think it is regrettable that the hon. member for Parkdale and his hon. colleagues would not also use some of their eloquence in trying to persuade the federal government of Canada to pay some attention to the problem of poverty.

If there is any government that is more unconscious of the problem than the government of Ontario, I would say it is the government of Canada. They have shown no disposition whatever to try to tackle this problem, yet surely this is the place from which leadership should come, just as it is coming in the United States, in the first instance, from the federal government. Well, I will not put it in terms of the first instance, but in terms of first responsibility the federal government must give leadership if we are to have an effective campaign against poverty. It seems to me rather curious that Liberals would berate the government opposite for paying no attention to the problem, whereas

their own colleagues in Ottawa are equally unmindful of the situation.

However, I do not want to give the impression that I think this government has no responsibility in the field. In fact, I would like to call to the attention of the government, and the House, the fact that the first concrete plans in what is now described as the war against poverty in the United States were undertaken not by the federal government but by a state government—in the state of North Carolina. I think that this government in Ontario might very well accept North Carolina's initiative and enterprise as an example for itself.

I would say the same to other provincial governments in Canada, and other state governments in the United States. This is not exclusively a federal problem; it is a problem for all levels of government and for all citizens. A provincial government such as the government of Ontario can make an important contribution by taking the first steps, just as the state of North Carolina made an important contribution by taking the first steps in the United States. Perhaps the first step by this province will lead to much needed action at the federal level, just as the North Carolina action in the United States has now become extremely useful to the federal administration there, in working out its plans.

In relation to that programme in North Carolina, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few extracts from an item which appeared in the *New York Times* on March 18 of this year:

The federal government's war on poverty was little more than a vague idea when the people of North Carolina decided to act on their own last fall. Now, with the federal attack on poverty still just getting underway, North Carolina is quietly moving to break the cycle of poverty in which so many children are trapped. The state's \$14 million assault on poverty, the first such state plan in the nation, has not gone unnoticed by those who have put together President Johnson's programme.

The federal planners, frequently disorganized and arguing among themselves, have turned from time to time to the men who planned the North Carolina programme: Governor Terry Sanford, Paul Ylvisaker of the Ford Foundation, the principal contributor to the state's anti-poverty campaign and others. Copies of the booklet outlining the North Carolina plan have become dog-eared in recent weeks as federal planners have sought ideas on how best to combat poverty.

I will skip some paragraphs in the item and read the following:

"I have come to believe," the governor said [that is Governor Sanford of North Carolina] "that charity and relief are not the best answers to human suffering; that the schools are not the answer so long as only a third or a half of our students finish school—that the wealth of America is not the answer if many families have fifty-some cents a day per person for all expenses.

"In North Carolina," the governor went on, "we want to go into a few communities and say to the leaders of schools, government, welfare, health, charity, 'Look, let's get together. Let us see if together in a few neighbourhoods near here we cannot break the cycle of poverty and give these children a better chance'."

Fifty-one communities, both urban and rural, put together suggested plans of action. By mid April, those administering the programme will have chosen ten of those communities as sites for projects entitled to financial help. The local communities will operate the interracial projects and underwrite part of the costs.

The proposed projects include preschool teaching centres designed to offset bad home environments; counselling and job training; remedial education centres; adult education courses and services in budgeting and home care for low income families. Funds also will be used to establish a learning laboratory near both the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University at Durham, to study methods of teaching slow learners and problem children and to improve teaching instruction.

The anti-poverty planners will also seek to recruit college graduates to work for a year or two in the project communities as part of a sort of domestic peace corps. All of these North Carolina projects, just as the federal programme unveiled today by President Johnson, will focus largely on young people, seeking to help them escape from poverty in which their families have been trapped for generations.

While generally considered one of the wealthiest and most progressive of southern states, North Carolina has widespread poverty, particularly among Negroes, who constitute a quarter of the population. "Definitions of poverty vary," the state anti-poverty planners noted in their policy booklet, "but, whatever the definition, the record in North Carolina is distressing."

Mr. Chairman, I think one could say the same with regard to the province of Ontario.

Whatever definition we use of poverty, the record of Ontario and of all of Canada is distressing. There have been a number of attempts made in United States to determine the magnitude of poverty and, of course, the figure one arrives at depends largely on the definition one uses as to what constitutes poverty.

The lowest definition, which anybody who has studied the problem has come up with, is that there are 30 million men, women and children in the United States at this time who are living in what can only be described as poverty. Michael Harrington, a student of this problem who has published a book on it recently, has given many valid reasons for believing that estimate is an under-estimate. He has arrived at a figure of 40 to 50 million people—men, women and children in the United States—living in poverty.

In other words, depending on whose estimate you accept, somewhere between one-sixth and one-quarter of the people of the United States live in poverty. Unfortunately, in this country, we seem to lag behind in so many things. We have really done no significant statistical study of the problem of poverty, and we have no figures. But I would suggest that it is not likely that the percentage of people living in poverty is any smaller in Ontario or in Canada than it is in the United States. If we take the figure for the United States of between one-sixth and one quarter of the population and apply it to Ontario, we arrive at the startling fact that between one million and 1.5 million of the men, women and children of this province are living in poverty.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Oh, the hon. member is talking through his hat!

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Shame!

Mr. Bryden: We have just heard a typical Tory comment, in fact a comment indicating a great poverty of intellect, if not a poverty of the type that I am describing. As a matter of fact, one of the Pooh Bahs of the Tory party is a gentleman, a friend of mine I would even say—I hope I could say that—who was an opponent of mine not so terribly long ago. He is now trying to palm off on his party—apparently with some success—and on the public generally—I hope with no success—the preposterous proposition that the problem of welfare has now been solved. He suggests that policymakers should now turn their attention to what I would describe as—if I

could put myself into his mode of thinking for a moment, which is difficult—the deserving rich, and to devise ways and means of looking after their interests, forgetting altogether about the poor who constitute a significant proportion of our population, and who live under circumstances which, as I said earlier, are very difficult for privileged people, such as ourselves sitting in this House, even to comprehend.

Mr. Peck: This is the 20th century.

Mr. Bryden: You know, one of our difficulties in dealing with this problem is that we have inherited, in our puritanical traditions, a pharisaical attitude towards people who are unfortunate enough to be poor. We consider that they suffer from some sort of moral turpitude; that this is what has reduced them to poverty; that it is because of some special fault of their own which we, fine Pharisees that we are, do not suffer—and therefore they live in poverty and we live in affluence, and that is their hard luck because they brought it upon themselves.

Or we become patronizing sometimes and we make a differentiation; we refer to the deserving poor. There are some, apparently, who are deserving; they are worthy objects of charity—people on whom we can bestow our great beneficence and make ourselves feel important by taking advantage of their suffering. And then also, of course, there are always the undeserving poor who do not even deserve our beneficence, but to whom we grudgingly hand out small benefits to prevent them from starving.

Well, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no such thing as the deserving poor; no one deserves to be poor.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Get to the point.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to read from one of the leading experts in the welfare field, Professor Albert Rose of the University of Toronto School of Social Work, from an article which appeared some years ago in a magazine put out by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The title of his article was "Public Housing and Public Welfare." And he remarked as follows:

The "poor" are still commonly thought to be lazy, shiftless, wasteful persons who are either so devoid of energy that their earnings are nil or substandard or highly irregular; or so devoid of intelligence in their spending habits that the product of their labour is largely wasted or does not

redound to the benefit of their families. The fact is that there are few such people in our society today, and those who might fit the descriptions are persons with a profound emotional sickness—the alcoholic, the drug addict and the like. . . .

The "poor" then [he says] are those individuals or families who experience serious and long-term poverty from which there is little prospect of escape. Such poverty stems from some disadvantageous situation usually beyond the control of the individual and his family.

And that, I think, is the finding of almost everybody who has studied the problem. People who are poor have become so because of misfortune, because of circumstances beyond their control. Circumstance has driven them down to the point where, by their own efforts, it is impossible for them to escape from the vicious circle of poverty.

These people clearly need special assistance, and the assistance they need is not merely financial, although certainly they need financial assistance. They need much more than financial assistance, especially if such assistance is on the very limited scale provided under our general welfare assistance in this province and in other provinces in Canada.

Merely to provide people with enough money to prevent them from starving will not in any way assist them to get out of the vicious circle of poverty and particularly it will not assist their children to escape from that vicious circle. We now have in this country families who are traditionally poor. In fact Michael Harrington stated in his book, *The Other America*, that there is in the United States a whole subculture of poverty—of people and their families who are condemned to permanent poverty, who have been rejected by the community at large, who live within the community but are not part of it and who have developed their own culture of poverty with its own conditions and its own customs. This is the place where we have to attack the problem, and we cannot attack it simply by inadequate welfare allowances—they merely perpetuate the subculture of poverty.

An exciting development in this field was undertaken by this department, whose estimates we are now considering, and I would like to convey, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) and his department my congratulations on the work they are doing in trying to find new approaches in dealing with the problem of the citizen who has been reduced to the lowest

possible level. This department has conducted a number of interesting and important studies and experiments. One to which I want to refer is its most recent one, on which it reported just within the last month or two in a bulletin entitled: *Long-term Assistance Families*, with a sub-title: "*A Demonstration Project.*"

This bulletin reported the results of an experiment undertaken by the department in co-operation with the welfare department of the city of Toronto. The project is well described in the deputy Minister's introduction to the bulletin. He said:

The two staff members assigned, under the supervision of the project director, Mr. E. V. Ralph, thus selected 100 cases for attention, while another 100 were chosen as a control group against which could be measured the results of concentrated service to their counterparts in the study group.

The department set up two groups of 100 each, one group consisting of people to whom special, concentrated, intensive counselling services were given; the other 100 were called a control group, and it consisted of a group of people who simply get the normal service — that is, mainly their bi-monthly hand-out. The deputy Minister commented as follows:

The outcome is significant. It indicates that a high proportion of long-term assistance families will, with stimulation and guidance, become independent within a comparatively brief time.

Most will improve their attitudes and habits to an extent that carries them a good way towards rehabilitation. Some were found to be eligible for provincial welfare programmes, rather than those of the municipality.

The implication is that it would be to the advantage of both welfare recipients and municipalities if there were a systematic review of the caseload in order to direct special help and attention to those who remain on the rolls for an unusually long time.

I would just like to give some of the statistical backing for the deputy Minister's statement. I would like to refer briefly to pages 8 and 9 of the report, in which it is stated:

The general conclusion of this study is that concentrated attention given to long-term assistance families results in significant improvements. One positive benefit was that 42 per cent of the study group left the municipal assistance rolls.

In other words, out of the 100 they started

with, by the time the study was completed, 42 had left the assistance rolls altogether.

In the control group, that is the group that was not getting special services, only 23 out of 100 had left the welfare rolls in the same period of time. And then, almost equally significant, is this statement from the report:

A second positive result is that among those 58 cases remaining on the rolls there was a noticeable upgrading in economic, health and family circumstances for 54 of these and only four cases showed no favourable response.

So, to summarize the total situation, if you take the study group of 100, 42 got off the welfare rolls altogether, 54 improved substantially, and only four showed no noticeable improvement. Whereas, in the other group which was not receiving this special assistance, 23 got off the welfare rolls, 13 only showed significant improvement without getting off the rolls, and 64 showed no noticeable improvement.

Of course, this is just one study; I understand that the department has others under way, but this study is sensational enough in itself that I think it should give rise to a complete change in the direction of government policy under general welfare assistance. There should be a new stress on personal services, on individual counselling of these families. This will cost money, but it will cost nothing compared to what we are paying now in general welfare assistance.

Indeed, if one forgets about human values altogether and just considers dollars and cents and the welfare of the provincial Treasury, one would say that it is good business to pursue, on a large scale, the type of project the department has undertaken on an experimental basis only. The savings in costs over a period of years could be tremendous, both for the provincial government and for the municipalities.

I am hoping that this little bulletin, small as it is, may be indicative—or it may be the first harbinger, shall we say?—of a complete revolution in government welfare policy. Unfortunately, it is my observation, and the observation of most people, that The Department of Public Welfare is far more progressive than the hon. Minister of Public Welfare or the government. It keeps trying to push forward but it has to carry with it this great anchor of Tory indifference, as personified in the government. Perhaps the government can be appealed to on the basis of simply saving money; and even on that basis I think a new approach to the whole problem of welfare, and more particularly of

general welfare assistance, should be undertaken.

It should not be confined only to this one facet to which I have referred here. We should, as I was trying to suggest earlier, be undertaking an overall attack on the whole problem of poverty. To do that we have to consider what are the basic causes of poverty. I tried to do that at some length in my contribution to the Throne Speech debate. I will not repeat now what I said there. I listed a great many categories of people who are more subject to poverty than others. I would now like to focus attention on some of the major causes of poverty.

I would like to quote two or three paragraphs from an article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the *Toronto Daily Star* of March 24, 1964, entitled: "New Ideas Fight Poverty".

The article was devoted mainly to a description of President Johnson's new programme, but in the course of his discussion Mr. Lippmann called attention to what he considered to be the major causes of poverty as revealed by various studies undertaken in the United States, and I quote as follows:

The modern studies of poverty have demonstrated—I think beyond dispute—that the greatest of all causes of poverty is a lack of education.

The next greatest cause is discrimination, which makes a non-white family 2.5 times as likely to be poor as a white family.

Another great cause of poverty is poor health. Another is the absence of a full-time wage earner, due to the age of the parents or to the fact that the family is broken.

These are some of the major causes of poverty and, I think, are matters to which we should be directing our attention when we start considering the problems of the people who are covered by this vote dealing with general welfare assistance. I think that the point that Lippmann was making has been well expressed in an editorial in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of March 20, 1964 entitled: "The U.S. War on Poverty."

The *Globe and Mail* had this to say:

What is revolutionary about the whole programme is that it puts the emphasis, not where it has always been before, on hand-outs to the poor—

As, for example, under the general welfare assistance branch—I continue:

—but on providing the poor with the tools of new skills, new environments and new

hope with which to work themselves out of poverty.

"Like father like son" is an old tag with truth. Many of the poor in this country, as well as the United States, are poor because their fathers and forefathers were poor. Born in urban and rural slums, they grow up in them and raise their children in them. There is no family impulse to the education that could lift them, and no money to pay for it.

The problem of poverty begets ignorance, physical unfitness, mental damage, which in their turn beget more poverty. The cycle must be broken.

In Canada, we always do later what they have already started to do in the United States, but we cannot afford to be much later in launching our war on poverty. No more than they can we be a rich country while the poor are always with us.

In any case, it costs too much to keep the poor. In Toronto we have kept one such family poor for 25 years. We have given them hand-outs, but none of the help with which they could have worked themselves into prosperity. It has cost us \$61,700 for this one family.

And the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) is worried about his financial problems. Here is a way he might consider solving them.

Mr. Chairman, I quoted a number of causes of poverty as isolated by Mr. Walter Lippmann, but one factor that he did not mention is at least as important as any of the others, and that is the problem of bad housing. I suppose that one cannot say that bad housing causes poverty. In a way we have a hen-and-egg situation. Poverty causes bad housing and bad housing causes more poverty, and so it goes on and on and on. But if we can accept the advice of Michael Harrington, another expert, if we want to really tackle the problem of poverty, we have got to head into the problem of housing.

I am not going to try to deal in detail with housing at this time because it comes under the estimates of another department. The hon. Minister of that department has indicated that he has important announcements to make with regard to housing policy. As far as this group is concerned, we will await his announcements with much interest, and I can assure him that we will give him every possible assistance in trying to develop a more dynamic housing programme in this province.

In the meantime, though I will not try to deal with the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, I would like

to make some references to the housing problem as it relates to the problem of poverty—which is the subject with which we are directly concerned at this time.

I would like to refer, for example, to an article which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of February 19, 1964, by Jurgen Hesse, entitled: "Slums With High Rents." I am going to read a few paragraphs from this article, because I think, even if hon. members have already read it, it is worth hearing again:

The stench of poverty is permanent. It hovers in clothes, in the cracks of the wall where plaster is missing, underneath the sagging wood floors, in the threadbare upholstery. The three bedrooms upstairs have no built-in closets, the stairs are rickety, and the house has no bathtub, just a toilet.

Mrs. Mary Lapping and her six children live in this house on Trefann St. It is in one of the 59 slum pockets in Toronto proper. The monthly rent is \$60, the heating bill in the winter about \$30, electricity and water another \$5. Mrs. Lapping has a wood and coal stove for which her son Lonie, 15, gathers scrap wood.

Her total monthly income is \$204 from social welfare and \$36 in family allowance—\$240. She said that her husband is an epileptic, could not get a steady job as a result and has left Mrs. Lapping and the six children to fend for themselves. But this fending is tough since 40 per cent of her income goes toward rent and heat. To feed and clothe her family, Mrs. Lapping has exactly \$145 a month, or \$20.71 a head, or 66 cents a head per day.

Mrs. Lapping and her family are not a unique case of hardship. There are thousands like her in Toronto. Three million Canadians live on incomes of less than \$3,000 a year. This applies also to families where the husband works and has not deserted his wife and children.

But nowhere in Canada are slum rents as high as Toronto. Nowhere in Canada is the proportion between rents and incomes so imbalanced as here. The relation should be 25 per cent of the income for rent. Mrs. Lapping pays 40 per cent and in some extreme cases there are families which line the slum landlords' pockets with 50 per cent of their income.

Mrs. Lapping almost could do better if she were to move into one of those spanking new apartment blocks in the suburbs where a two-bedroom suite costs \$110 a month including heat and water.

The only trouble is that the apartment owner likely wouldn't permit six children in his beautiful building and chances are he wouldn't permit a social welfare recipient to live next door to well-groomed office girls, rising young executives and solid, responsible citizens. . . .

While Mrs. Lapping and thousands of other Toronto families try to eke out a decent living, Toronto slum landlords get rich. It is established practice in the 59 slum districts for landlords to send agents around on the first of the month to collect the rent.

This, I think, is one of the most brutal tragedies of our time, the way these vultures, the slum landlords, fatten on the misfortune of poor people who have been reduced, in most cases through no fault of their own, to a condition of poverty and then are maintained there because of the exorbitant demands of slum landlords. Yet public housing projects languish. A few proceed, but most of them get tangled up in red tape and this is the sort of result we get.

Here is an article in the *Toronto Daily Star* of March 12, 1964, which says:

Needy families have to wait as long as three years for low rental housing in Metro Toronto, and the longest waits face those who need a place most—those with seven children or more.

A report to the Metro housing authority has revealed that only 651 of 1,640 on Metro's waiting list could be placed in the 12-month period up to January 31, 1964.

The staff study showed there are 531 applications for three-bedroom apartments, 327 for four bedrooms and 121 for five bedrooms.

The housing authority has produced fewer than 400 family units in five years against a target of 5,000.

It gets 50 applications a week but can offer only 13 vacancies.

And so as a result of this, the slum landlords fatten on the poor people who have to live in the slums. The consequences extend in many directions. The problem of housing is related to the problem of education, which Walter Lippmann has cited as the most important single cause of poverty. Here is another story from the *Toronto Daily Star* of November 7, 1963, by Ben Rose, a staff writer.

Downtown areas of Toronto and other big Canadian cities spawn crime, alcoholism, drug addiction and disease, the

Canadian Education Association reported today.

It also blamed downtown conditions for broken homes and conditions that seriously impair children's learning ability.

The report draws a composite picture of the central cores of Canadian cities being deserted by all but low-income families and immigrants and of such overcrowding that many children are forced to do their homework in restaurants.

Nearly 50 per cent of the cases of failures, dropouts, truancy and delinquency in the large Canadian cities come from the downtown schools, the CEA said.

There is a direct correlation between the learning capacity and achievement of children and the economic level of the district in which they live, said the report. Pupils from the downtown schools are invariably in the lowest categories and generally children from the poorest homes, economically, don't do as well in school or show as much ambition.

So here we have again the interrelationship of one evil piled upon another and compounding the other. Inadequacy in education is compounded by inadequacy in housing. Inadequacy in housing drives people further and further down so that we have a growing segment of our population who can only be described as permanent poor, and we hear only minor, tentative suggestions as to ways to get out of this vicious circle.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come to take a look at the whole problem; to tell ourselves once and for all that petty little hand-outs euphemistically called general welfare assistance are never going to solve this problem—as a matter of fact, in many ways they intensify it, they perpetuate it. We have to find a way out of the situation—it can be found—and we in this country surely have enough brains and intelligence to use the tremendous resources with which we are blessed to solve the problem of poverty. Not merely to alleviate it, but solve it once and for all!

In recent months, Mr. Chairman, we have heard many proposals from federal, provincial and municipal governments for projects to symbolize the hundredth anniversary of confederation in 1967. Most of these are proposals for buildings and other physical monuments, many of which are worthy in themselves but none of which in my opinion has that imaginative and dynamic quality which will give Canadians a real sense of pride in achieving 100 years of nationhood.

I propose that we should adopt a much more challenging and inspiring objective. We should now, not tomorrow or the next day but now, set ourselves the task of eliminating poverty throughout the length and breadth of Canada by 1967. This will obviously require a supreme effort by governments at all levels and by organizations of private citizens in many fields, but if we really believe in Canada we will not shrink from the task any more than our forefathers shrank from the task of carving a community out of a hostile wilderness in the face of most difficult economic circumstances.

The programmes undertaken will be many and varied but they should all be co-ordinated under federal leadership and directed towards the single overall objective of eliminating poverty. To focus public attention on this objective, I would suggest that it should be set forth in black and white, along with at least a general outline of the kinds of programmes by which it is to be achieved, in a document which I would call the Centennial Charter of Economic and Social Emancipation. This charter would recognize that our theoretical rights and liberties—theoretical for many people at any rate, not for all of us—that the rights and liberties of which we are justly proud are theoretical for many people and cannot in fact be exercised by citizens who are ground down by poverty.

At federal-provincial conferences it is not enough to argue about the details of pension plans and the division of tax revenues. These matters are important, but I believe that the major emphasis of the Ontario government in its relations with the Dominion at this time should be to try to inspire the federal government to give effective leadership in the war on poverty.

As evidence of good faith, the Ontario government should adopt a programme of its own without further delay, just as the government of North Carolina adopted a programme without waiting for the federal government in that country to get moving. The Ontario government should be prepared to co-ordinate its programme with any federal programme that might be developed, but if the federal government cannot be persuaded to accept the challenge of leadership, then I suggest that the Ontario government should proceed on its own. They should have a programme, in any case, co-ordinated with any federal plans which may be developed; but as long as there are no federal plans, then let us go ahead on our own with a programme to tackle this problem.

I am going to make a few specific suggestions as to the kind of measures which should be included in such a programme directed against poverty. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that in making these suggestions I am not attempting to be comprehensive. I put them forward merely as indications of the types of things that could be done, but a great many other suggestions could be made.

For example, there is one that comes to my own mind just at this moment, which I have not included in my list of examples. That is the whole question of health insurance. One of the major causes of poverty is ill health; especially when breadwinners suffer ill health. Families are then faced with large bills and, what is even worse, the family income is frequently cut off and the family is reduced into a condition from which sometimes, Mr. Chairman, it is almost impossible to escape.

It is time we went ahead with a full-scale medical care insurance programme; but not only that, we should also proceed with a programme to provide out-of-work benefits to people who lose work because of sickness or injury and who are not covered by workmen's compensation. That is another vital measure in the war on poverty. I have not included it among the specific suggestions I make here; I mention it only to indicate that there are many other suggestions in addition to those I list here.

I would like to refer briefly to seven suggestions which I think would make a very good nucleus for an all-out attack on the problem of poverty—which would appear very appropriately, in what I have suggested should be called a centennial charter of economic and social emancipation, as the lines of attack to be taken, not in reducing but in eliminating poverty in Canada. Here are seven measures I put forward as illustrative of the type of thinking that should be considered.

(1) A special committee of the Cabinet should be established, that is the Cabinet of Ontario, headed by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) himself—no one of less status would do in view of the magnitude of the job—to co-ordinate the activities of all departments with responsibilities in this field, such as Public Welfare, Labour, Education, Economics and Development and so on. A full-time secretariat should be provided for the committee, just as the Treasury board has a full-time staff.

(2) The government's entire policy on public welfare should be revolutionized, not merely reformed, to place major emphasis on

the re-establishment of welfare recipients as self-supporting, self-reliant citizens.

(3) There should be a major expansion of individual counselling along the lines of the department's own bulletin, to which I have referred earlier.

(4) The present system of providing welfare assistance according to categories—which is, I think, in the jargon of the profession, referred to as categorical aid, in which the aid is given according to categories in which recipients are arbitrarily placed—that system should be replaced by a system in which all assistance is related to the need and rehabilitation potential of the families and individuals concerned.

My colleague, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) has dealt with this point before and I will not belabour it; no doubt he has some further useful observations to make. Surely there is no justice for determining the amount of assistance a person gets according to a category in which some bureaucrat has placed him.

If he fits into one category, he gets a certain level of assistance; if he fits into another one, he gets a different level. If he does not happen to fit into any category, he may have trouble getting assistance. But the needs of the human being are not the determining factor at all; it is the category into which he is placed. I suggest that that system of categories should be abandoned in favour of a system which takes into account the needs of the whole human being and the whole human family.

(5) Since lack of education is one of the greatest causes of poverty, there should be a completely new approach to the whole problem of remedial training and retraining; and much greater advantage should be taken of new developments in the field of programmed learning. A great deal has been learned—this is a matter which we can take up with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) when his estimates are before us—as to improved methods of teaching people, and we make very, very little use of them in this province. It is about time—especially with slow learners, and with people who, fairly late in life, have to learn new skills and accumulate new information—that we start taking advantage of some of these new techniques and try to use them to assist people who have difficulty in learning.

(6) Existing rehabilitation services should be co-ordinated and greatly expanded. I will not dwell on that point at this time because I intend to refer to it more fully, a little later, when we come to vote 1808.

(7) In view of the close connection between bad housing and poverty, a separate department of housing and urban redevelopment should be established to mount a full-scale attack on the housing problem.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is the line of approach we should be taking. We should be developing past the stage of general welfare assistance, which is the purpose of this vote. We should be looking to new horizons; we should be looking to the day when general welfare assistance will not be necessary, when the problem of poverty will have been solved and when those who are unfortunate enough not to be able to care for themselves will not be on welfare—as the term is now used, in much the same way as the old term “on relief” used to be used or “on the pogy”, or whatever you want to call it. We should look to the day when those who are unfortunate and need assistance will get assistance of a kind which will assist them to re-establish themselves as independent, self-reliant citizens and will not keep them in a permanent, vicious circle of poverty.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the challenge we face. Nothing less than a full-scale answer to that challenge is adequate in a country as favourably blessed as Canada is. I suggest that we should not be prepared to celebrate any centenary in 1967, but instead should hang our heads in shame when 1967 comes, if we have not by that time adopted full-scale programmes which will eliminate poverty forever.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, some three weeks ago on the occasion of our last discussion of the estimates of this department, the question of the 80-20 grants to municipalities for general welfare assistance had come in for substantial criticism, and was fairly discussed by my hon. colleague, the member for Parkdale, and others. It was fairly well established, I think, and again today by the hon. member for Woodbine, that the policy of the department left much to be desired.

The question of whether this grant structure was adequate for suffering families, so far, has been left fairly well up in the air although fairly well talked about; but, in order to get back on the track of welfare, as it is distributed or as it is paid out by the municipalities, I would like to mention that I have no desire, first of all, to embarrass The Department of Public Welfare, but I certainly have a desire—and, in fact, I am determined—to get some answers and some evidence that

the department is ready to commit itself to a constructive effort to cure a situation to which I am going to refer.

As one who has acted in the capacity of mayor and on councils for a good many years in municipalities much less favoured than some economically, and certainly during times much less affluent than this, I know something about dispensing public welfare. I think I have enough knowledge to discuss this problem properly without, as the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) mentioned the other day, reading from a book and I think I can manage without any ridiculous stories about soup kitchens from the hon. Minister. Those of us who have had experience along this line do realize that in organized municipalities a measure of control is exercised by municipal bodies and therefore welfare assistance is kept at a minimum and works to the advantage of the department and to the protection of the taxpayer.

Now I would also mention at this point that the one thing that makes this department tick in my opinion is the dedication of some of the senior people who administer public welfare for this department.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Farquhar: I will be very much surprised if there is any hon. member in this House who does not owe a debt of gratitude, for instance, to the effective way that the deputy Minister handles his job.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Farquhar: Now this brings me to the problem that arises in areas of unorganized municipalities, of which we have many in the north, and in which areas public welfare is administered by Queen's Park without the benefit of the municipal controls that I have mentioned.

To my certain knowledge, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister and members of his senior staff are well aware of the situations that have developed in some of these unorganized municipalities and which have become a complete and absolute disgrace, not only to the department but to this whole government.

For the benefit of hon. members who are not aware of this situation, I point out that public welfare recipients have developed an organized racket and this situation is spreading though many sections in the north. I want to mention also that while the regional administrators do their best to control this situation their hands are completely tied by a lack of policy and a lack of effort on the part of the hon. Minister to support their efforts.

I know, for instance, of a situation whereby the administrator, a Mr. MacDonald from Sault Ste. Marie, dispenses welfare cheques and during the course of his efforts to control the funds is told, not asked, by this group what he must do. These groups, which have organized themselves for the sole purpose of exploiting public welfare funds, travel about the country soliciting members to increase the ranks of their organization, arguing that since these people are having trouble obtaining welfare they should, "join our ranks and we will get you welfare." The end part of this thing, Mr. Chairman, is that they do get welfare through this group—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Have they got that unionized, too?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They did that in my riding, join the Tory party and you will get—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Chairman, through this whole frustrating discussion of this department's estimates I did not interfere with anybody and I would like to be given the opportunity to make a point or two.

Mr. Chairman, you can imagine the allegations and suggestions that are prevalent in the area to the effect that this group has access to senior officials in the department from whom they can obtain almost any amount of public welfare while good citizens of our communities are held strictly to the statutes governing this portion of public welfare. I can document without any trouble the actual facts of this situation. I have known these people for several years on a doorstep basis, and although I am in no position to state that there is direct collusion between these people and the department, at least something is wrong.

I do not know whether the situation has resulted from laziness or a desire to avoid controversy or whether it has just been politically expedient to pay rather than to argue. For some reason or other this situation has been allowed to grow and develop and has spread like a poison throughout our society. It is to the disgrace of this government that this insidious poison has been allowed to attain such proportions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I might as well mention it is not necessarily politically expedient for me to declare war on a group of my good constituents, but I do not intend

to back away from this problem and I ask the hon. Minister here now to advise the House what steps have been undertaken or are being contemplated to correct this situation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I really welcome the words of my friend, the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin because if he thinks that the certain group he speaks about has been a headache in the area, it has been a terrific one with us here. As a matter of fact I can assure you, sir, that if you are disliked by them: they do not dislike me, they hate me more than might be expected. If all the hate in Ontario were concentrated against me, that group would have most of it, because we have dealt with them, I think, as severely as we can.

But at the same time I must say that I have no objection to disquieting them because I have no love for them, I assure you. A certain group call themselves the Union of Electors and they wear white caps. Some of these persons, naturally, have qualified for general welfare assistance in the same manner as other persons in the area. I think, as a matter of fact, that the gentleman to whom the hon. member referred has had much trouble with them and he has been very severe with them.

I can assure you that one gentleman, who unfortunately is not with us any more, Mr. Bosanquet, had many dealings with them and I think he has treated them fairly, but certainly not over-zealously. I think we have the same feeling in that particular respect that you have.

I have had representation from Blind River, from the Catholic priest there and from other people, along the same lines as you have. We have made investigations, and we are now making investigations, of some of these people to see if they are really deserving of welfare in the way they have claimed. We have found many faults so far and I think we will be able to take some action pretty soon. I will be very glad to advise my hon. friend when we do that and on what basis we are doing it. I can assure him that there is nothing that we have been doing for these people other than what we are strictly bound by regulations to do.

As a matter of fact, I might go so far as to tell you this: you can really say there are two or three fomenters of this trouble. As a matter of fact I have even offered to pay—and this may be the worst thing I could do,

to impose them on some other province—I have offered to pay the full passage for whole families if I could transplant them some other place, I can assure you of that.

I would go further than this. I shall not give the name, but apparently somebody from Blind River was in to see me and he wanted to have an open war, or an open season on them, which naturally I could not go for, because after all we have to preserve certain human instincts. But surely anything the hon. member can bring forward will be helpful and I am glad he objected because I did so myself. We have wanted to be as humane as possible. But I know that he knows the situation better than I do and better than maybe I ever will. He knows it, because he lives with these people. The remarks which he made will help us to find these people and eradicate them from the rolls. I shall forever owe him a debt of thanks.

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Chairman, I did not get the answer I hoped for because I would like to advise the hon. Minister that there is an answer to this situation. I do not think that he is naive enough to have overlooked it to this point, because, as I say, there is an answer.

We expect, as I mentioned in the first part of my remarks, organized municipalities to do a job of controlling this type of thing. In places where we have not such a municipal structure—and this is administered straight from Queen's Park — we have to expect Queen's Park to control this situation. I think, if the hon. Minister took from my remarks that I am suggesting further control—further, not control because I am not thinking of control, but further rough measures on these people to eliminate this, this is not the answer I am suggesting. The answer I am suggesting is a little help along the lines I have suggested.

For instance, to try to promote the economy in the area, establish an economy—in one way or another, and several ways are quite apparent—to produce a payroll which will eliminate the need for welfare.

We certainly cannot say that these people do not need welfare and therefore we must take stringent measures to cut them off welfare because a good many of these people are deserving of a lot more welfare assistance than they are getting. The whole point of the thing is that this government has not made any constructive or effective effort to solve the basic problem. The basic problem is the type of economy that is prevalent in this area.

Along this line—and I do not know why I should take all this responsibility—but along this line, I have been to visit the regional offices of The Department of Lands and Forests, both in Sault Ste. Marie and in Sudbury. I find that these people are perfectly willing, sir, or at least they see the advantage, for instance, of instituting a programme of tree planting in the area. I wonder if The Department of Public Welfare finds it beneath themselves to go, for instance, to some of these departments for help in a situation like this?

Is there any reason why, for instance, a little co-operation between The Department of Lands and Forests, The Department of Labour and The Department of Highways—goodness knows there is plenty of work to be done in that area by all of these departments—could not produce an economy which might help these people and eradicate the need for this kind of welfare; and, by that token, possibly eliminate the need for the racket in the organized welfare situation we have there? This is the kind of answer I was hoping to get from the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, first I might just say, further to this, that I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin because I know he faces a problem. But he agrees with me, I am sure, that it is not the general group which is doing this. It is three or four leaders of that group who are now under investigation; they are promoting an idea exactly the opposite of what the hon. member is promoting over there. The leaders do not want these people to accept any work if they can avoid it. The people themselves, I am sure, will do what they can and we have made efforts along that line.

Of that I am satisfied. I am advised of that. We have made efforts along the line of employment; but against that there are certain leaders who will not co-operate and they will say to their people exactly the words you quoted a moment ago: "You come along with us and we will find you welfare, regardless if you want to work or not." But I am quite sure the general bulk of them are exactly what you state; we have been making efforts along that line, and, I am quite sure we are prepared to go along with the suggestion of the hon. member.

In the meantime, I might tell him while we are doing this, we will also investigate the three or four heads who are running this show, or so-called show. I think the investigation might prove very beneficial. We can eradicate the false leadership. I think that

is where the canker is, if there is one. If we can eliminate these groups who are advising these people, accordingly I think we will have some measure of success. We are not only providing investigation, but help. After all, as you stated a moment ago, we cannot refuse them the need. They have no work, and I am sure that in the particular area about which you speak, you did not name it—I do not suppose we should mention it—but we all know the area, and there is not the work there that there would be in some other areas.

We have tried to move people back to where they were before. A lot of them were not original residents. They have been brought in there, a lot of them, by these particular leaders. Once we can find out about that aspect—and we have high hopes of doing so in the very near future—then I think we might at least partly solve it or be on the way to solving it.

I want the hon. member to really know from me that I appreciate his remarks very much on that. We are going along trying to eradicate the problem, or at least improve it from what it is right now, by finding out what exactly is the trouble. I think you and I will agree that not everyone of them thinks that way; there are a few only—I could possibly count on half the fingers of one hand—those who are running, or trying to run, the show.

You could come to my office. I have correspondence stacked high from these particular three persons. They have threatened me with all the powers of evil—might it be on this side of the world or on the other side. But we are looking at this question right now and I am sure some of those people have been in court.

If I remember rightly, I think the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) had one as a client at one time. We know exactly what they are thinking and we are trying, right now, to see what solution we can arrive at so that these people who are conducting themselves in that particular way will benefit by whatever can be done for them—not only in the line of welfare but also in the line of finding them some work.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister: In respect to the long-term assistance families demonstration project, the leaflet or booklet which came to our desks recently, the hon. member for Woodbine dealt with this experiment at some length. I would like to bring the hon. Minister back to this, and ask him to what extent the

department is considering similar projects, and an extension of this kind of project, to the whole welfare field in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I might advise the hon. member that we are now in the formation of what we call teams to go out and continue the long-term studies of the project.

I might tell him at the present time that our staff is at the moment collaborating with the city of Hamilton's welfare department; and we have also assured Windsor, which has also made a request for our help. We also will lend assistance to the city of Ottawa in the very near future.

So we are in the formation, now, of teams and will go about and look at this particular feature, the results of which have been so encouraging. And you can appreciate, with me, that there is always the perennial problem of obtaining the increased staff to carry out these extra duties. But we are in the process now of forming these teams and I can assure you that the success of what has been done right now, with the co-operation of the city of Toronto, certainly leads us to carry it on further to the best of our ability in all respects.

I might say, in passing, that I certainly enjoyed and I agreed with a lot of what was said by the hon. member for Woodbine a moment ago; he mentioned this project as a feature that should be part of the general picture. I think he was right. I can assure hon. members that this project is not strictly a trial balloon; it is something that is here with us to stay and will continue to be improved. Any suggestions along that line will be welcome, I can assure you.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister—we seem to be giving, I would say, very substantial sums in connection with general welfare assistance.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Would the hon. member repeat that? I did not hear it.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry. I would say that we seem to be giving large amounts for general welfare assistance. I look at the sum of \$18 million in connection with this item that we are on. I would also say that the hon. Minister has been in that post for a great number of years and I am sure that in that time he must know and would be able to tell us very succinctly and quickly, what are the major causes for people being on welfare.

Would the hon. Minister say that unemployment, that health, that housing and that education, the lack of these things, are the reasons for people going to apply for welfare?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that those are very important features of welfare because of the world we live in today. You can maybe blame a bit on automation for that matter, because people have to be re-educated in some form or another so that they can apply themselves to another job. Another thing that is striking in our province is that where large developments take place—for instance, the Seaway building in the Cornwall area—there is a period of adjustment afterwards. Then the moving out of the excess population was slow because these people were not close to a large centre like Toronto or Hamilton. It took a little longer period to re-establish people in the area or else outside of the area. That is also one of the reasons, but that is not a reason that would be continuous, it is just the reason for a certain isolated situation that gradually cures itself, I believe.

I think the main reasons are what the hon. member has cited. I do not disagree with that at all. As far as housing is concerned, well, I suppose that would be a more prevalent problem in a larger centre than it would be in a smaller centre. In a smaller centre, for some reason or another, these matters can be rectified much more easily and better than in a large centre where people do not know one another and there is a certain amount of—what should I say?—an unsympathetic attitude between people. I do not know if that is the proper way of expressing it, but that is one way of looking at it. What the hon. member has stated, I think, gives what are the basic reasons.

Mr. Thompson: If I can follow up on this then, I appreciate the hon. Minister would agree with me that the main reason for people needing welfare, being on welfare, is unemployment, health, housing, education; and he has added automation—I could suggest some side effects of automation.

Another was the loneliness with respect to urbanization, and I think perhaps in the back of his mind he is thinking of one group, the Indian groups who have come from reserves. I am just trying to follow the thinking of the hon. Minister on it. Could I ask the hon. Minister: We now have \$18 million which we are giving for general assistance and I would assume that he is a man who believes that if he knows what the causes are that then when he gives finances

he is giving them in order to get at the root causes. I would appreciate if the hon. Minister could tell us how his general welfare assistance branch is tackling the situation of housing, for example, which he says is a root cause in creating welfare recipients. Perhaps I could start with that and ask how he is tackling that.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the statement perhaps I should make in this respect right now is that general welfare assistance is essentially a municipal programme, in that the municipalities administer the relief and issue payments to individuals. Senior governments, of course, share a per cent of the cost of the issuance within the limits of the legislation and the provincial agreement with the federal government.

It is the decision of the municipal authorities as to who receives relief and how much is paid. The provincial Act does not limit the municipal administration, it ensures that standards are complied with and it states the items and amount that the senior governments will subsidize. But the municipality, as you know, can supplement this service in any way it sees fit. They have the authority to help persons in any circumstances to the extent they find necessary. So it is really a programme which is controlled by the municipal governments and subsidized by the senior governments.

Mind you, I do not avoid the hon. member's question in this respect. I am not saying that the municipalities do not also have some control on housing and maybe that problem should be brought to their attention and at the present moment I think we are doing just that.

Mr. Thompson: If I could respectfully suggest it, the hon. Minister has given me a reply which has shown me the administration of funds. He has suggested that it is really the responsibility of the municipalities in connection with welfare. But surely a Department of Public Welfare, of which the hon. Minister is the head, has an overall responsibility to the people applying for welfare. Surely if we are being asked to pass on an \$18 million item, he just cannot tell us that the responsibility for all this is with municipal councils. Perhaps then instead of discussing it here we should be going to municipal councils to give our vote to them.

I would like to come back again to the point that the hon. Minister has suggested that there are five root problems that cause people to go on welfare. I know him as a

man with a legal mind; if there are root problems he would believe surely that the best approach in connection with the people's money is to tackle those root problems. The hon. Minister has told me that with his experience—and believe me, I respect that, he has a vast and long experience as the Minister of Public Welfare—he has told me that in his experience housing is one of the problems. When I asked him how, under the general welfare assistance, of which we are being asked to pass an \$18 million item, is that going to tackle one of the root problems in connection with welfare—housing—he does not reply to me. He tells me it really has something to do with municipal councils.

Perhaps the hon. Minister feels he does not have an adequate programme on this. Could the hon. Minister tell us how he tackles the root problem of poor housing, which he says is one of the real problems for people being on welfare?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, that might be quite so. In spite of the fact that I admit a root problem might be housing or it might be education, it does not mean that I am administering that type of programme. I am really administering a welfare programme in conjunction with the municipalities and the federal government in the sense that I am subsidizing with the senior government what is expended for the purposes which my hon. friend from Woodbine mentioned a moment ago. We at least aim to keep body and soul together and to give shelter, paying for part of shelter, and also for clothing or food as needed.

Now, as far as housing is concerned, I do not disagree with my hon. friend when he says that is one of the basic reasons. But I do not know what I can do administratively in that respect, except advise the municipalities and the other people who are entrusted with that responsibility that an improvement is necessary.

At the same time, I might mention one of the basic projects we have finished just recently which was mentioned a moment ago; the long-term assistance family project is dealing with people to find out whether they should really be on relief or how they should get off it, either through their own resources, or else if it is impossible for them to do so alone, to assist them to do so. This is something new and on which I would not dare at the present moment make even the smallest prediction, but so far I think there has been some accomplishment.

That, I think, is the work of this depart-

ment and not the task of trying to find housing or to provide education and that sort of thing. In that respect, it is possible I did not understand my hon. friend well. But that is what I believe that this department is here for. It is a service department providing the necessities of life in this particular respect. Suggesting, yes, and advising as to these matters you speak about; but administering them, no!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, just to follow up on the point developed by my hon. colleague from Dovercourt. The hon. Minister surely will recall the programme launched by the former Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) which was hailed apparently through the width and breadth of North America as the most outstanding contribution for public housing that anyone had ever heard of.

There were all sorts of pictures and citations and quotations from one and all. And I would presume, as I heard that gentleman bring forward the programme, that this had been carefully discussed in Cabinet; and the hon. Minister of Public Welfare would have applauded it along with his colleagues and said, "Here is, at long last, a programme that is going to produce public housing."

But this is most relevant, Mr. Chairman, because my hon. friend established the point that one of the causes for people being in need of welfare assistance was lack of proper housing; and my hon. friend was asking, and I do not think we have had a proper answer yet, what is being done about housing. As I understood the hon. Minister, he said that he is concerned but it really is not his fault. I am suggesting that it is a collective responsibility of the whole Cabinet to see that there is adequate housing for those people who cannot afford it.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): And especially this hon. Minister.

Mr. Singer: Indeed so, and that is why I am most interested in finding out what this hon. Minister has done about the collapse of the Macaulay plan to provide housing; because it has collapsed. That Minister has gone; the new hon. Minister (Mr. Randall) has made no pronouncements as yet on housing. Somebody has to assume the responsibility, and since this hon. Minister is asking for the expenditure of many millions of dollars of the public money of Ontario, perhaps he can get into the housing field because apparently nobody else on that side of the House is doing this.

Mr. Sopha: What they need is another Macaulay.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think I will leave that question to be asked of the hon. Minister when he does speak. I do not agree with exactly what my hon. friend has stated; that is a matter of opinion.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be more appropriately asked when the proper estimates come up.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, implicit in what the hon. member who last spoke had to say is the key point we have been trying to make throughout all these estimates; that is that the hon. Minister is obviously the fifth wheel to the carriage in The Department of Public Welfare. And clearly, after years in the department, his detailed knowledge of what goes on in the department is about as close to nil as is possible. One shudders to think of how little impact he must have in the Cabinet in fighting for welfare matters.

Housing, education—all of these other factors which contribute to poverty—are in effect creating the conditions for which we have to spend \$18 million in The Department of Public Welfare. Sooner or later we, in the House, have to face up to the fact: What is this hon. Minister doing to fight—to cope with—the conditions of welfare?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Nothing, nothing.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, he has indicated nothing in the House—and this year we are taking the gloves off because he was so indiscreet—I would say, politically inept—to deal with the issue on a political level in such a 19th-century obscurantist approach as to indicate that he is incompetent to deal with welfare matters. He not only knows nothing of the detail of it; he indicated in some of his comments that he personally—in his instincts and his attitude, apart from the sort of camaraderie that is his general answer to queries from this side of the House—he is opposed to most of the ideas which are emerging from his own deputy Minister and from most of his advisers. I think the time has come when we have got to face up to it. One has a sense of futility in facing up to it, because one wonders if the hon. Minister has really any appreciation of what one is talking about. But in spite of that—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! We are dealing with item 4, general welfare assistance.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, Mr. Chairman, and I hope you have not been paying as little attention as the hon. Minister; because if you have, we have been talking about poverty, which is the whole problem in relating to general welfare assistance. We are going to continue to talk about it, Mr. Chairman—even if I must be forceful about it—because we are pouring \$18 million down the drain and perpetuating the problems these people have to cope with.

The department has done some good work in charting new horizons toward which we might be working, that would solve them; and if this government, for one reason or the other, wants to leave a Minister in the post who is perpetuating the conditions, whose attitudes are such that they are not going to improve the situation, we in this House have to exercise our responsibility and our obligation on this side of the House.

I do not know how long this is going to go on, but as long as it goes on, we are going to accept our responsibility. And yes, when the hon. Minister sitting next to him smiles, it is because we have had to take the gloves off with regard to him; and perhaps we will have to do it again when his estimates come before the House; then we will do it once again, because this whole Cabinet is riddled with deadwood.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! I am going to ask the Minister of this department to explain this item of general welfare assistance so we can vote on it afterwards.

Mr. MacDonald: Now just a minute, before we get away from it.

Mr. Sopha: If somebody left the Cabinet they would be on welfare.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! I have asked the Minister to explain this item and then I will allow you to speak after that.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, very good.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if I could speak on a point of order, I would say that the hon. Minister has clarified the general welfare assistance item most fundamentally and clearly. He told us that the causes are unemployment, health, housing, education, automation and urbanization; and, at the moment, sir, we are discussing the matter of

housing, which the hon. Minister has told us is one of the root problems.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the Minister to explain general welfare assistance.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, in respect to housing, my hon. friend a moment ago asked a question and answered it himself and asked me if I would agree with his answer. He asked: Was lack of education part of the reason why we have people on relief or on welfare, and were other reasons housing and health? I think, as far as housing is concerned, as I said a moment ago welfare administration is with the municipality and the housing authorities are also, I think, with the municipality. I can only pray, with him, that that matter is looked into. I encourage it as he would, and as he does. This matter should be looked after, but why this department should be saddled with the administration of housing, I do not understand. What does my hon. friend mean?

Mr. Thompson: Do you want me to explain it to you, sir? I would say, sir, that the hon. Minister has asked me a question, Mr. Chairman, and I would be delighted to answer him. I would say, sir, that with respect to housing he should be saddled with the worry of it. I say definitely that the reason he should be saddled with it is that he himself has admitted poor housing is a root cause of poverty.

If you, sir, are taking a genuine and responsible attitude toward your department—and that is to cure poverty, to alleviate it—then you must go to the root of the problem and try to do something about it; and if your hon. colleagues are not doing something about it and you want to take a responsible attitude, you will see that they do something about it or resign.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: So I would suggest, sir, that you shuffle off housing—poor housing. The first time you told me it was the responsibility of the municipalities. Not having been able to escape that area, you say it is the responsibility of a Cabinet colleague. Surely you believe in Cabinet solidarity? Let us get a collective action in connection with poverty.

You have been incisive enough to agree with "war on poverty" by the United States, and with the study that was done by your deputy Minister, and with others—that there are five major root causes. We are discussing

the expenditure of \$18 million in order to alleviate poverty; then we will discuss the root causes. The first one I frankly will not dwell on any more because it is so deplorably obvious that the hon. Minister is not interested in one of the root causes—or he has no answer to it. Therefore, sir, I will move to the next one considered a root cause—health. I would ask the hon. Minister what he is doing about health, which is a root cause in connection with which he is giving \$18 million to alleviate poverty? What, sir, is the hon. Minister doing with respect to health?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, this item is not an item to alleviate poverty as far as I can understand it. We were talking in a general way, in a philosophical way but this \$18 million the hon. member talks about is not to alleviate poverty. That I can assure him.

Mr. Bryden: What is it for?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It is just, as my hon. friend stated a moment ago, to provide some people with money. Is it sufficient? This I cannot answer. I have to go along with the tables that are set forth by the experts. This money is used strictly to provide for people who are out of work, for reasons that are not their own fault—who are out of work because they are between jobs and are not in receipt of any unemployment insurance.

I quite agree that it is not a very high living but it is a living of some sort until they can rehabilitate themselves. As this report that has been made here states, we have tried to find out the causes of this and I think we have obtained some measure of success. But this is not a matter of alleviating poverty I can assure the hon. member.

I am sure my hon. friend agrees with me on that. This is strictly a subsidy handed over to the municipality to pay for the bill that they have to pay; and we in turn receive an amount from the senior government at Ottawa. Certainly if I may use an expression which is a very bad one, it is not to alleviate poverty. It might be to alleviate the need of people who are poor, but cannot eradicate poverty.

That is an entirely different concept. At least we do not conceive the problem in the same way. The problem of poverty is a wide one and we know that the programme which has been started in the United States is a good one. I hope it has some results and I hope we have the same thing here on a national basis. I am sure that if there is one,

I will be the first to recommend that we should co-operate on that particular matter.

This certainly has nothing to do with the particular programme the hon. member for Woodbine was speaking about.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I think there are several things the hon. Minister has said that are of interest to us as we are voting.

The first, sir, is that the hope has been raised that we might have something like they have in the United States in connection with war on poverty, and the hon. Minister's suggestion that if such a thing should come along that he would co-operate.

Just who does the hon. Minister envisage that he is? Is he not sitting as the Minister responsible for welfare for the whole of this province? He is the man who should not just hope, but should initiate a programme. That is my first remark about that, sir.

My second remark is that the hon. Minister asks us to give \$18 million, and I hope I am correct in paraphrasing what he has said, in order to help people who are between jobs. As he says it might not be enough, and that there are dietary laws that he is not quite sure about.

What a shocking statement by a responsible Minister of the Crown—to tell us vaguely that we hand out this \$18 million for people in between jobs. He is not sure, if it is sufficient or not, but he hopes that hon. members appreciate what this is being passed for.

I find it very hard to think that the hon. Minister is being serious in connection with his estimates. It is like an Alice in Wonderland situation. He wants us to vote on a vague kind of Christmas tree atmosphere and he is not even sure whether it is enough to help people or not.

This is an admission from the government benches of that vagueness about the purpose of which we are asked to pass \$18 million; an admission that the hon. Minister has a lack of knowledge about whether it is enough on dietary reasons or not. Well, sir, assuming that the hon. Minister has this kind of superficial thinking, there is really not much point in our going on talking about the root problems.

I, sir, had really complimented the hon. Minister when I suggested that he might have thought there were root problems, as other research people have discovered there are, to poverty, and I thought that when we were voting \$18 million, we would be voting on a means to eradicate these problems and

I was going to go through these problems systematically.

I will, sir—perhaps in a vain hope—ask the hon. Minister, would it surely not be wiser when we are giving \$18 million to people who are on relief, to look at the reasons why they are on relief and try to eradicate those reasons, rather than just handing out \$18 million—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is the study we are making now.

Mr. Thompson: Well, the hon. Minister has suggested to me, that with his years of experience—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I never mentioned the years of experience.

Mr. Thompson: No, sir, I am saying that the hon. Minister was more modest than to say that. I am the one who said he had years of experience and I suggested that when he has had years of experience, that he might also have years of insight and I suggested that he might have defined from the insight that he has, what are the root problems. And we are agreed on the root problems. I am suggesting since we have agreed on the root problems, let us discuss those root problems and let the hon. Minister let us know what he is doing about them. Therefore, as I say, because I am an optimist even in a discussion like this, I now ask the hon. Minister what is he doing about health, which is one of the root problems?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, as you know, we pay \$1.25 for medical coverage of each recipient under all the categorical programmes and the bill for anybody having a physician attending them at home, or in the physician's office, is sent to the medical association and then the doctor is paid. That is one thing that we do in a definite way with respect to health.

Now, I do not know how far my hon. friend is thinking along this line—if he means hospital beds, hospitalization, or hospital insurance, that is another story. But if he is asking me exactly what is in the budget for those people who are in receipt of welfare allowances, well, that is the answer as far as the categorical programmes are concerned and also in respect of the relief programmes.

We also have emergency dental treatment for the welfare programmes and we pay, as you know, 70 cents per child for those who receive mothers' allowances. Those are specific things that we do in respect to health,

and I am sure that all the field workers and supervisors also look at the general conditions that exist, and advise—at least they are told to advise—everybody in the family to consult the doctor, or nurse, when necessary. I am sure the different health units in the area also are asked by the municipality, as well as our own field workers, to look after certain families who would be in need of that help. Apart from anything more specific than that, as far as the department is concerned, I think that just about covers it.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I appreciate your answer, sir, but would you consider that this health programme is sufficient? I want to stress that you, sir, with me, agree that health, poor health, is one of the reasons for people having to be on relief. Do you, sir, feel that the structure that we have in this province—one of the wealthiest provinces, I presume, in the world—that the structure that we have with respect to health, is satisfactory?

Are you satisfied with this—with the health administration for the people? And if you are not satisfied, what proposals have you brought forward to your government because I can see, sir, that you feel most sympathetic that bad health is a problem and I assume that you would have ideas on a government level how this could be changed.

I am asking, are you satisfied with this \$1.25 or \$1.50 you provide on relief, plus dental treatment, and if you are not satisfied, what proposals you would make? You have been Minister of Public Welfare now for a number of years, could you tell us when you proposed any suggestions of a broader approach to health, having agreed that health is one of the problems of people being on relief?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is a matter on which the hon. member is asking me to make either a political pronouncement or something of that description, which I am not in a habit of doing in that particular respect. However, I might say that I do not think any of us, regardless of where we sit, will ever be satisfied that any programme of that description is one that is good enough, and should be fixed at where we have it at any time.

I think we must continue at all times to try to better it in as many ways as possible.

As far as the \$1.25 is concerned, this is a matter of agreement between the doctors; 70 cents is also a matter of agreement with the dentists. Every four or five years we look at this matter again to see if it compensates the doctors well enough to look after this

particular job. There are areas with people on relief, where the municipality pays for dental and surgical costs entirely, while we deal with other matters which come under general relief and pay the 80 per cent prescribed as shareable.

There are still some fields in which we are not perfect. We hope, and I have high hopes, Mr. Chairman, that when we meet in Ottawa many of these problems, instead of having different categorical programmes, will be under one general agreement. I must congratulate the Ottawa government in this respect; they have expressed the view of possibly going along with that change. We shall know about this on May 11, 12 or 13 and I hope it comes to pass. Maybe we will be able to enlarge these programmes more as we would like to at the present time.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to continue on this because we both realize that it is such a root problem. You have hopes, sir, for the future in connection with agreements with the federal government. Could I ask you, for example, in connection with the health of the people of this province, what advances in the past three years you have advocated and implemented in connection with the programme for the health of the people of this province? Again, always stressing that this is one of the root problems that causes relief, in the past three years, what have you done, what have you changed in a dynamic aggressive way, in connection with the health of the people?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: One feature, if I recall well, Mr. Chairman, is that we prepay the hospital insurance premium—which is certainly a large item. I can assure the hon. member that I will be fighting very hard for the same thing to happen when the other matter comes in to be legislated upon.

Mr. Bryden: You mean that doctors' services be prepaid?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Somewhat as they are now under our plan.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I appreciate these sentiments of yours. When you say "the other matter," are you referring to the medical insurance plan?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes. I hope these people will have it on the same basis they have it now—free; that they will have to pay no premiums as—

Mr. MacDonald: Is that government policy?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Does that mean it is government policy, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I was asked to give my own impression, and I am giving it. I do not know if it will be government policy, but you were asking what I think of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I appreciate this is probably one of the most enlightening days we have had from the hon. Minister of Public Welfare. I said, I remember, in the last estimates that somewhere you would be a knight on a white horse. Clouds misted that vision, I must admit, for a long time but at long last the vision is coming to me. I am sure, sir, that you speak for the government because we all agree with the principle of Cabinet solidarity. We have seen occasions when that has not completely applied—

Mr. Reilly: Oh, let us get on!

Mr. Thompson: Let me tell you this is very fundamental. A Minister stands there and tells us he is for medical insurance programmes—I can appreciate that the hon. member says, “Oh, let us get on.” There are people in this province who have been waiting for years—

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: —and they did not bring in a medical insurance programme; and we are not going to—

Mr. Reilly: In 1919 a Liberal federal government promised a health plan—

Mr. Thompson: We are not going to listen to the cries of these fellows saying, “Let us get on!”

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Again, as I would emphasize for our poor deluded friends, I am talking about the root problem which the discerning hon. Minister enunciated as the basis of relief. If our friends are disinterested in this, if they want to throw aside these root problems, sir, I would suggest to them that they can either resign or leave this Chamber while we are discussing them.

Mr. Reilly: Denounce your own friends in Ottawa!

An hon. member: Go to the hockey game!

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate then, sir, that you have come to the conclusion that there should be a medical insurance programme, a comprehensive medical insurance programme.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, I did not say that. I said I would like those people to be treated, if there is any medical insurance plan, the same way as they are under the hospitalization plan, if at all possible.

Mr. Sopha: No, you did not exactly say that.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is what I said. Do not paraphrase me, putting words into my mouth.

Mr. Thompson: And I would like to come to education, which the hon. Minister pointed out as one of the root problems.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say again that I have sat in this House now for four years and I have not become completely conditioned to the cynicism and arrogance on the part of certain people. To me, \$18 million of welfare can give hope to mothers and to children, if we are giving it with a proper, forward-looking approach. I can remember, sir, walking through my own riding at one point, then standing in this House and talking about some of the homes I had visited. I talked about one where a little girl had come out and told me there was only one pair of shoes for the children. I told this in this House, and I remember one particular Minister, across the way, who pulled out a handkerchief to mock me and pretended he was wiping tears from his eyes—

An hon. member: Crocodile tears.

Mr. Thompson: —and I would say this cynicism, if anything, made me proud and also resolve that I would stay a Liberal, even though we stay on this side for years. And we will not. But if anything makes me proud to be part of it, it was the fact that at least we can remain true to the cause of people who are in suffering. And if they are bored, the government members, that is fine with me because I intend to pursue this subject. Now I come to education.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Try to elucidate it, too.

Mr. Thompson: I will try, sir. The problem is that we want the hon. Minister to

elucidate. He, after all, is responsible for the programme. It has taken a long time, perhaps, to get some elucidations from him but could I ask you, sir, with respect to education: You agree that lack of education is one of the root causes of people being on welfare? You have also agreed that there are generations of welfare cases.

Could I ask what kind of dynamic approach you are taking? We have seen in the United States, and I am sure you have read some of their studies—have you seen the approaches they have taken with special teachers in poor economic areas? We have seen the Atkinson Foundation study, for example, showing where, in low economic areas, there is a situation of not getting as good an education for the children as otherwise. I ask the hon. Minister then, in view of recognizing these problems, what is he doing about that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member asking me as a member of the government, or asking me as a private member?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I can say that I do not know. I do not know that in this province there is any child who wants to be educated who cannot be educated. I think our school system has to take a bow to no one else, not only in Canada but indeed in North America. We can get educated here.

Naturally I do not expect, and I trust the hon. member does not expect me or anyone of my staff to go around and tell the people who are on relief or otherwise, to take their children to school and see that they are educated. Surely, in this day and age, there are enough facilities of learning available, not only in the city of Toronto but right across the province, and I am quite sure the people of the province of Ontario are wise enough to know this and take full advantage of it.

If you go into the upper echelon, of matters of high school and technical school and all that, I think there again these facilities exist. And all I can do—I am quite sure I cannot do anything else—if the hon. member has anything to suggest to me other than this, I would be very pleased to know about it. All we can do is to try to educate the people and the parents generally that this is exactly the position and they should make use of education. As you know, the laws of the province, in the primary sense at least, are very stringent and this has been, I think, pretty well followed across the province. This school attendance has not been a problem and I am

quite sure that encouragement has been given in a general way, so much so that I would dare anybody in this House to say that there is any better system of education in Canada than that which we have here in Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: Well if you add this approach of such utter blindness to the conditions that really exist across this province—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do not agree with the hon. member. I think my word is as good as his.

Mr. Thompson: I am not talking about words between the hon. Minister and myself, I am talking about research being done on this.

Again, I would refer the hon. Minister to some of the Atkinson research in connection with children who can go on to university. He may come to a sudden revelation that university and higher education is still to an extent a privilege for those who can afford it. I would suggest to the hon. Minister as well that if—and I question in fact, I would ask him to answer me: has he read this study that is being done in the United States in connection with the war on poverty, the economic council study? Could I ask the hon. Minister if he has read it?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As to the economic study that is taking place in the United States at the present moment, I have not read it extensively as the hon. member might have. But I certainly have listened to many discourses on it, especially President Johnson's address in this particular respect, a copy of which I have at home. I have listened to it and I am quite sure that many of us here have. But not to say that I might have gone into the subject extensively, as the hon. member has, and he has taken a special tangent. I appreciate that—and I admit to the hon. member that I do not know everything, that is for sure. Sometimes, many times, those sitting on either side of the House certainly have some knowledge which is of benefit to all of us and which benefits me too. I appreciate that and I make no bones about it, because it is true. However, to say that I have studied the topic really deeply, I must confess to the hon. member, no. I do not know where I would find the time to do all these things in the first place.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate the hon. Minister saying he does not know everything, and I would agree with him. No, I do not want to say it in that sense. I would say I certainly do not know everything either.

My only hope is that as the Minister of Public Welfare he might know some points about welfare and give us some answers.

I say again on this; in connection with education, he asked did I have any suggestions. Well I suggest first of all, as a priority I would give some reading to the discussions going on in the United States about war on poverty. As another priority I suggest that the hon. Minister might read the book which the hon. member for Woodbine has suggested, that might give him a frame of mind, a philosophy, towards the problems of welfare.

And then, sir, I would say this, that having read those I think the hon. Minister might look at some of the studies being done with respect to education. I am thinking of the Atkinson research study. I even suggested before this session had adjourned that he might have a look at the situation in British Columbia and the problem there—it is a particularly different one, it is a cultural one—but it is the problem with generation after generation having hidebound attitudes. I am speaking of the Doukhobors, the radical Sons of Freedom. The approach there is that they have tried to change the younger generation, and I suggest this might, in a sense, be applicable to hardcore family cases. In other words, with the young people, if we could concentrate on encouraging them with education and providing grants, and doing in fact what the hon. Minister says that he would feel I would never suggest, that is to go out to these families, tell them of the opportunities of education and to provide opportunities.

I had thought on the general welfare assistance Acts—and I have asked this previously—I thought that there were opportunities for the children, for example, to secure the help they needed to go to university. I asked that about four years ago because even at that time I could sense the needs of young children who live in an economically deprived home for opportunities to give them a broader vision. At that time the hon. Minister told me there were no provisions for this. Having made, I hope, some suggestions to the hon. Minister with respect to education, I trust we are both agreed that education plays a great part in rehabilitating a person, far more than just giving them some financial assistance.

The hon. Minister mentioned unemployment, and tied that in with automation. When I think of unemployment and automation I am thinking of the tie-in with retraining and so on, and I wonder if the hon. Minister could enlarge on that for us?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I want to enter into a discourse on automation and unemployment. We have heard some very able speeches made here by the hon. member for Scarborough West and also the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) I think had some words about this. Also the hon. Minister of Economics and Development made some remarks about it. I am sure that they have expressed views on which I could not elaborate because their knowledge on that is much larger than mine, and certainly their research was.

Another thing that I might say, Mr. Chairman, is that in Ontario here the unemployment figure is about 3.8 per cent at the present moment. I do not think it has ever been as good. All these people who are receiving welfare allowances today are certainly not people who are out of work because of the fact that they are not able to find work. The percentage who are able to work is very small. But as to the general impression that unemployment causes relief, or anything like that; sure, it is a part and parcel of the picture, but it is certainly not the largest part of the picture.

I would say that maybe the matter of health is the greatest part of it. There are people who are unable to work because of health conditions, because of the fact that they are crippled or the fact that they have a certain heart sickness or some other sickness and are not able to do any work but are not eligible in a categorical programme, so they go on relief. But those who are employable and do not receive unemployment insurance, I think represent a very small number as far as we have it now. To say that it is not a cause of what we mentioned as the general causes would be, I think, not correct; but I think it is a very small cause compared to the others at the present moment.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister thinks that we have a very small number of unemployed who could work and are unemployed, why is it that he pays such a miserly sum of \$1.68 a day for a man who is unemployed? One man at \$1.86 a day! How does the hon. Minister expect him to pay rent and to live and get by? And yet he says there is a small number of them.

I think the hon. Minister is very wrong on that, but how you can be a Minister of Public Welfare and pay such a miserly sum, I do not know. I would like to know if the hon. Minister could answer this question. Do you believe that a human being in the city of Toronto can live on \$1.86 a day? Can you answer that question?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can say in respect to this, as I said a moment ago the allowances for food have always been based on the Canadian dietary standards as approved by the Canadian Council on Nutrition.

Mr. Trotter: The welfare council will not support a \$1.86—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: You are speaking of a single person?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, a single man.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: A single man?

Mr. Trotter: Gets \$1.86 a day to live on!

Hon. Mr. Cecile: A single man now will receive, at least as of April 1—it has gone up \$10—will receive a matter of about \$60 to \$70 per month. He can go up to \$70. This includes electric light.

Mr. Trotter: It is \$1.86 a day, unless the rates have gone up since January 15.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, since April 1 of this year.

Mr. Trotter: Since April 1 of this year. Now it is \$2 a day. Fourteen cents more.

Mr. Thompson: I would just like to—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. Minister has struck trenchantly to the philosophic core of why we have a welfare programme, I would like to have him strike to the core of justifying the nature of The General Welfare Assistance Act and, in essence, the underlying philosophy of that Act—which is categorical assistance.

Aid is divided into categories in this province, an approach which we of the New Democratic Party have repudiated; and we have repudiated it, I think, basically for two reasons. You establish categories into which recipients must arbitrarily fall and beyond which maximum allowance they cannot possibly draw.

Now I do not believe, like the hon. member for Dovercourt, that a Minister of Public Welfare, administering a certain limited number of Acts, would not be able to explain to this House justifications for the regulations and sections of those Acts. So I should like to ask the hon. Minister some specific questions relating to the regulations of The

General Welfare Assistance Act, in order to demonstrate the nature of categorical assistance and what it implies for human beings.

Let us start with something he just referred to. He mentioned the Canadian Council on Nutrition, a group which has been advising the federal department of health since 1937.

Mr. Minister, under section 12 of the regulations in general welfare assistance, you make certain special dietary provisions for pregnant women. I have a couple of questions I would like to ask you. You say there should be an additional supply of milk and vitamin D for pregnant women in their last five months of pregnancy; then you say there should be an additional supply of milk, food, and vitamin D for women in the period of lactation. Now could the hon. Minister explain to me—and this leads to something about the Canadian Council on Nutrition to which I want to come—can the hon. Minister explain to me why food is necessary in one instance as a supplement for women nursing, and why is it not necessary in the other instance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well again, Mr. Chairman, I say this is a question which I am quite sure could be answered better by my friend the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Mr. Bryden: Well, they are your regulations.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The regulations, yes. As I mentioned a moment ago, I have the regulations as they are formulated. I am guided completely by them in the sense that they are formulated by the nutrition experts, as I stated a moment ago, by the late Dr. McHenry, I think, the professor of public health nutrition at the University of Toronto, as well as the qualified nutritionist we have on our staff in the department—who continually reviews the adequacy of food allowances, to an actual and detailed analysis of prepared food costs.

I confess that, being a layman in this respect, I could not tell you the value of one food or another, but I have to follow these people who are supposed to know about these things; that is the way we deal with it. Again I state that this matter is completely under the control and the jurisdiction of the municipality, with the instructions we have handed over to deal with this.

I might cite, as an example of the present amount included in the pre-added budgets as a food allowance under general welfare

assistance, as compared with the average monthly food requirements which have been calculated by the visiting homemakers, for instance, in Toronto, and compared also with the most recent food cost analysis of our staff nutritionist. I suppose that is the best way to do it. If I take an example of a family, for instance, of six persons, including father and mother and four children, let us say they are eleven, six, three, and eight months, if you wish to have a baby in there—we find that the allowance which would be granted to this family for food would amount to \$104.75. The monthly amount for the same family, as calculated from the figures supplied by the homemakers association, would be \$94.44; while the latest nutritionist calculation provides an amount of \$99.51.

You have those figures, I have no doubt, and you will note that the food allowance as provided for in the regulations is in excess, naturally, of the calculations. Clothing allowances in the pre-added budget for the family are also calculated on the basis of \$36 per year per person—and \$72 for two, \$96 for three and so on. Nominal amounts of up to \$3 are provided for household sundries, depending on the size of the family. I do not like to say that because somebody is doing worse or better than me that is the way things should be, but in the United States, generally, it is much lower across the board.

I might say that now, as you know, the maximum shareable budget since April 1, right across the board in Ontario—the \$75 for rental has not been included in the pre-added budget, so you can go up to \$255 a month allowance. These regulations are based upon what we have received from people who are supposed to know about these things, and that is how I have to conduct myself accordingly. To say that it has not worked; well, surely the people who are administering this matter, the municipalities, would certainly have been on our back from way back but they have not done so. The only thing they really have been at us for, for some time now, is the matter of rent; and we added to that before in respect to the larger cities—now it is right across the board for Ontario.

As far as the municipal administration is concerned, I must say, Mr. Chairman, that they seem to have been carrying out the purposes of the legislation pretty well. I am not saying that is the reason they have not asked us for anything. We admit that maybe, if it was necessary, we would look at needs further upon their request, but at the present moment that is the way the situation stands. If my hon. friend expects me to give him the

difference between a nursing mother and, as he mentioned a moment ago, a woman in a certain condition, well I confess to him that I could not answer that.

Mr. S. Lewis: I do not expect, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister to tell me the number of tablets a woman is required to take for a protein supplement during pregnancy, but I do expect the hon. Minister to be able to justify certain regulations before this House. I raised this in the aftermath of something he said quite purposely, because again we have this peculiar situation of his own advisers contradicting the contents and material of the department. I shall quote to you what the Canadian Council on Nutrition thinks should be a supplement for a young woman in such a situation—and they do not say milk and vitamin D. They say three quarts of milk, four eggs, one pound of fresh fruit, one pound of green vegetables, 12 ounces of meat, four ounces of fish, several vitamin supplements, and they come up with a figure somewhat beyond that of the department.

If the department is, in fact, being advised by the Canadian Council of Nutrition, then it contradicts its own advisors. I think that the explanation comes basically to the fact that the hon. Minister has set up these peculiar, irrelevant and arbitrary categories into which people are supposed to fall.

I want to take that another step further in the general assistance regulations. I would like the hon. Minister to explain to me, and to the House as a whole, why, in determining the circumstances under which people are entitled to welfare, 40 per cent is removed from any allowance they may be otherwise receiving under a blind assistance or disabled assistance or mothers' allowances, or old age assistance. I will go further: Why do you deduct 40 per cent from people on welfare when somebody in the same house with them is receiving some other allowance? After that, I should like the hon. Minister to tell me how, when people are thereby driven to such impossible circumstances, he can suggest that he understands the root causes of a welfare programme.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The only answer I can give is this—I presume my hon. friend means that there is a reduction because a person, one of those receiving a pension or some other form of categorical aid has also another source of income such as a boarder. That is why the reduction is made. It is the same thing. I imagine, as in the case of someone who is on a partial pension because of the

fact that other revenues are coming in—such as a rent that should be charged, or is charged against the allowance or pension.

Mr. S. Lewis: What the hon. Minister is saying then, and I think we should get it down, is that if there is a disabled person living in the house with an individual who is on welfare, that man who receives welfare has his allowance cut by 40 per cent of the amount which the disabled person is receiving. What is the hon. Minister trying to achieve? Does he think the disabled person should be required to live on less? Does he believe the welfare recipient should be required to live on less? Just who is the department discriminating against?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is calculated, as I stated a moment ago, on the fact that a person, regardless of what he is receiving either from a pension or disabled persons allowance is supposed to pay rent. He pays rent, and that is revenue for the person to whom it is paid.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let me ask the hon. Minister, then, why he would remove from a person, requiring general welfare under the regulations, all income from any pension, small or otherwise, which he may have accumulated. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, who has a closer association with this than I have: Why is it that a man who has contributed his productive capacities to society for a period of 20 or 30 years, and has accumulated perhaps a pittance of a pension, let us say \$5 or \$10 a week, and then finds himself on general welfare—why must his pension, as a result of his contribution to society, be deducted from the amount the department gives?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: What is my hon. friend suggesting by that, may I ask him? Is he suggesting no limit in this respect, or must there be a limit some place?

Mr. S. Lewis: I am asking the hon. Minister to explain this aspect of it. If he explains it in terms of limits, then we can pursue it a step further. I should like to know how the department explains the regulation.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As the hon. member knows, there is a limit. You can give just so much welfare, depending on what society permits or the individual needs. There is a limit there. If you belong to a categorical programme you have a right to earn so much; and over and above that there is a reduction on your pension. I would presume the same principle applies everywhere.

Mr. S. Lewis: The setting of arbitrary limits is precisely what we take offence to, because you cannot expect people in society to be suffocated within the boundaries of arbitrary limits which bear no relation whatsoever to their economic and social needs. If you set some limits, we suggest, on the basis of what a family legitimately needs, rather than on the basis of what will keep them in perpetual indigence, then you have a much more realistic development. Let me ask the hon. Minister how he explains the figures which do exist, which his department hands out.

I see by the regulations that a single person, unattached, receives under general welfare assistance, \$29.85 a month, pre-added budget. That is \$358 a year. Then he receives, for rent, \$35 a month for a heated premises. That is \$420 per year. So the department pays a single person on general welfare \$778.20 a year.

There are some single people in this Legislature. There is the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough) on my immediate left; there is the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) left of him again. I wonder if it is conceivable, in the course of time and fate, that they might no longer sit in this august Assembly. When they return to the constituency from whence they came they may not again fit into the employment category they were pursuing before election. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, about these people, who would then have to live on an income—I feel very sadly for them—of \$778.20 a year. I ask the hon. Minister: Does he think that is a reasonable income for a single man who is unemployed and on general welfare—\$778.20 a year?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I still think that is a very nice philosophy which I could discuss for a long, long while. I presume—it all depends in what part of Ontario you are. You might live very handily with that in some areas but in some other places it would be with very great difficulty. Then, as I stated a moment ago, this programme is absolutely and entirely administered by the municipality which can give this person any amount but the federal government and the provincial government, or the senior governments, subsidize up to 80 per cent of that part which is under regulation, but there is nothing stopping the municipality from going beyond that. As a matter of fact they receive, right now, some unconditional grants which are related to welfare. I am quite sure, and I am satisfied by meeting many of the people who deal with this problem in the

different cities, that they do exceed the maximums shareable to a large extent. They do that to a very large extent where the need is shown.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I continue on this particular attack only to demonstrate that there is not that much of a discrepancy—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am getting to that, gentlemen.

An hon. member: Put it on the record.

Mr. S. Lewis: I know, Mr. Chairman, that the august members of deserved affluence in this House find it difficult at times to comprehend discussions of welfare but we ask them—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: We are coming to that. Mr. Minister, from your various advisors, who have suggested what is required for people living on a general welfare pattern or living at any point of subsistence level, you have received carefully calculated minimum family budgets. You referred to one source yourself at the outset of your remarks, put out by the homemakers association of Toronto. In every single instance, in the budget which they consider a minimum, a budget which relates to maintenance of a minimum standard of health and self respect, in almost every instance, experts in the field, who have dealt with human beings in need and welfare applicants, suggest \$1,000 more a year for individuals, for families, for whatever size group you would wish.

Now these are minimum figures, the minimum—so it is written in the preface—necessary to maintain a standard of health and self respect. And most of them rise as high as \$1,000 greater than this department is prepared to allocate. These are the people from whom you receive advice. And it does not jibe. Again the hon. Minister's advisors, his consultative agencies, run counter to what he himself has put forward in the departmental estimates and in the regulations of this particular Act.

I have one more specific question to ask on the issue of categories, because I think that is what it resolves itself to—fitting people into arbitrary income allowances, destroying any possibilities which exist for self-respect and integration into the society as working human beings. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is not true that a mother with two fatherless children under general welfare assistance receives less than a mother with

two fatherless children under mother's allowance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, I think there would be a differential there, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: Could the hon. Minister tell me why it is—and again we come to this incredible situation of categories—that the children, fatherless in one instance, receive more than children who are fatherless in another instance? How does The Department of Public Welfare justify it, how does he explain it?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that under the general welfare assistance in this respect, or relief if you want to make it definite, these are used for short-term purposes and the other, the mothers' allowances, are on a long-term basis and are much higher.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does the hon. Minister then contend that people are any the less needy in the short term?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, I would suggest that, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister would suggest that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, because on a short-term basis you might have some funds at your disposition that you would not have on a long-term basis.

Mr. S. Lewis: In other words, if a mother finds herself with two fatherless children, for whatever tragic reason, in January of 1964, you are arguing Mr. Minister, that, in January and February, under one category her needs would be less than under another category?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, if I may at this moment—I should have said this before but it just crossed my mind at the present time—that this is one programme that we have looked at over the years and have been reducing the waiting period from twelve months to six months. I do not think I am giving out any secrets, because I am going to bring it in here later in legislation—this waiting period will be reduced—as I hope to have my colleagues agree with me on this matter, and I think the House will too—I hope to decrease that period to three months. This will apply in cases of desertion by father, or whatever has happened in this respect. So it will really be on a very short term. This will also apply as far as jail terms to the breadwinner are concerned. We hope to bring this in at this very session.

Mr. S. Lewis: All what would be reduced? The length of time would be telescoped?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, the short term the hon. member speaks about would be three months only.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right. Suppose it is three months only. I ask the hon. Minister how he justifies it? I cannot see it and he says he does justify it. He says he justifies it because of some strange short-term versus long-term formula. We are not dealing with preferred shares, we are dealing with a mother and fatherless children. Now how does he justify giving them less for three months with precisely the same needs under one category as under another? I think that the House deserves some kind of explanation.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I suppose there is a place where you must put a termination or a beginning. As far as we are concerned this period used to be a full year, and at one time there was nothing at all if you could find the deserting father. But this the hon. member must also realize—and I am sure that I will not cause any harm or grieve anyone when I say this—that at the same time, while I am trying to protect or help these people, at the same time I do not want any of the deserting husbands or that sort of thing to take unfair advantage of welfare and be gone every now and then. It has been found in our investigations this has been done in Toronto and other places, that is what is happening. I have to draw the line some place. If I have not drawn it at the proper place, this is a question that will have to be determined in our studies as we go along; but so far we have appreciated the fact that the six-months period was maybe a little too long. I am not claiming that it is perfect, but at the present time in our studies we think that it will serve the purpose for the time being at least.

I think we have reduced it to three months now for all the cases that come under desertion. If a man is sent to prison for a period of three months or more you get on to it immediately and that is the way we have made a decision in that respect. Now that decision may be changed later on, I do not know, but for now that is what it is.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I have sat and listened with very great care and I have reflected upon the various statements and sallies that have been made across the floor and it strikes me, sir, that fundamentally, though it has been a very useful debate, a very useful and enlightening one in this matter of welfare which is of grave concern

to all sides of the House, that fundamentally the problem is one of philosophy and a divergence and a difference of philosophy between the hon. Minister and his hon. colleagues—especially the hon. Minister, because he has been the articulate one—on one side of the House and those of us on the other side of the House.

Really, the hon. Minister let the cat out of the bag and disclosed his hand, he did not play his cards very close to the vest, when he first introduced his estimates in this House on March 18, as long ago as that day when we commenced a discussion of estimates. The hon. member for York South is right when he alludes to the fact that in the previous four or five years the estimates have gone through this House relatively easily. Now it may be that no estimates from now on are going to go through this House during the next three or four sessions with facility, but until this year, in my recollection, there has not been the analytical approach to these estimates that we have had this year.

On March 18 the hon. Minister displayed for all who would see—and that includes even the most obtuse—his philosophy to the problem of welfare. When he said in summing up his views about the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough West that when we come to the day that the people of Ontario are regimented and paternalized, then perhaps the suggestions of the hon. member for Scarborough West, which are not fundamentally different in principle and philosophy from the remarks of the hon. member for Dovercourt and my hon. friend from Parkdale, who is a man who feels deeply these things, there is no difference in philosophy between them—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I am speaking of welfare and welfare assistance. I will get specific, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister in his mind and the use of his intellect seems to be saying that we on this side of the House want to keep these people in their state, that we want to increase the grant to them so that they do not suffer discomfort, anxiety and distress. He seems to be saying that we believe that all we need do is increase the amount of money that is given to them.

Nothing could be further from the truth, if one listened with any ordinary degree of care at all to the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. member for Dovercourt, for inherent in their remarks is always the supervening and compelling principle that what we on this side of the

House are concerned about is to raise these people out of their state and once again to return them to a useful and an active role within society so that they are not dependent upon the public purse or anybody else's charity.

That is what the hon. member for Dovercourt was saying when he delineated the five root factors. He made the House cognizant of the reasons for the need for welfare among people who come to the public purse and beg charity; if you analyze them, then you take a large step in the direction of alleviating, improving and removing their condition. That is the thinking behind all the words that emit from this side of the House. The hon. Minister, I am sad to say—because he is a likeable fellow, really he is a likeable fellow, one has to like him for his personality—but it saddens me to have to stand in the House and say that the hon. Minister, I fear, being as objective as I can though I am a politician, I fear he does not comprehend these things. He does not understand them at all.

Now, in the matter of welfare under this vote—what is the number? Vote 1806?

An hon. member: Vote 1806.

Mr. Sopha: One hears a great deal recently about shared cost programmes. They are much in the news. They have been since the end of March. This is a shared cost programme between the provincial government and the municipalities and perhaps the time has come when we might have a look at this shared cost between this Legislature and the municipalities who share the cost with us on an 80-20 ratio, is it? We put up 80 per cent of the money and they put up 20 per cent and, speaking for myself entirely, exercising the freedom inherent in being a member of the Opposition as opposed to being a Minister of the Crown, I wonder whether in 1964 we have not come to the day when the province ought to absorb all of the cost of welfare and its administration.

The reason I say that—I could give many reasons, but I will give only one—I will give one with which I have become impressed as a result of reading that study, inaugurated by the deputy Minister of this department, into the problems of long-term assistance programmes. I was convinced that I was right when I read the part of that study which indicated that they had evaluated the principle that, when there was counselling of these people and their families, they saw a result which, in the words of the deputy Minister, “exceeded all expecta-

tions”. What a wonderful result—when all they had sought to do was to bring scientific technique to bear to see what could be done for and toward these people, and the results “exceeded all expectations”. They found in group B, of 100 families, that where they were given all possible help and treatment and personal counselling twice as many of those people, as on a voluntary basis, had to a large measure become alleviated in their condition within six months.

I am impressed with family counselling. I am impressed with it, not only from the point of view of what it might do to restore these people to a useful role in society—but, coming from the community I come from, I am impressed with it as a possible means of preventing homicide. Homicide—which we have had in my community since Christmas. We have had three startling demonstrations of homicide. That, some will say, is a matter for the criminal law. A matter of detection. Punishment. But I hurl it back and I say it is a matter of prevention; for when people get into a state of family dislocation so that the anxieties and the stresses and the strains are more than they can bear, and they have no place to turn, they have no place to go for succour and help and assistance and sympathy, then in many cases, and in my community since Christmas, they have resorted to homicide.

In two cases whole families were wiped out. The entire family was wiped out and little children, a number of them; how many do they number? They number seven or eight, and their distressed and anxious and perhaps paranoiac parent decided that he or she had come to the end of the rope. The string had snapped and all reason had disappeared; then that parent took the lives of the children.

That is what impels me to the conclusion that the time has come when the provincial government must take over the whole responsibility of welfare, for I see it as the only means whereby we will have the establishment soon, in our province, at least in large urban centres, of family counselling services. Yes—call them what you will. I call them family counselling services.

You have an agency. It will be an agency, staffed by trained people—sociologists, trained social workers—to whom recourse might be made by people who suffer from family dislocation and disharmony, whether it comes from alcohol or whether it comes from gambling or whether it comes from the fact that the parent no longer is interested, in an affectionate way, in his wife and is perhaps wandering to the arms of

someone else. Whatever the reason, maybe then there will be an agency to which these people might turn and seek help and advice. And beyond that, an agency which will exercise follow-up care.

Where do they go now? Where does a mother go now when she needs advice about her family problems? Generally speaking, she goes to one of three persons—she might go to all three of them. She goes to the clergyman; she goes to the medical practitioner, their doctor, the family doctor; or she goes to the lawyer.

And apart from the clergyman—and I do not speak for them because I do not know a great deal about their life and work—but apart from the clergyman, who may be qualified to give advice and may be able to exercise some follow-up inspection, I do say that when she goes to the doctor or the lawyer she is going to people who are unqualified. Unqualified in the sense that they have no formal training to advise in family disharmony. They did not learn it at any university.

The only qualifications that are in them are those they have picked up from the ordinary experience of living and seeing the problems; but apart from that, the lawyer is no more qualified, and perhaps is less qualified, to advise on family life than the baker or the man who delivers the milk to the house. And besides, the doctor and the lawyer, when all is said and done, are much too busy. They are much too busy to give advice.

I have seen these women—mostly women—I have seen hundreds of them. And I felt inadequate and unsure about what I said to them.

I think I related the story about when, as a lawyer, I was in a police station one night recently, and a woman came in and deposited a gun with the sergeant of police—deposited a gun and ammunition with them. I was rather dumbfounded. I said to the sergeant, "Does that happen often?" He said, "Two or three times a week a woman brings a gun and ammunition in and leaves it with us." I do not need to spell out the reason she does that.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): You got that in twice.

Mr. Sopha: I am not going to tarry to discuss it with the hon. Provincial Secretary. I say to my friend, because he has been my friend, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, that if he will but open his eyes and see the possibilities of this department in the im-

provement of our society, that if he will just approach his task in this House in presenting and piloting his estimates through, we, in the Liberal party, will not vote to reduce his travelling expenses. We will give him more if he wants. We will be agreeable to give him more. But if he will just listen to the discussion from the point of view that every hon. member on each side of the House who speaks is not interested in socializing and regimenting these people, what we say here is emitted from the point of view that we want to improve our society.

You know, really, the philosophy of the hon. Minister made me reflect on the night I saw Professor Frank Underhill on the television, discussing with—by George, I think it was Senator Grattan O'Leary, the man much in the news now. They were discussing things, and Professor Underhill said the difference between a Conservative and a Liberal is that the Conservative believes in the doctrine of original sin and a Liberal does not. Perhaps there is a lot of truth in that. There is a lot of truth in it. To me a Liberal believes in the possibility of the betterment of the human condition at all times.

Finally, we, in this party, and we can safely say for our hon. friends on the left here, we, in this party, are not interested only in a society where, as the hon. Minister says, there is only 3.8 per cent unemployment, a society of such affluence that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. We are not really interested in the rich at all. They can look after themselves. What we really are interested in is these people who are the recipients of this \$18 million that we are asked to vote, because they cannot look after themselves without advice and aid and sympathy and constructive assistance in order to remove them from that condition of poverty that my hon. friend from Woodbine speaks about, and that they may be lifted up out of that condition into a condition of dignity that is the right of all mankind. I say to the hon. Minister, that is the philosophical basis with which we, on this side of the House, speak to him and would implore him to receive our suggestions according to that vein.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to the point that my hon. friend from Scarborough West was dealing with a few minutes ago, the question of the mother with small children, where there is no father in the house.

Now sometimes it is a little difficult to hear the hon. Minister, those microphones seem to be rather a long way away from

him and I am not quite sure I understood his answers. I want to raise this problem in relation to women in a specific situation, where they have been deserted by their husbands, or at any rate by the father of their children. The husband and father has been located, his whereabouts is known, and if he is earning any income, some sort of a court award can be got against him for maintenance. Now, in a situation of this kind, does that woman ever get on mother's allowance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, when my hon. friend from Woodbine raises former occasions it reminds me that there have been many recollections mentioned here before, so if he does not mind, I will recall former days.

There used to be a great gentleman sitting where my hon. friend from York South is sitting today, from Ansonville, I think. He used to make a great speech about husbands who desert their families. I think it would be very salutary for all of us to read it, as he certainly had no use and no sympathy for these deserting husbands as we call them. However, I do not exactly know if I can answer the question properly. I understand that in the case of a deserting husband, and I hope to introduce legislation on this at this session, if he is not to be found, let us say for a period of three months, then the wife in question is eligible for mother's allowance on the basis of the fact that her husband is gone. Before this it was six months, but now we hope to put it at three months. If the husband is found, meanwhile, I think there is another period which must lapse before the mother's allowance payments are discontinued to allow the restored husband to start work. If it is impossible for him to work for physical reasons or otherwise, well, then the mother's allowance will be continued. Does that answer the question?

Mr. Bryden: I think, in part, Mr. Chairman. At least it answered the question as far as I posed it. There are some further aspects of it with which I would like to deal. I think the plans the hon. Minister has announced represent a step forward, and we can certainly always welcome steps forward, even if we would like to see even further progress made. But excepting the fact that the regulations that I believe he has in mind are not yet in effect, or am I right in assuming that these are regulations that you are still considering and hope—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: These are not regulations, Mr. Chairman. It will be a bill presented—

Mr. Bryden: Well, there will be legislation that you hope to bring before this House and that you hope the House will pass.

What about the mother then? As I take it from the answer you gave, under this proposed new legislation if a deserting husband is not found in three months, then the woman will qualify for mother's allowance. If he is found, but has not got anything and cannot pay anything for the maintenance of the children, there will be another period before she will qualify. Well—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No. There will be a period of grace before the allowance will be discontinued.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, I see. Yes. Well, then, what about the case where the husband is found, he is known to have an income, there is an order from the family court against him to pay a certain amount for the maintenance of the children for whom he certainly should be held responsible and that amount does not add up to as much as the woman would get under mother's allowance, what sort of help will she get?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that there are not too many, thank God, of these cases, but that matter is now under review. This, I can assure you, is under review and I think we will be able to deal with it in the same sense as the others in providing a supplement in that respect.

However, I have nothing exactly in that particular field at the present moment. I can assure my hon. friend that there are very few of these. As I say, I am not an awfully sympathetic fellow with respect to these deserters. I might take the suggestion of my friend, Mr. Grummett, in those days, that these people should not be allowed to roam around. We should put them away some place so as to allow the mother and her children to be raised properly, even if the need might be very small, because this kind of example is not very good. That was the general tenor of the speeches as I can recall them.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many are affected. I suspect the hon. Minister may be a little sanguine when he says the number is very small. But even if there is only one, I think there is a problem, and since the matter is now under active consideration, this might be an appropriate time to put forward suggestions that are amateurish, no doubt, but are based at least on some personal experience in trying to assist women who find themselves in this situation.

As far as the deserting father is concerned, I have no sympathy for him. I certainly think that everything possible should be done to make him fulfil his obligations. I remember many of the comments that Mr. Grummett, I think he is the gentleman the hon. Minister is referring to, has made, and I think that many of those comments were well taken.

However, my concern is not so much with the man who has deserted his children and his children's mother, but with the mother and the children, they are the people I think we should be mainly concerned about. As to the hard hand of the law coming down on the father, I do not think there is any harm in that, but let us not penalize the mother and her children. This is what we are doing now. I know of cases, I have dealt with cases—and I will say that the deputy Minister and his department have given tremendous assistance in these cases within the framework of the law in which they must operate—cases of women who spend endless time going down to family court, trying to collect on an order made by the court. Unfortunately we have situations where a mother with two or three small children is deserted by her husband, his whereabouts is known, he is earning an income, there is a court order against him for the maintenance of his children, which is all as it should be, but we come now to the point where I think there should be a change. Who is fundamentally responsible for making sure that he pays up to the mother? If he does not pay she has to go down to family court and they have to chase after him. He may pay or he may not. If he does not, she can get some general welfare assistance. If he does, well, then she will carry on for another month with

perhaps a lower level of general welfare assistance.

But a mother with two, three or four small children—and no father in the house—entirely responsible for the upbringing of those children, and with very limited resources for that purpose, should not have to worry herself with this perpetual trek to the family court to try to make sure that the father accepts his responsibility. I will quite agree that the father should be made to accept his responsibilities, if it is humanly possible, but I think that the mother should be in a position where she can relieve herself of any worry in that connection.

I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister that some sort of system should be worked out whereby a mother in those circumstances may, if she wishes, assign her claim against the father to the department. Then the department will pay her mother's allowances in exactly the same way it would pay mother's allowances to a widow and various other categories of women with children to bring up without any father to provide for them.

I think the woman has enough worries as it is and should be relieved of this additional worry. The department could relieve her if they were allowed to take assignments of her claims against the father and then pay the mother's allowance at the regular scale. Let the mother devote all of her energy and attention to looking after her children. It is just too much of a strain on her now to have this constant worry, and certainly there are many of these court orders which have to be enforced over and over again.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX "A"

STATEMENT OF GRANTS PAID BY MUNICIPALITIES TO THEIR HOSPITALS
FOR CONSTRUCTION SINCE 1959

Counties	Grant	Mill Rate*
Peel	\$4,210,000	2.36
Halton	3,214,000	1.39
Middlesex	1,350,000	2.03
Norfolk	1,909,334	2.66
Ontario	1,675,532	1.65
Essex	938,20075
Dufferin	300,000	1.61
Haldimand	675,000	1.78
Wentworth	900,00093
York	1,360,00078
Cities and Towns		
Hamilton	\$10,217,000	1.87
North Bay	2,192,000	6.58
Port Arthur	1,780,000	2.26
Sault Ste. Marie	1,750,000	1.11
Kitchener-Waterloo	1,570,000	(Kitchener) .51 (Waterloo) 1.51
Peterborough	1,380,000	1.68
St. Catharines	1,800,000	1.39
Sarnia	1,049,78765
Windsor	1,025,00027
Ottawa	4,323,00077
Brantford	550,00049
Paris	90,000	1.40
Owen Sound	250,000	1.32
London	800,00024
Oshawa	500,00022
Metro Toronto		
Riverdale (a municipal Hospital)	\$2,300,000056
(It is worth noting that Provincial grant was \$2,748,195)		
Metro Municipalities (Local Financing without Metro Help)		
North York Township	\$1,679,000	(1 mill yearly for 10 years beginning 1963)
Scarborough	660,00015
Etobicoke	325,00007
York Township	75,00034
Weston	25,00010
New Toronto	25,00006

*Mill rate is based on an average cost of 6 per cent and a 15-year debenture.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 14, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 14, 1964

Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, concluded	2055
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2079

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE (continued)

On vote 1806:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) spoke about the national importance of an incident tonight. I understand that the Attorney General of the United States is speaking here tonight, too, and we would have appreciated an opportunity to hear that; but now, to get to assistance in welfare.

The 1963 public accounts show the amount of some \$12 million-odd in general welfare assistance. I notice this here under the heading of general welfare assistance. Is it \$18 million, in the estimates?

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) in his reply to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) indicated that the reason for so much welfare assistance was because of the health of the nation. I understood him to say that the people on welfare are mostly those who are unable to work. Does that mean, sir, that the health of this province has so deteriorated in one year that \$6 million more is required?

I notice also that it is rather interesting, comparing my own metropolitan area in North Bay with the two surrounding townships—approximately 45,000 people. The welfare assistance to that area amounts to less than \$40,000. I will look at some of the hon. Ministers' areas—the hon. Minister of Public Welfare's own area—Hawkesbury, a town, I think, of a comparatively few thousand, has \$89,000 in welfare; Brockville—the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) again—less than 20,000 population, \$50,000 in welfare. We look to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) and we find, for the town of Dunnville, a very high percentage of welfare. Look at the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) in the town of Timmins—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Troy: Well, it is \$248,000—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): We can read it all, too.

Mr. Troy: I know you can read it all—

Mr. Kerr: We can read the whole book—

Mr. Troy: Well, I do not have to read the whole book. I just have to read a few of these striking examples.

Does it mean, then, that this district—shall I say, of Nipissing, which in the election campaign needed various things—does it mean that it is such a busy area or such a healthy area? The hon. Minister says that people are on relief mostly because of reasons of health. Does it mean—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I did not say anything of the kind—

Mr. Troy: Are you the Minister? Are you the one who made the—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, but you are talking to me about Timmins.

Mr. Troy: I am not talking to you—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Do not get excited!

Mr. Troy: Let us not get excited. I just said that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs—you are the Minister of Municipal Affairs, sir—you are from the town of Timmins. Your welfare assistance is up to \$200,000 and more, and the hon. Minister said it is because the people are in poor health; that is why there is so much relief.

There were four causes mentioned by the hon. member for Dovercourt, and he discussed unemployment, education, health—

An hon. member: Five.

Mr. Troy: Five—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: Well, these people are reading your mind. There was a fifth one I did not know about, but one of them—and then you said both of them, because they were unable to work.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): What is your point, Leo?

Mr. Troy: The point is this: If there is \$6 million extra this year what has the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) been doing about the situation in this province, if we have to have 50 per cent more for welfare because of the fact that the bulk of the people are unable to work? Is that it?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Troy: Well, in Hawkesbury; in London, Ontario; the city of Peterborough—50,000-odd people, almost \$470,000 in welfare. Then, I notice in today's *Toronto Telegram*, I think it is—yes, Tuesday, April 14—it is with regard to the city welfare commissioner. I would like to get the hon. Minister's comments. I quote:

Toronto will fight Ontario's proposed Medicare scheme for fear it will burden municipal taxpayers.

The reason will be that there will be so many indigents and then they will be forced to contribute to the medical expenses of these in drugs, eyeglasses, nursing, dental care and so on; and they are not covered. So it says that the provincial Medicare plan which is envisaged—

would seem, forces municipalities to determine the eligibility of "medical indigents" for assistance.

It will mean a great increase in general welfare assistance. Would the hon. Minister comment on the two things I brought up—the increase in welfare assistance from \$12 million to \$18 million and the impact of this on the health of the nation, and then the proposed Medicare plan that the province envisages without any coverage for any dental, drugs, nursing and eyeglasses? What effect will that have on increasing general welfare assistance?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): The answer to my hon. friend's question would be that this now includes dependent fathers, who were formerly in mothers' allowance to the amount of \$2.4 million; then widows and unmarried women, which is also due and which will amount to \$2.8 million.

Mr. Troy: That means \$2 million extra this year in addition to those things?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes. That is what makes the difference between the \$12 million and the \$18 million.

Mr. Troy: A rough sum in addition—I thought you said \$2.4 million and—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Troy: From my figures the addition would be about \$4 million.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Dependent father cases formerly included in mothers' allowances cost an amount of \$1 million the last year they were included in mother's allowances. This year they are included in general welfare assistance for an amount of \$2.4 million. Widows' and unmarried women's allowances, \$2.8 million, are new also, which makes a total of \$5.2 million in new costs.

Mr. Troy: Does that cover the whole addition?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: For the most part, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. Minister there is not a hint of political innuendo in this question. If in fact there are over 50,000 people in the area of Peterborough charging up over \$400,000 to general welfare assistance, this must surely be abnormal in the province. I am curious. Could the hon. Minister tell why there is such a concentration of general welfare recipients in that particular area?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I will try to find that out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well I have here, for instance, I am going to take two of them—like the Cornwall area which was 42,356 population in 1964, has 7 per cent population on relief; 1963 was 7.7 per cent on relief; which means, in January of 1964, 3,004 people on relief. In Peterborough, with 51,000 in 1964, there is 3.4 per cent on relief; and in 1963, 3.9 on relief for the amount of 1,730 people—as of January this year. So it would be primarily, I think, unemployment.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1806 carried?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): On vote 1806, am I correct; did I understand the hon. Minister correctly when he said he was going to institute studies in the Windsor area

concerning the hard core of those receiving welfare?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: They have asked us to carry out the programme I was speaking of in Toronto here, and we are, as I said, creating the means to do that, and we will do that.

Mr. Newman: I think we really welcome that into the area, because we still have almost 4,000 people on welfare, and an unemployed total of almost 7,000 people. If the studies can point to some way of lowering those two figures, it would be a real asset to the community.

The hon. member for Dovercourt has mentioned something concerning education and adult retraining. One of the difficulties in the retraining programme, as I have brought out previously before the adjournment of the House, was the fact that individuals on welfare quite often refuse to take retraining because of the loss of welfare benefits. There seems to be no incentive. Has the department ever approached the National Employment Service with the intention of attempting to encourage, in some fashion, those on welfare to take retraining?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that The Department of Labour in Ottawa is now presently studying this question so as to provide for more money along the lines I trust the hon. member is talking about, in respect to these retraining programmes.

Mr. Newman: In other words, the individual taking the retraining course now would not be deprived of any welfare benefits that he might be entitled to? Is that the idea?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, there is some supplementing of cases. By the way, I was glad to find out that the Windsor area, which is a very striking example, decreased in January, 1964 from January, 1963 by 24.7 per cent, which I think is good.

Mr. Newman: That still leaves us with well over 3,700 people, I think it is, on welfare, which is too high a figure. It is almost 3.5 per cent of the population, and we still have well over eight per cent of our work force unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, the other question that I had was concerning the payments to individuals for home visits. What are the payments for home visits today?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The hon. member is talking about homemakers?

Mr. Newman: Homemakers, yes.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that we share 50 per cent of \$8.

Mr. Newman: Is the hon. Minister aware then that the Ontario Welfare Council has suggested that the figure of \$8 is not realistic at all in today's times and strongly recommended that it be extended or increased?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, we have had that report. I have no quarrel with it, it is a very fine report. As a matter of fact, it is under study right now.

Mr. Newman: Is the hon. Minister taking it into consideration with the intention of implementing or increasing the payment to homemaker services?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. Newman: Right. I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am sure my hon. friends in the Conservative camp will be pleased to know that we are going to try to subject the homemakers and nurses services to a bit of scrutiny at this point, because I think perhaps they need it. We would not want a service as important as this to get lost in the general welfare assistance area.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: I know the raw nerve ends demonstrate themselves during welfare estimates; but I think they might be contained. Could I ask the hon. Minister one or two specific questions? First, how many municipalities are actually participating in the homemaker programme?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: One hundred and eighty-seven.

Mr. S. Lewis: Am I right in thinking that there are some 900 municipalities in the province?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I beg your pardon?

Mr. S. Lewis: Are there some 900 municipalities in the province? I should be looking at the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs when I say this.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That seems possible, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Could I ask how many homemaker services were administered by municipalities or through municipalities last year?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Before we go into this, I should just state the number of participating

municipalities are included in the two counties as such.

I do not know if I can answer the question of the hon. member directly, but perhaps these figures might be interesting in this respect. I have here: number of hours' service of homemakers in addition to eight hours a day, 29,060; number of days' service, 26,377; number of children at home served, 9,000-plus; number of adults, 4,400; number of cases as such, 3,105.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is in the hon. Minister's report and I appreciate it. I was curious to know whether the service had been extended to an increasing number of municipalities. I am aware that there are more people being served.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I only have the figures on a percentage basis, and that is 19.2 per cent increase.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is in the number of hours of service provided?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is as administered through the municipalities. Oh, I am sorry, the increase is 14.2 and the total cost as shared has increased 19.2 per cent. The increase as such in the number of municipalities is 14.2 per cent. The increase in total cost is 19.2, which is \$204,374.

I might say this is one programme that I am quite sure that the hon. member will appreciate, after all, cannot be imposed on municipalities, but we are encouraging it, I can assure him. No municipality which has wanted to come into the picture has been refused, but instead has been encouraged to go along with it, to provide for the services.

I have a figure here that 40 new municipalities came in.

Mr. S. Lewis: How precisely is the hon. Minister encouraging the involvement of municipalities in the homemaker programme? What is there within the homemakers branch of the department which allows them to encourage municipalities beyond the mere distribution of literature?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There has been added in the staff here one other person dealing with that exclusively. Naturally, we deal with the municipalities themselves through the administrators of the different programmes. Participation is also suggested by all the field workers we have in the field and more especially by the administrators in municipalities and cities where there is industry especially, which calls for this type of work.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Minister, I raised this particular line because I too think it is a profoundly important piece of social legislation. I am delighted it is in effect in this province and recognize that in a very real sense it breaks new ground. But I am very concerned that it is not in fact being widely used. One could not pretend otherwise when saying 187 out of 900 municipalities use it. I wonder if the hon. Minister is aware of the special study which said, and I am quoting now:

—that all the various homemaker associations express concern regarding the lack of experience and knowledge of welfare administrators in small municipalities who seem to be unaware of the provisions of the Act.

The report goes further to suggest that they sometimes seem to be unaware of the Act entirely. Now if, in fact, the welfare department takes the Act seriously, then I think—as in the field of day nurseries, a similar or parallel branch in this department—that there should be a much more vigorous prosecution of establishing units and services throughout Ontario.

I wonder if some of it is not handicapped by lack of funds. You said to the hon. member who spoke earlier that you were thinking of revising the per diem payments upward. Am I right in that? May I also ask whether you are thinking of revising the number of hours which you allow, upward? At the moment you allow an eight-hour maximum, if I am right?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: All in the same package, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: You intend to revise it? I am sure the people in the field will be interested to know. May I now ask, from The Department of Public Welfare's most recent annual report, services of homemakers and nurses services amount to \$205,000. Could you indicate to me which portion of that was homemakers services?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: On the nurses services for the calendar year January 1, 1963 to December 31, 1963, I have a total cost, shared 50-50 by the province and municipalities, of \$310,993.32. That is nurses services. The homemakers services, which I have for the same calendar year, amounted to \$204,574.20.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am reliably informed by a visiting homemaker, Mr. Minister, that it is one to nothing for the Leafs.

Before proceeding further into the homemaker area, I would like to make these observations. Mr. Minister, I think the field of homemakers services in the province of Ontario is indispensable and I think the hon. Minister is inclining, inadvertently or otherwise, to destroy the service at birth by making it impossible for any meaningful functioning with the present financial strictures. There has been a very valuable report documenting all the areas of homemaker needs. Page after page of the report enunciates that it is necessary to curtail services, indispensable human services, because either the province will not give the money or the municipalities will not participate in the repayment formula.

I think this situation has reached a serious, indeed, crisis proportion, because if a government speaks seriously, if a Minister speaks seriously as you have been doing, about the need to take the pressure off hospitals and about the need to provide home care for older people and about the need generally to give rehabilitation and substance to your whole public welfare apparatus, then something has to be done about homemakers services in the province. Mr. Minister, you have a report on homemakers services in Ontario given to you in February of this year, as itemized and carefully drawn together a report as one could possibly wish. On the committee, Mr. Minister, the sub-committee on homemakers services of the Ontario Welfare Council, there sit the following people: Miss Margaret Wilkie, section supervisor, child welfare hospitalization, Department of Public Welfare; Miss Doris Moore, supervisor, homemakers services, Department of Public Welfare; Dr. B. T. Dale, Wellington County Health Unit; Mrs. Jack Barter, administrative assistant, Pilot Home Care Programme, Department of Public Health; and several other eminent people in the field. But the crux of the listing is that people directly linked with your own department participated in the formation of a sub-committee which then proceeded to establish a study body whose wholesale contention at the end of a very careful study was that the higher intent of the Act, the objective of the Act, was seriously undermined by the regulations.

Now, I think I have suggested this on previous occasions, but this is what distresses me about the nature of The Department of Public Welfare. Because with all the best sentiments possible—and even if those of us on this side of the House do not agree with your priorities and with your attitude, one cannot deny the sincerity of the sentiment—

yet the sentiments have no relevance to the legislation that is handed down and thus makes it very difficult for people on this side to have confidence.

Now, in the little pamphlet which you were good enough to send to every single hon. member of this House, homemakers and nurses services were described thusly, and I think it is instructive to repeat it:

The services of a homemaker may be used to keep a family together when the mother is ill or in hospital.

That is to prevent family disintegration at a time of acute health need.

Elderly, handicapped and convalescent persons may also benefit from this programme and thus remain in their own homes while receiving all necessary care and attention.

Now what could possibly be more worthwhile than that? And yet every page of the report suggests that the gap between the demand for the services and the resources available to meet those services is constantly growing. If the department does not want to strangle the homemakers services at the outset, because it is the embryonic period which will make the difference here, then the department has to change its approach.

Let me be more specific, Mr. Minister. I am sure you are aware that only 51 per cent of the people who applied last year for homemakers services to the three major voluntary homemaker associations in Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa and the Red Cross branches through the province could be attended to. All the rest had to be denied and yet—and this is surely significant—all of them, 100 per cent of them, made their requests on the basis of some health need. So that 49 per cent of the people—and this was averaged out on a study of the month of May, in 1963, and felt to be applicable to the whole year—almost half of the people who applied because of a serious health need, were turned away. What were some of the instances of people turned away? Perhaps the hon. members would be interested:

A doctor's nurse called concerning an East York couple. The husband was 80 and frail and his wife, aged 77, had a broken patella. She could be hospitalized but the husband would need help in the house and his meals cooked. Their income was too limited to employ private help.

Mr. and Mrs. F. were in their early seventies. Mr. F. due to be discharged from hospital. Mrs. F. had arthritis quite

badly and said she really did not know how to cope with the extra work a semi-invalid would create.

Or further:

Mr. S., social worker at The Department of Veterans' Affairs, was seeking help for an elderly veteran who had had a stroke. His wife urgently needed an operation to save her sight and she refused to be admitted until there was some plan worked out to look after her husband.

These examples are taken from the Visiting Homemakers Association in Toronto. They are the types of cases that an association set up for precisely this purpose was forced to turn down categorically because they lacked provincial assistance.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, the curtailment works in every field. It now discriminates heavily against the elderly, for which this programme was devised. The Toronto Homemakers Association can give no services to the elderly whatsoever. They have had to cut them off.

It now discriminates against all mothers on a normal confinement basis, because there are no funds to look after them. It is also forced to discriminate against any long-term chronic care.

Unless one imputes the wrong thing to using the word discriminate, I should say the association is necessarily prevented from helping these areas of human need because the province has refused to see fit to grant what necessary financial assistance they suggested under their own legislation.

Now, Mr. Minister, the municipalities in this province are unaware of the homemakers legislation. There is just no question about that.

They could not be otherwise. You cannot have two or three people in an entire province of this size pursuing a piece of social legislation and expect to get a reaction from a large number of municipalities. It is humanly impossible and it is characteristic of many programmes in the department.

It is worth noting that in the month of May, 1963, out of 1,377 cases referred to various homemakers groups, 41 out of the 1,377 came from public welfare offices. Two or three per cent of the referrals were from that source.

Again, it reduces the legislation to a travesty. One asks why is it on the books? If a public welfare apparatus were apprised of the government's intention to pursue this particular course—so be it—but obviously the municipalities are not aware.

An hon. member: Oh yes, they are.

Mr. S. Lewis: Obviously the municipalities are not aware or there would have been much greater advantage taken of this aspect. There is no problem in municipalities taking advantage of mothers' allowance, or general welfare assistance or of all the other shared programmes administered by this department. But when it comes to the showpiece legislation of this department, when it comes to the areas of day nurseries and of homemakers services, then the department fails noticeably, and that I think is an unfortunate thing. The municipalities do not accept their sense of responsibility because it has not been communicated to them. On page 18 of the report—

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): How do you know that?

Mr. S. Lewis: The report compiled by the advisers to the hon. Minister said so and I can think of no better source for justifying it. On page 18 of the report—

An hon. member: Get the hockey game back on.

Mr. S. Lewis: —there are a couple of quotes given, which I think hon. members of the House if they are not too thick-skinned, hard-boiled and otherwise to appreciate, might well sympathize with.

Mother with three small children admitted to hospital for fourth confinement. Father working as salesman earning \$250 per month. Application made by supervisor for financial assistance for family under Act 148 without effect.

Another example:

Public health unit requested homemakers service for family, husband, wife and five children under nine years of age. Family recently arrived from another province. Mother admitted to Ontario Hospital for complete nervous breakdown. Father had been unemployed for a long period, was due to start training in insurance business. Family had temporary accommodation with relatives but no income apart from family allowance. Family deep in debt which contributed to the breakdown in mother's health. Assistance under Act 148 applied for. Application refused.

The report of people from the hon. Minister's own department, indicates cases of municipalities simply refusing to accept working agreements under this social legislation. If the hon. Minister is satisfied with that particular set of circumstances, so be it, but it

simply does not jibe with the stated objectives of the department. Again one wonders whether the primary intent here is not destroyed by the regulations.

I appreciate some of the interjections; let some of them be made when the hon. members rise to their feet. I am documenting this from the hon. Minister's own material. That is the approach we have followed throughout these estimates so it would not be possible to stray, and I am sure the hon. Minister will be able to give an explanation for it.

The other aspect of homemakers legislation which is seriously distressing, is that within the legislation it suggests that for those families capable of part payment, services will be provided. As the hon. Minister well knows, that simply is not the case. I suggest to him strongly that he participates in a misleading deception when he puts that in the literature of the homemakers branch. In fact, experience after experience with individual homemakers associations shows that unless people are capable of paying the entire amount themselves, or unless they are totally indigent, the municipality will have nothing to do with payment. If they fall in the intermediate category, the municipality simply will not contribute anything. That is generally true for the city of Toronto and I think it is also worth pointing out what the report says about Ottawa, which has one of the most active voluntary homemakers associations.

The analysis of these case histories shows that service is given primarily to the indigent and to families with adequate incomes. The majority of the families in the community fall between these two extremes and are not receiving service because the agency has no way of financing services to the group and the municipalities simply will not participate.

In fact, for the Toronto Homemakers Association, 80 per cent of the money comes from The United Appeal, five per cent comes from individual contributions and only 15 per cent comes via the provincial legislation which was supposed to break such ground in this new and important field. So again, the policy of the department stands at least partially indicted, and I hope when the new regulations are tabled that they will give some promise of change.

The analysis of the per diem and the number of hours need not be gone into in any great detail except to say that to suggest that an \$8 cost per diem is the average cost, is, as the hon. Minister knows, totally absurd. The average cost in Toronto is \$12.06 a day.

In Hamilton it is \$10.41 a day. In Ottawa it is \$11.40 a day and even in the Red Cross units it is \$9.52 a day. To pass legislation basing per diem payments on totally unrealistic figures—and we are going to get into this again in The Charitable Institutions Act and the homes for the aged branch coming up—is too much to ask from the Opposition for anything but a lack of confidence to develop. Only the Red Cross branches are perhaps capable of functioning properly on this basis.

I simply appeal to the hon. Minister that when these regulations are changed, they are changed with the report in mind. The Ontario Welfare Council subcommittee—and I emphasized again, comprising the hon. Minister's own people—made certain recommendations. One of them underlines that emphasis be placed on more effective interpretation of the legislation to municipalities. The other recommendations are as follows: a nine-and-a-half-hour work day instead of the present eight-hour-day; a 24-hour continuous service where needed; a more realistic per diem payment in relation to costs in a variety of communities; and that all information in the report lead to a province-wide study undertaken by a committee, representative of all such services, to present the hon. Minister with some kind of definitive report.

I think that I would now appreciate some comments from the hon. Minister on the area of homemakers services. I take for granted that his department, having passed the legislation, considers it of consequence. I also take for granted on the basis of his own studies, that the morale, the objectives, and the purpose of the legislation are being seriously undermined by the total refusal to face the realities involved, and that this cannot be when the nature of the problem is as extensive as it is.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the only comment that I would like to make at this time is that I appreciate the comments of the hon. member for Scarborough West. I would say this, that the report as he stated came in in February of this year. It is a very good report—I agree with the hon. member, it is a very good report.

I would just like to point out to him that this is rather a new programme. I am far from saying that it is a perfect programme, as yet. It is a very new programme, it has been in operation only for some four years, and surely there have been some advances made on this. This study which has been brought about has now introduced the whole department to that particular area and action is under study.

I can assure the hon. member, as I stated a moment ago to someone else, that we are studying this matter and we are going to take the report into deep consideration. I can assure him that we have found some very good thoughts in it and some very good material which we hope to be able to carry out in view of some of the conclusions that are set out in that report. Further than that, in respect to educating the municipalities to adopt the programme, well I do not know what might be suggested except that I do not know of any municipality that does not know about it. If they do not know about it, it is because they do not choose to know about it for some reasons of their own. But I am quite sure that this department cannot be blamed for the municipalities not going into the programme in respect of them not knowing about it, because I think they do know about it.

So, Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can tell the hon. member at this moment in the House is that we are taking under serious consideration the report that he mentioned and we hope to be able to come up with some improvements, either in the regulations or in the general design of the Act.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I follow it up simply by asking this, Mr. Minister: Has Miss Doris Moore any other particular area of activity apart from homemaker services?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, it is primarily the homemaker services, and nurses, that is what she deals with.

Mr. S. Lewis: Primarily. Is she then involved in some other project?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Homemakers and nurses services; that is what she does, nothing else.

Mr. S. Lewis: Nothing else. Then may I ask how many other full-time people there are at the centre of this programme, apart from clerical staff?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: One other full-time person.

Mr. S. Lewis: One other full-time person!

Now, Mr. Minister, this is a modern age. I think it is generally accepted by those in the public relations field that if you circulate one piece of literature advertising a programme you do not get a very overwhelming response. I suggest to the hon. Minister that when he says to me: "I don't know why the municipalities shouldn't know of it", part of the answer lies in two people doing the major job of disseminating the information to 900

municipalities, plus whatever the welfare officers in the field are able to do—they have a desperate job coping with the mere administration of the governmental programmes at their level, let alone pursuing these other programmes.

The hon. Minister admits that there are only two people involved in the centre; there should be ten or a dozen people for a programme of this kind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is never any problem in this House—I want to say to this House, to my good friends here on the left and to the hon. members opposite—it is always in good taste in a provincial Legislature to talk about financing certain projects and construction relating to public works or highways or any similar industrial or semi-industrial or municipal field. There is always much applause and much appreciation and much camaraderie amongst all the government members, and much jumping to feet and suggesting that we should be going further. But once a member on this side of the House has the temerity to suggest a modest extension in social services to human beings, then the hounds begin to bay.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is a sad and illustrative comment on the kind of mentality with which one is dealing.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He might have said donkeys.

An hon. member: The hon. member for Sudbury has been braying enough today.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am going to pay the hon. Minister the compliment of suggesting—and I feel confident of this—that this is certainly not characteristic of his department—may not be characteristic of him. We can only assume on this side of the House that it is characteristic of those who sit in the Treasury benches; and from the eloquent interventions heard here by way of heckling during the course of today's debates, it is obviously characteristic of the government as a whole, and that is a sad commentary.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister: In general welfare assistance what is the percentage of repayments you get in the share cost programme from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Fifty per cent, less medical services.

Mr. Troy: Fifty per cent less medical services! In regard to our Indian bands, does the federal government assume the full welfare assistance or is it just the same as other areas?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: In some areas we do and in some areas they share proportionately as we do with the rest of the province.

Mr. Troy: The treaty Indians, I suppose, get the full assistance. Thank you.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the hon. Minister: What is the maximum allowance for each home visit by a nurse?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I will get that figure for the hon. member.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like the figure, because one year ago I brought up in the House a resolution passed by the city of Windsor concerning the fact that the amount paid was much too low. At that time the hon. Minister replied an upward revision was under consideration. I understand there has been no revision at all, yet it was on April 16, 1962, that the hon. Minister was made aware of a resolution passed by the city of Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The hon. member will appreciate that most of the discussions were held in regard to the Victorian Order of Nurses, I suppose that is what the hon. member had in mind at the time. This matter is still being discussed with them. As the hon. member knows, there is an amount of \$80,000 in the grant. We are discussing it with them now to see if that grant could not be incorporated in a per diem rate, which I think would be the best thing to do. Personally, I do favour that, and I think that maybe they are thinking along that line. However, up to a certain point the Victorian Order of Nurses is also a national body, and this is where the discussion has not been completed as far as they are concerned. But I understand that there is a figure of \$2.50 per visit, that is \$5 total.

Mr. Newman: It has gone up to \$5. It was only \$2.50 a year ago, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is our share.

Mr. Newman: When the hon. Minister says \$5, he means it is his share, the \$5? Or is this the total amount including the municipality's share?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The total amount is \$2.50.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have one short question left about which I am very

curious. If we could revert back to general welfare assistance for a moment; can the hon. Minister tell me how many people in the province of Ontario are receiving incapacitation allowances?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am afraid I do not have that figure here, but I will get it for the hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister has no rough idea?

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): What are you referring to as incapacitation allowance?

Mr. S. Lewis: That is what I am trying to find out.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: You mean you have in mind the borderline cases who do not comply with the regulations?

Mr. S. Lewis: I have the regulations in front of me and I could not believe this regulation when I read it. That is why I am asking the question. I wonder if, as in some of the child welfare areas the municipal co-ordination apparatus just might not be obsolete or inoperative. What is this incapacitation allowance; or at least—is it used at all in the province?

I see here, Mr. Chairman, that to be entitled to it one has to be an unemployable person, not merely unemployed, but unemployable; that one cannot be eligible for allowance under The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act; that one cannot be a patient or resident in any public or private hospital, any sanatoria, or institutions under The Homes for the Aged Act, charitable institutions, and so on; that one must not be provided with rehabilitation services; that one cannot live with a parent or a person *in loco parentis* who is financially able to provide for one's maintenance; that one's liquid assets are not more than \$250, and that one cannot have an income, including the allowance, of more than \$70 a month. This means that somewhere, some people in this province are living on \$840 a year who are almost totally disabled and unemployable.

Now, if the province sanctions such an allowance how many people are thus covered and who are they?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The note I have here, Mr. Chairman, says that we capitulate it separately. For that reason we cannot give an exact figure. I am quite sure and as I said this afternoon we are satisfied, that the federal government is moving along that line—that if we can put through a programme as

a whole, instead of the different programmes we have. These categorical grants, as we know them, which exist, will all go into one; and this will disappear completely.

Mr. S. Lewis: I see. Can the hon. Minister describe to the House, because I do not have total faith as yet in the federal government, what kind of a person would be eligible for this, who would not fall under The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The other Act, if the hon. member will recall this, asks that the person should be totally and permanently disabled. Those you have in mind, I would imagine, would be those who do not enter into that category—which we all call here, rightly or not, borderline cases.

Mr. S. Lewis: So they would be, in effect, temporarily disabled; but totally temporarily disabled—according to the definition in the regulations—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, but not permanently.

Mr. S. Lewis: But not permanently; and, during the period of temporary total disability, this government pays them \$70 a month maximum. The regulation says \$48 a month, but they can have an income bringing it up to \$70. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, I guess that is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, again the hon. Minister will forgive consternation. I did not think he had it in him—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There are very few along that line, I can assure the hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, suppose there were half a dozen, Mr. Chairman. If one of them came to an individual in his individual riding a great deal would be felt by the member involved. It is not sufficient to say that there are very few of them: there are very few thalidomide children in the province of Ontario, but the reaction is absolute. There may be very few temporarily total disabilities, but the reaction should be absolute; and an absolute reaction to that kind of need does not embrace \$48 to \$70 a month.

That is preposterous, and I hope this particular regulation does disappear. I would be curious to know why one has not heard anything about it.

I am further inclined, as I slip over pages, under the same general welfare assistance, to ask a question about the emergency dental services.

Am I right, Mr. Chairman, that to qualify for emergency dental services the patient who is on welfare can only have an extraction and no other form of dental service?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the man's teeth were rotting. Supposing his teeth were in a state of serious decay; suppose he needed cavities filled and was in serious pain. He could not have anything done under general welfare assistance, short of emergency extraction?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: My hon. friend could go to any length to bring cases like that, but I have to tell him that it is only in the matter of extractions that it is done.

Mr. S. Lewis: All I am trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, is that these regulations are obsolete. These regulations have no relevance to human needs in the 1960s; they have no relevance to human needs at any time. They are categorical regulations. They force people into arbitrary categories; they force a man to have teeth extracted when he has a toothache. He has no alternative under this particular regulation.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The municipality can do it, if they wish to.

Mr. S. Lewis: The municipality, but is it not —

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The municipality can do it, if they wish to.

Mr. S. Lewis: The municipality; but is it not usual for the municipality to undertake things for which they can be reimbursed 80 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, not always—not always. I am sure that the city of Toronto does a lot of those—a lot of those—additional services.

Mr. S. Lewis: A lot of those?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, in an article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* not very long ago the head of the public dental clinic, I believe it was at Toronto General Hospital, indicated that the most serious sort of public problem faced was that he had countless numbers of people in need of tooth "renovation", and all he could deal with were extractions.

I do not want to belabour the picayune points; I get as frustrated with them as other hon. members of this House. But I think the

essential principle remains the same, Mr. Chairman: that if, federally and provincially, we are going to work out a new cost-sharing basis, or if certain major services are to be turned back into the hands of the province, then general welfare regulations such as this should be consigned to the scrap heap. An entirely new apparatus should be established, which bases grants and allowances on need and not on categories.

Mr. Troy: I certainly agree with that, Mr. Chairman. I had a situation where this chap applied for a disabled person's allowance. He was unable to work at all; the letter sent to him said that if his situation deteriorated to any extent then he should apply again. It deteriorated so quickly that about a week after receiving that letter, he was in the ground—six feet under.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I intended to bring this problem up under vote 1809, but apparently it fits into this vote 1806 a little better; that is dental work.

One year ago I asked the hon. Minister for a grant to the Civitan Dental Clinic in my community. They had been doing work among the youngsters on welfare and, just as the hon. member for Scarborough West mentioned, only extractions were allowed. Dental work was not permitted at all under the Act.

I would like to bring to the hon. Minister's attention that extractions are only a very small portion of the amount of work done to the individual.

In 1960, the Civitan Dental Clinic spent a total of \$6,900—only \$1,100 of which was for extraction. In 1961, of \$6,300 they spent in operating their clinic, \$1,300 was for extractions. In 1962—and they only operated for four months because The Department of the Attorney General forbade the raffling of automobiles in my community and yet permitted it in other communities; as a result, the Civitan Dental Clinic could not get sufficient funds to operate and had to curtail their programme very markedly. In that year 1962 they operated for only four months and their extractions amounted to \$490, whereas their total bill for dental services was \$3,600. In 1964, for a two-month period, extractions were only \$52, whereas the total amount of dental services provided was \$500.

I think that the department should undertake to use the Civitan Dental Clinic as a pilot project to see the feasibility of instituting such similar projects throughout the province of Ontario. This group—the Civitans—provided a very much needed service to

youngsters on welfare, and the department should go all out in some attempt to use this as a pilot project to see and to judge as to the merits of the programme.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1806 carried?

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I have one question to ask. Did I understand the hon. Minister to say this afternoon that deserted wives, after six months, now become eligible for mothers' allowance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Right now it is six months, yes.

Mr. Whicher: Since when did that come into force? I understood it had to be two or three years?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The last time that was introduced, I understand was around maybe 1957 or 1958; I am not too sure. That was dropped to six months.

Vote 1806 agreed to.

On vote 1807:

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister whether it is the intention of his department to revise upwards the per diem payments under The Charitable Institutions Act in the province.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is, Mr. Chairman, at the present time, being reviewed. I have nothing in the estimates for this year; but we are studying that factor. We are discussing this matter, and discussing it is the plan for this year.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well this Act came into effect, Mr. Chairman, in 1958, if I am correct. I believe there are some 60 institutions involved. I would be interested to know if the deputy Minister might tell us how many people are in those 60 institutions.

There are some 60 institutions in the schedule under The Charitable Institutions Act for which the province pays 75 per cent of the deficit up to \$3.40 a day over and above what the individuals themselves are able to provide. That rate was set in 1958. Costs go up. It is now 1964. Last September, there was a meeting of all Ontario Homes for the Aged representatives, who made recommendations, regarding infirmary patients, special care units and all other patients, of a major increase in payment—75 per cent of a \$5 minimum, or in their submission even 100 per cent in total. Can the hon. Minister inform this House what he thinks of those

recommendations and whether he intends to act on the recommendations from the various homes falling under his department's Act?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am told that there is approximately 8,000 population in the institutions. I do not know if I can say any more about this. Mr. Chairman, except to say that we have been in communication with them. They have been in communication with us. We are discussing this presently. I am quite satisfied that we are looking not for the level to stand still or go down, we are looking for the level to go up and I am quite sure that there will be some change. I cannot tell you exactly what. These matters are still under discussion with them, but there is a revision and the revision is up. That is about all I can say.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well I am glad to get it on the record. I know the people who are involved in the charitable institutions themselves will be pleased to know it, as the people in the children's institutions and in the homemakers field will be pleased to know that the hon. Minister plans a similar upward revision in the contributions.

The hon. Minister is aware of these aspects as I am.

One of the largest such institutions lies in the very heart of my riding, Providence Villa. There are several hundred people in the Villa, well over 500 who fall within this institution serviced by the hon. Minister's department. It pays 75 per cent of the deficit up to \$3.40 a day. Actual costs last year of Providence Villa were \$3.90 a day for normal care. Not only was it getting just 75 per cent, but like every other regulation, it was getting that percentage based on an unrealistic figure.

Much more than that; some of these institutions—certainly it is true of Baycrest and certainly it is true of Providence Villa—have specific infirmary units. There the cost is \$5.83 per day and, of course, this includes the necessity of having as many as eight nurses on a day shift at any given time. Yet for the infirmary areas, the department only pays 75 per cent, I believe it is, up to \$4 a day, despite the fact that the realistic cost is \$5.83 a day. Again, the department is providing only three-quarters of the cost of a totally unrealistic figure and, beg as they may, the charitable institutions cannot get any specific promise of a revision upward of the regulations.

These institutions are going seriously into debt. I think it fair to say, without revealing confidences, that one at least of those I have

mentioned, and many others of the 60, have serious operating deficits and serious capital deficits. Those deficits continue to mount because the province refuses to give them monies related to a realistic appraisal of costs. One asks no more than that. Again I submit that if the province establishes certain Acts and certain regulations, it has to fulfil those regulations or not bother establishing the Act at all.

Might I ask the hon. Minister why it is that for municipal homes for the aged, the department is willing to pay up to 100 per cent, but that in charitable institutions the department is willing to pay 75 per cent? What is the philosophic distinction there?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I missed the first part of it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I gather that for municipal homes for the aged, the department is prepared to rise to 100 per cent of cost, but that in charitable institutions it pays 75 per cent of the deficit up to an arbitrary level.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I have here, Mr. Chairman, information that for bed care to an institution which has 120 beds, 75 per cent of \$5 per day was paid—that is the institution you spoke about—and the actual per diem rate apparently is under \$4.50.

Mr. S. Lewis: With respect, Mr. Minister, that is what it looks like on the surface. That is not what it is in practice. The bed care rate should be 75 per cent up to a maximum of \$5 per day, but in fact when you tabulate the 75 per cent figure, you average in all the beds in the institution, so that in fact they receive only \$4 a day. This may be a very clever method of financial computing, but it does not solve the problems of the institution.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As I stated a moment ago to my hon. friend, that is the overall picture, and that is the way we work toward making our revision upwards. I think the 75 per cent, as he stated a moment ago, is shared; we have the report and we hope we can arrive at some conclusion in that respect. The revision is going up.

Mr. S. Lewis: Can you just answer the question I asked — there may be a valid answer to it? Why can it be 100 per cent in the case of certain municipal homes and why 75 per cent in the case of charitable institutions?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There again I am advised that in this—I would hate to mention names

in this respect—but some who are very prominent in the field have sanctioned the figure of 75 per cent. These are very prominent figures in the field—those who operate most of these institutions, as a matter of fact—and they did not think that going to 100 per cent would be the proper thing to do.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am intrigued by that. I understand that a September 1963 conference with representatives from homes for the aged right across the province of Ontario—both municipal and charitable—felt that there should be 100 per cent cost assumed by the province. Frankly, I, too, think there should be 100 per cent cost in this instance assumed by the province. If certain charitable agencies are willing to undertake this kind of service to the people of the province, then there is no reason why the province should not contribute in this fashion. It certainly is no reason why the province should make invidious distinctions between different kinds of institutions pursuing precisely the same objectives.

Perhaps in a less eloquent fashion than the hon. member for Sudbury this afternoon, I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I think the consequences of old age, and the geriatric problem generally, merit a total provincial responsibility rather than a very partial responsibility which drives the charitable institutions into serious debt.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: If the hon. member was making a comparison of public homes and charitable institutions when he mentioned 100 per cent, that is true. One hundred per cent is paid through public funds but 70 per cent of it is met by the province in public homes. The other public funds do not come from the province. They come from the counties or cities which are dealing with these municipal homes. The province does not pay the 100 per cent.

Mr. S. Lewis: The province pays no 100 per cent for any of the homes for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: We recognize the 100 per cent because I suppose it is all public monies.

Mr. S. Lewis: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, but it is not the government of Ontario, as such, reimbursing 100 per cent. The municipalities or the counties pay the 30 per cent of costs where it is needed.

Mr. S. Lewis: But, in precisely the same context, you recognize the figure of 75 per cent when dealing with charitable institutions.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: At one time there was nothing at all.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, at one time there was only the wheel. I admit that if one goes back far enough one can find roots, for anything, which are somewhat different from what exists today. That does not justify the situation.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am not quarrelling with the hon. member's point, but I want to point out that we have been progressively moving along according to our line of thinking, and in line with what is in the report. I am not stating that 100 per cent is a bad thing. The only thing is that we have discussed this matter and some people in the field themselves do not think it is the proper thing to do; though some others do. That is what we are discussing now, trying to weed out what information we can and arrive at some arrangement one way or the other.

I have no personal objection to what the hon. member says in this respect. I just want to point out that at one time the charitable institutions got no subsidies. I think, as a matter of fact, we were the first to establish these subsidies in that particular field. We established the homes for the aged, away back when the people there were committed to an institution of that description; but it is very much different today. In going along with the upward revision of these rates, I have no set principle or set idea in my mind that it should not happen; but how it will get there is one of those things we are looking at.

Mr. S. Lewis: Ah, sweet mysteries of life, how will it get there? The hon. Minister says he genuinely agrees—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: We have done pretty well.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister says that he follows his advisors, and the advisors suggest that that is the way it should go, and then we are confronted with this insoluble enigma: How will it get there? I suggest to the hon. Minister that it will get there precisely the way all the legislation in The Department of Public Welfare should get there, by the hon. Minister himself taking a militant and persuasive stand.

When the hon. Minister says he has inaugurated good legislation, no one denies that, but let us remember some of the things which have been revealed in these estimates.

The \$100-a-month contribution for children's aid societies, i.e. the \$100 a month granted per employee, was first established

in 1956; it is now 1964 and it has not yet been revised upward. These regulations were first established in 1958; it is now 1964 and they have not been revised upward. It is not as if one were talking about a gap of six months or a year; one is always talking about anywhere from five years to a decade. I think in that context the Opposition has the right to raise it, and ask that something be done, other than general suggestions that "We are revising upwards," with uplifting sweeps of the arm.

An hon. member: In the fullness of time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Precisely.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, a question of the hon. Minister. Has the hon. Minister statistics concerning the age levels of people in communities; in other words, the number of 60-year-olds, 61-year-olds, 62-year-olds, and so forth? Does the department have such statistics?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The residents of the homes or the general population?

Mr. Newman: Just the general population.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am sure I have not that here with me right at this moment.

Mr. Newman: No, but does the department keep records like that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, I think we can find that figure; we have it.

Mr. Newman: Very well, then. More than likely the department is aware that the city of Windsor has a disproportionately large population of aged. Has the department taken into consideration the fact that there are more aged in the city of Windsor than the average, and the fact that likewise there is only the one home for the aged? And, having taken all that into consideration, should not the department initiate discussions with the community with the hope of setting up another home for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member. There have been some discussions along that line, but surely Windsor should have the initiative to bring this to us? We are willing to sit down and talk with them at any time.

Mr. Newman: Has the department pointed out to the community the fact that there is the need for one?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, surely the city of Windsor should know that.

Mr. Newman: Does the department have any liaison with The Department of Economics and Development?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. Newman: They do? Well, can the hon. Minister tell me if there is need then for senior citizens' housing in Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I presume that as for housing for senior citizens in the city of Windsor—and I must say this by the way: It was one of the first cities to introduce that particular phase of housing and has done a very good job with it. If there is one city in Ontario which is cognizant of its needs, I am sure the city of Windsor is one of the best in respect to housing. I am sure that it has taken full advantage of whatever legislation there was in that particular respect and, as was said before, when the hon. Minister (Mr. Randall) brings his estimates before you, that would be a very good question as to what his programme is up there, and what he has in mind in Windsor. And I am sure it will be very interesting.

There is one city in the province of Ontario which I must congratulate along that line; it has been a pioneer in many of these programmes and has led the way. I am sure there is not one city in Ontario which has more knowledge about those things than the city of Windsor.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister: Does he give any grants to private nursing homes?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Directly, Mr. Chairman, no. But through the municipalities, yes.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the hon. Minister might prevail upon the hon. Minister of Health to recognize a private nursing home in Nipissing. The doctors say there is need for such an institution; the OHSC says no. It is there, and unfortunately people with small incomes have to pay the full amount.

I know of one gentleman who had a couple of heart attacks. He had an income of some \$210 a month; it cost him \$180 for his wife's care in that nursing home, so he had to go to work in order to pay it even though he himself had had two heart attacks.

There is a need for a nursing home in Nipissing, a private nursing home, and I ask the hon. Minister to support the medical association in that area and try to impress upon the hon. Minister of Health to approve it.

Vote 1807 agreed to.

On vote 1808:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, in regard to vote 1808, I would like to say, first of all, that I believe the department has done a remarkably good job with quite modest resources in its rehabilitation services branch. I would even venture to say that there is no area, in all of the nearly \$1.5 billion the government is asking for this year, where it gets as good value for its money as it does under this vote.

The quite modest sum of \$407,000 is being asked for, to carry on the work of the rehabilitation services branch. I am rather disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that it is not more than this. Last year the amount we were asked to vote was \$400,000, so apparently it is envisaged that the activities of this branch will be carried on on much the same scale as last year. This, I think, is unfortunate. I think this branch should be expanded. I think it has done very good work in the past.

I will say that in my own experience I have found that the rehabilitation services branch of The Department of Public Welfare gets better results in assisting people in difficult situations to find employment than any other agency I know of. I would like to see this vote increased, and increased greatly, for the purpose of increasing the services of the branch. I think that spending on this branch would save us money in the long run. The more people we can get off the welfare rolls and into gainful employment, the more money we will save for the hon. Provincial Treasurer. And what is probably even more important, the—my hesitation at the moment, Mr. Chairman, is due to my attempt to interpret the signal system of the hon. Provincial Treasurer with regard to, I take it, the hockey game, and I think I have got his signal.

I will now return to the matter under consideration. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer should be thinking more about this vote too, because this is a place where he could save himself money in welfare costs. If he and the Treasury board could persuade the hon. Minister to increase this vote, they could save themselves money in the long run. What is even more important, they could contribute to the economic growth of the country, because after all, a person who is on welfare is contributing nothing to the wealth of the province. A person who is in gainful employment is making a useful contribution. This branch has done important work in bringing people into gainful employment and I think their efforts should be expanded.

There is one area in particular where I would like to see an expansion of their activities. I raised this matter before, and I am going to raise it again. This relates to the problem of the epileptic. I am not suggesting that the rehabilitation services branch does not do anything for epileptics. I know of cases where it has tried to be of assistance and has been of assistance. But the problems that epileptics face in finding employment are so great that a branch such as this cannot possibly do the kind of job that is required with the resources now placed at its disposal.

I raised the problems of the epileptic under the estimates of The Department of Health and I must say that I did not get very far at the time, so I am trying again now. I think perhaps that this is a more appropriate place to raise them.

At any rate surely there is some place where we can raise the problems of epileptics. Surely there is some agency of this government that will take an interest in this problem to the extent not merely of assisting a relatively small number of individuals who come to the attention of the agency concerned, but of developing a full-scale programme to develop a change in public attitudes with regard to the epileptic; to educate employers to the point of view that an epileptic can do good work as well as anybody else; the fact that he may occasionally suffer a small seizure is no reason for alarm.

There is no reason to advise the National Employment Service—an employer advised them in a case in which I am interested just a few days ago that they do not want anybody like that sent back to them. This is stupid prejudice, based on nothing, and I think these people should have an opportunity to find gainful employment in the community.

It is impossible for them in most cases to do it on their own. Somebody has to act as an intermediary for them to prepare the way for them, to find openings for them. I believe from my own observation of the rehabilitation services branch that, given the facilities, it can do the job. I would like to see its activities expanded, not only for general purposes but more particularly for the epileptic.

I would like to read to the House a letter I received after I raised this matter under the estimates of The Department of Health.

Allow me to thank you for the stand you took in the Legislature on the question of jobs for epileptics. Being an epileptic myself, I quite understand the prejudice and ignorance that exists among most employers. Although I am one of the fortunate few who managed through the years

to get positions with understanding employers, I have also had a lot of struggle before obtaining these positions.

For instance, when I first started working, too many times I was fired because I committed the crime of having a petit mal, a small seizure.

Another thing I found was that the special placement department of the NES expected me to take jobs—I am a stenographer below the standard wage because of my condition.

I had the same experience in the NES a few years ago when I decided to go back to work instead of being a full-time housewife. My answer to them was the same as at first: "I am not selling my condition, I am selling my work."

Eventually, through the ads, I got into an office with fair pay and where there is no prejudice.

In answer to Dr. Dymond, I would like to say that although I have been working approximately 20 years, I have never had an accident. Incidentally, before working in an office I worked in a needle trade factory operating a power machine and no accidents occurred.

However, not everyone has the luck I had. There are far too many epileptics who are forced to go on welfare because they are denied the right to work. When that right is taken away, it becomes not only an economic problem, but also a problem of health, as the seizures have a tendency to increase when the morale of the patient is down.

I would also like to point out the terrific costs there are for an epileptic to be controlled as much as possible. I spend approximately \$20 a month in the drug store, although I go to a discount store, and that's not counting the money needed for the doctor. No one can tell me that our medical laws are the best.

Can the Legislature not do anything in the way of educating the employers on the abilities of people with handicaps of one kind or another?

I would very much appreciate hearing from you if anything develops in that end.

Unfortunately, I am not in a position to advise the author of this letter that anything has developed, but I am hopeful that either I or the hon. Minister or someone will be able to advise her in the near future that we are going to undertake a programme to assist epileptics to play their rightful part in the community. I would like to read an item that

appeared in the *Toronto Star* on March 6, 1964, not long after I raised this matter in the Legislature:

About one person in every 200 suffers from some form of epilepsy, the Rotary Club of Toronto was told today.

Dr. John S. Prichard added that anyone can get it at any time—and run into unreasonable prejudice.

Dr. Prichard, chairman of the medical advisory committee of the Ontario Epilepsy Association, said the disease is a symptom, just like a cough.

It indicates that something is happening in the brain, just as a cough indicates something is happening in the respiratory system, he told a noon luncheon. Both symptoms could be caused by any number of things, he added.

However, the doctor said, unlike victims of other diseases, epilepsy sufferers often face discrimination and prejudice.

He quoted Ken Bryden, New Democratic Party member for Woodbine, who recently told the Legislature about an intelligent young man who couldn't get a job when employers learned he suffered from epilepsy.

"I have to say that is very accurate," said the doctor, adding that as a staff doctor at the Hospital for Sick Children he knew the same kind of discrimination existed for children.

Even children are discriminated against if they are unfortunate enough to suffer from this malady.

"Parents tell me of prejudice at school and at play," he said. "Other youngsters aren't allowed to play with epilepsy victims. It's a deplorable state of affairs, and most unreasonable."

Dr. Prichard asked Rotary members to convince their fellow citizens that epilepsy is nothing but a normal sort of disease, and a common one. Victims can do their jobs as well as any other individual, and should be hired, just as palsy victims.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I could add anything to what has already been said in this letter and in this report of a speech by Dr. Prichard of the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto.

Surely the time has come when the unreasonable prejudice against epileptics can be beaten down. Surely we can carry on an educational programme that will induce employers to give these people the same sort of chance they give to any other people. I think

that this branch in The Department of Public Welfare can do this job. I know the kind of work it has done in other fields. I would like to see it given the money to undertake a real programme to assist epileptics in finding employment. I am certain that what is needed is the kind of personal service that this branch gives in educating employers, in preparing them to accept people with this handicap. I am certain from the epileptics I know, that if they are given the chance, they will be able to do the job. All that is required is for someone to prepare the way so they can be given the chance.

I would like to leave that thought with the hon. Minister. I congratulate him and the department on the work that the rehabilitation services branch has already done. I suggest that its activities should be greatly expanded and that an immediate need is in this field of helping epileptics find employment.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to thank very kindly the hon. member for Woodbine. I would like to relay these thanks to the chairman of this committee on rehabilitation, which is the hon. member for Forest Hill, who has done a great job in this respect. I am sure that the words of the hon. member for Woodbine have pleased him very much in this respect.

I also very much appreciate the problem—and I have seen it personally. There are not too many in the area where I live now, but I well understand when he speaks about the epileptics. It is really a tragedy to watch sometimes. They are very able persons but for some reason or another their employment does not stay with them because of the consequences of that particular disease. I quite appreciate the words of my hon. friend, and I understand. Possibly the hon. member for Forest Hill might state that some of these cases have been rehabilitated.

As you know, in this shared programme, beyond the amount that is mentioned here, there is also another some \$200,000 from the federal government that comes into this picture. I understand we expect to extend our services with ten new social workers who will come into the field this year in this particular area. We hope to carry on with the work further and I can assure my friend that he has made an impression in many places; might it be with those who share this problem with us, and who understand with us the particular plea that he made. I welcome it and possibly the hon. member for Forest Hill might have a few words to say about this, because this is of very deep interest to him.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, does the department have many cases from the Workmen's Compensation Board that it has to rehabilitate, because quite often an individual is injured on the job—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, it has its own programme which is pretty complete.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the hon. Minister, because I know of two instances within the past week at home, where an individual was injured in a plant and received workmen's compensation. They have a partial disability. Workmen's compensation claims that they are capable of returning to work. The individual gets from his own doctor a certificate stating that he is not able to work. Now the man cannot carry on the same type of work he had been doing before, and as a result has to be rehabilitated. He may have been doing quite heavy lifting type of work in a factory. No longer can he do that work, yet workmen's compensation refuses to retrain him or find him employment in a lighter field of endeavour.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Is my friend suggesting that there is a dispute between the doctors of compensation and his own doctor in this respect?

Mr. Newman: Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There is none?

Mr. Newman: There is a dispute between the two doctors, yes.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Naturally, I could quite appreciate the situation. If there is no more compensation for this man then we would be very pleased to have his name taken for our own programme.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may explain to the hon. Minister. The individual has been working, let us say, in an automobile factory, working on a production line. He received an injury. He was treated by workmen's compensation but no longer could return to that same type of job because the injury was such that required much lighter work. The manufacturer does not have that type of work. So what happens to the individual? He is unemployed. He needs rehabilitation, so that he can qualify for some type of lighter work. Workmen's compensation does not rehabilitate the man for a lighter type of work at all. It claims that its duties as far as the man is concerned, were finished once they treated him and gave him a partial disability pension.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that as long as the person in question is under workmen's compensation—which I understand has a complete programme of rehabilitation—or is receiving benefits from compensation, he is not eligible for our programme. The moment he is out of it, we would like to have his name and we will consider him, I am sure. Naturally, if there is a question of dispute between his own doctor and the doctor of the compensation, this is a matter to be settled amongst themselves. It has to be that way. I cannot come into the dispute, I am sure.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, my simplest answer to this is that I will turn the name over to Mr. Band there and he can have a field representative look into it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Be glad to.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Could I ask the hon. Minister, sir, about this rehabilitation services branch? I wonder if he would be good enough to clarify for me, please, if this rehabilitation is for people who suffer from a physical handicap, rather than people who unfortunately have mental inability or are mentally retarded.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: We have both. We have physical and mental handicaps to deal with.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask, sir, has there been any study done in connection with the numbers—I presume you have a definition of what you mean by handicapped and I am just wondering what number this involves in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that we have on the payroll, on an average, 400 a month.

Mr. Thompson: The department services 400 a month?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: I assume the hon. Minister has a definition of what a handicapped person is and I just wondered if he knew the proportion of our population that fits into this category.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I understand that there is an assessment board which deals with questions as to whether there is a handicap, and decides upon that. As far as a definition is concerned, I would think a handicapped person, as I read the Act, means a person with a physical or mental impairment which

substantially prevents him from engaging in remunerative employment. I am giving the definition as it is stated in the Act. Each case goes before an assessment board which looks at these people.

Mr. Thompson: What I am really trying to find out, sir, is that 400 people seems to me to be quite a large number of people, but I am wondering whether this is just scratching the surface of a serious social problem that we have. Has the hon. Minister any idea whether the department is really helping the majority of people who fit under this definition or just helping a small portion of them?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, all the referrals who come to our attention from hospitals or private agencies and so on, are taken in—this is my information. I understand here there is a total case load of some 2,000. As I said, at present 400 to 500 are in training.

Mr. Thompson: Could I follow up on this—and the hon. Minister could probably correct me on this. I understand there are certain countries—and I do not know whether the hon. Minister would agree with this approach that they take or not, and again I say I stand to be corrected on it—but as I understand it, for example, in West Germany, first they know the number of people who do fit under a definition of being handicapped and then, knowing the number, they encourage industries to employ these people by perhaps employing two or three people; then there are certain tax deductions. Frankly, as I say, I have read this; but I do not know whether this really does take place.

I wondered if the hon. Minister had thought of some kind of approach like this. What I am getting at is whether the situation is so severe here that it would warrant further approach, or whether the hon. Minister is satisfied with the rehabilitation services he has.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that we have not gone that far as yet, because about 80 per cent of placements are rehabilitated now in actual fact; so that we have been able to place them pretty consistently. The figure of 80 per cent certainly is a pretty good figure. We look around for placements.

Vote 1808 agreed to.

On vote 1809:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1809, I would like to get some information from the

hon. Minister, if possible, with regard to the future of the various shared programmes, as they are called, the ones in which the federal government accepts a share.

I have been somewhat alarmed to note the glib way in which the current federal government at Ottawa seems ready to abandon the shared programmes in which the federal government is now involved. It has been freely offering, starting I believe with the Budget speech of Mr. Walter Gordon and continuing with various statements by the Prime Minister of Canada, to turn over shared programmes to the provinces and to make some sort of adjustment as far as the sharing of tax fields is concerned.

I am one of those people who like to think of themselves as Canadians. I was born in Ontario and have lived most of my life in Ontario and am proud of Ontario. But as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, anything which benefits Canada will benefit Ontario and Ontario's interests can only be considered in relation to the interests of our whole country. I am alarmed at the tendency towards balkanization which is almost promoted by the Liberal Party at Ottawa, and in which this government seems to be acquiescing—in fact, in which it is, one would think, almost eagerly participating.

It is an old story for Ontario and Quebec, the two most powerful provinces, to gang up on the federal government to look for special privileges for themselves. But I think we should be thinking in terms of our responsibilities as Canadians—not to sacrifice any legitimate interests of the people of Ontario, because I do not think that is involved—but to think of the whole country.

An abandonment of the shared programmes will have most serious consequences for this country—not so much for Ontario. I am sure, with our sources of tax revenues, we can look after those programmes perhaps as well as they are being looked after now. But I am thinking of other provinces, of the Maritime provinces. After all, let us remember that the Maritime provinces have suffered severely because of federal policies which benefited Ontario and Quebec; tariff policies, transportation policies, and so on. And now are we going to abandon them and tell them, with their limited and inadequate resources, that they have to carry on some of these programmes which are now shared?

I think that Ontario should object to any suggestion that the federal government will pull out of the shared programmes. In fact I think it should be increasing its contributions, and increasing its responsibilities in this

field. I do not know what the position of the Ontario government is on this matter. As a matter of fact, I would say, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this Legislature, that I regret that we do not seem to know what the position of the Ontario government is on almost anything relating to federal-provincial relations.

I think this House is entitled to a statement, at an early date, as to where the government stands on many of these vital questions which are being negotiated at federal-provincial conferences. I do not think we should have to be satisfied, and I do not think the people of Ontario should have to be satisfied, with the close-to-the-vest statements in which apparently the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) finds such satisfaction.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister right now, what the stand of this government is with regard to the future of the shared programmes. Is this government prepared to take a stand in favour of their continuance, or is it willing to work out some sort of deal to get a bit more tax revenue and let the federal government get out from under its responsibilities in this field? I would like to hear a statement of government policy on this matter. I think one is long overdue, and I think we should get one right now.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I will speak to this, Mr. Chairman. The old question of shared programmes and how they were to be dealt with perhaps does not come under the estimates of this department, but I would be happy to make a brief statement on the whole field; because, as the hon. members of this House know, shared programmes extend through all activities of government. There are some 70-odd—

Mr. Bryden: At this time I am asking specifically about those relating to welfare.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, those specifically. To answer that question I cannot, in a nutshell, tell the hon. member the position we have taken in regard to shared programmes. We recognize the great benefit they have been and, I think I have said this in various statements on various occasions, shared programmes have done a great deal for this country. I agree with the hon. member for Woodbine that over the years they have done things we all know about: (a) they have established common standards from coast to coast, at least some attempted common standards from coast to coast; and (b) from a financial point of view, they have given aid to many areas of Canada which might not be able to institute some of these

programmes themselves. They offered encouragement to many areas of Canada to institute various programmes; we recognize all these things and we have been participants in many programmes, and we accept the shared programme concept as such.

There is no policy on the part of this government, and I attempted to make this very clear, by which we would, as a matter of policy, opt out of shared programmes as such—whether they are in welfare or in health, whether they are in highway building, or in the field of agriculture.

That is your answer for the programmes in the estimates of this specific department. It is not our intent. The programmes themselves are so complex; there are so many of them; and the method of sharing and the results of sharing vary tremendously from programme to programme; and this is one matter which came up at the last federal-provincial conference.

For instance, the federal government has obviously adopted a policy by which they are going to recognize the right of any province to contract out; or, in many cases, it is a case of not contracting in rather than contracting out, because any of these programmes are really the prerogative, and the constitutional prerogative, of the provinces. And when a province does not contract out, it contracts in when it enters into an arrangement with the federal government.

The province of Quebec obviously has adopted, as an overall policy, that it chooses to run its own show, so to speak, and wants to contract out, and wants the fiscal equivalent—was the term developed at this last conference—the fiscal equivalent of its position, where it can begin the programme. Namely, if the federal government would spend X numbers of dollars in any given province in a shared programme; Quebec's point is, we want that amount of money that would come into Quebec from the federal government but we do not want it as part of a shared programme, we want the money in order to run a similar programme ourselves.

Well, now you can see the immediate difficulty you are in as far as establishing common standards is concerned, as far as the maintenance of standards and as far as increasing standards through shared programmes are concerned.

But I think we must take it for granted in all the pronouncements that have been made that the federal government has adopted this policy, that it is not going to attempt to keep the provinces within shared programmes. To answer your questions as far as this depart-

ment is concerned, and indeed in the broader picture of all shared programmes, this government does not adopt the policy that we wish to contract out. We are well aware of our Canadian responsibilities and I think that in many of these things we all feel alike in this House, regardless of where we may sit.

We are Canadians first and foremost. This does not mean necessarily that we would be in every shared programme. There may be some programmes in which it would be beneficial and proper for us not to be in and in not being in we will not be doing anyone else any harm. In other words, there is an element of choice in this situation. I think that we would err as much on the other side if we were to adopt a policy that whatever programme was offered by the federal government we must automatically join in it. I think there is an element of choice here as to whether we are in or out.

The real point is that the shared programme and the concept of it, in the opinion of this government, has been a very valuable thing for our country as a whole and we do not adopt the position that we propose to contract out when the opportunity offers. There is a middle ground even here, because some of the shared programmes have not been as effective as they might be because of the rigidities in them.

For instance, some of the maritime provinces simply say we are unable to take advantage of this shared programme because we have not enough money to put up our share, therefore we have in this programme a credit we can use, of \$6 million or \$7 million, which we cannot get at because we cannot put up the money to start the programme and perhaps that programme does not suit our local needs.

They say why can we not move that \$6 million which we cannot use there, over into this programme. Then we would be able to use it in a way that is more suitable to the local needs and to the needs of our province.

Now this is the difficulty with shared programmes in which you attempt to establish a set of relatively rigid rules that would apply through ten provinces because, let us face it, the facts and the circumstances are not the same in all the ten provinces of Canada. So it has been suggested, and it was suggested vehemently and I think supported by all the provinces, that in these shared programmes there might be some readjustment of the basis upon which you operate so that if one in the field of health—the hon. Minister of Health is very aware of this, Mr. Chairman—in the field of health there are various programmes

where we might want to put the stress in Ontario on one branch of health whereas another province might want to put it on another branch of health. This is a further refinement of the position that New Brunswick put as far as money for hospitals was concerned, when they really needed money for schools.

If we can, through this discussion of shared programmes, get to a position where we loosen up the rigidities of the requirements of the federal government before they would share, then of course the shared programme can become a much more flexible and much more effective instrument in many provinces than it is today.

Very briefly, those are some of the elements which were discussed in the adjustment of shared cost programmes.

Now the majority of the shared cost programmes are in areas where there is shared jurisdiction between the federal and the provincial governments or where it may be, under The British North America Act, provincial jurisdiction alone. I must say that when the province of Quebec says that they wish to run their own show but want the equivalent amount of money, they really are not asking for any favours. I think that this should be understood. In many instances, they are merely asking to exercise rights that are fundamentally theirs under The British North America Act. But we have no policy whereby we, as a government, are interested in contracting out of all shared programmes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two specific references on vote 1809. Let me preface my remarks—I hope I am not out of order—by saying to the hon. Prime Minister that on at least a personal basis—and I think I speak for others in this House—we welcome the gist of those remarks.

I think that it is indispensable at this point in the federal government's efforts to dismantle Confederation, that it be somehow prevented. We will watch with interest the evolution of this cost-sharing formula. It is good to know that somewhere a wholesale federal turning over of funds which undermines the standards and the basis of development of Canada for decades, will not be embraced *carte blanche*.

Mr. Chairman, in this particular vote there is the mothers' allowance section and I want once again to come back to the categories under the regulations and ask the hon. Minister to explain what is involved in some of them. As he knows, mothers who receive the mothers' allowance cannot have liquid

assets of more than \$1,000. Has that been upgraded recently?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It is \$1,000 for mother and child plus \$200 for each additional child.

Mr. S. Lewis: One thousand dollars for mother and child, and \$200 for every additional child.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister what one does in the case of a mother who has, let us say, \$1,300 and two children. What does the field worker say to that mother to bring her within the regulations? Obviously, she cannot qualify because of being \$100 above in liquid assets and this, I think, illustrates the folly of categorization generally. How is such a mother brought down within the category? What is said to her? What would the hon. Minister say to such a woman? How should she dispose of her \$100?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, there again there must be a place where a direction must be used. I am sure that my hon. friend is really bringing up a borderline case. I do not know of any mother, or any person of that particular category, who will not get what is offered by the regulations as such. Naturally, my hon. friend gives me a case which is really one that is borderline and very difficult to make up one's mind about.

I am sure, sir, that the mother, with all her resources and all her instincts about doing things, will, without being dishonest, arrive at the figure that is required. I am sure she would find a way of dealing with that situation to become eligible very quickly.

Mr. S. Lewis: In other words, what I am getting at, and apparently the hon. Minister concurs, is that somehow one has to get rid of one's savings, illicitly or otherwise, to fit within the category. The fact that the savings may be desperately needed by the mother is totally irrelevant to fitting within the particular strictures devised by the department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am sure that in a week or a month that amount could be spent very easily.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, perhaps you could. I am not sure that that would be a sufficient answer to a mother to whom \$100 might mean a great deal—if you said to her, in rather cavalier fashion, "Well, Mrs. Brown, you can spend the \$100 in a week or a month rather easily." I suspect that that might not sit well where there are fatherless children involved.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: My friend seems to have a great way of rephrasing statements of that description, but he knows very well that these cases are dealt with very kindly. We are not trying to make a person, for the sake of getting on some particular programme, despoil herself of any earnings of any description. I think the hon. member knows very well what I mean.

If there are assets there I cannot come along and say, "Because you have \$1,300 I have to include you and ignore the regulations." The regulations are set as such, and they have to be considered as such. We have to have a line of demarcation somewhere. I am sure that there would be some things in the house she might need—things that she might have to repair, something like that—so that funds could be used for that purpose and make her eligible.

Surely we are not going to discuss matters which are so close to the vest as that. And I consider that putting words in my mouth is unfair. I would not try to tell this woman to be dishonest with me or dishonest with the field worker, or to do things like that. I am quite sure that there are some cases which come close to the line but I do not know of any who have suffered from it to such an extent that they might be left destitute for that particular reason.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am not quite so sure that is true, Mr. Chairman. As a private member in this House, I have been very hard pressed in several instances as to what to advise such people when they say, "I am a few hundred dollars over in liquid or fixed assets, and I must have mothers' allowance to survive. How do I fall within the category?"

As the hon. Minister knows, such a mother is not allowed to take in boarders. Or, if one does taken in boarders to maintain a house, which, let us assume, has been left by a woman's husband, a large percentage of the income is subtracted from her mothers' allowance. So she finds herself in the anomalous position of having to reject the boarders, receive the mothers' allowance, not be able to keep up the payments on the house, lose the house, and then become a charge on the municipality. This is not a particularly unusual case.

There are many such specific instances which have passed through our party offices; and one or two of them are fairly carefully enunciated in this story in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of Thursday, February 27, on fatherless children.

The point, I think, is not so much that there are such individual cases. The point is that the establishing of arbitrary categories necessitates such cases; because when you set arbitrary limits of that kind, which are totally false and irrelevant, they inevitably bear no relation at any given point in time to needs. They are fixed peremptorily. When that is done individual cases are bound to be done an injustice. I would therefore again urge upon the department that when regulations are revised—be it in this kind of legislation or any other—contributions and allowances should be based totally on an evaluation of need made by the social worker on the spot.

I think that some basic approach could be established whereby a department would have a group of skilled people sufficient to make an assessment of family needs, and not force mothers with fatherless children into special categories so that they cannot have more than a certain amount of liquid assets or cannot earn any more than a certain amount of money, and if they do, 75 per cent of the income is subtracted from their allowance; or they cannot work more than 24 hours a week; or they cannot take in boarders, or if they do, 40 per cent is subtracted from their allowance.

It is psychologically and administratively wrong to approach welfare on that basis. Inevitably it costs the government a great deal more money and results in a great deal of human distress.

Vote 1809 agreed to.

On vote 1810:

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): There is one question I should like to direct to the hon. Minister. It has to do with disabled persons, and in this it covers the question of mental retardation and so on. In connection with that matter, I would like to read this communication to the hon. members present. The letter is addressed to me. It reads:

Dear Sir:

I am writing about a matter that I am convinced is a gross injustice against an incapacitated man, incapacitated to the extent that he would find it next to an impossibility to obtain steady employment or to plan a worthwhile and happy future. This is a case that cries "Shame" upon a government, and a government department that would allow this sort of thing to happen, and I am sincerely hoping that there is something that could be done to correct this injustice.

The case concerns my brother-in-law, Mr. Stewart Hillocks, aged approximately 35, former patient in the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur and in an Edmonton institution. His records are now in the Port Arthur institution and, I believe, The Department of Public Welfare disabled persons' allowance branch, Toronto. He is mentally retarded. I believe he has been in the Ontario Hospital and various other institutions since the early age of 13. Each time he was discharged he would work in various capacities for a while and then require readmittance for further treatment.

Quite frequently he would be in a form of amnesia and even to this day his memory is quite vague and often distorted in regard to past years. The last time my wife, Stewart's sister, knew of his whereabouts, until of course the last two or three years, was when he visited her in Fort William about 1950. He had a job at that time in a bakery in Winnipeg. Shortly after his return to Winnipeg she lost all track of him until December, 1960 when she received a Christmas card from him from the Provincial Mental Institute in Edmonton, Alberta, where overall he had spent three and a half years. He had just started to regain his memory with regard to his family. He is still not clear in remembering a great deal of the time prior to his hospitalization in regard to where he has been, just a vague recollection of wandering the prairie provinces and working on various farms.

My wife and I, with the help of the authorities, effected Stewart's transfer to the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur, the city of his birth, in 1961. And in June 1962, as we were moving to the country to try our hand at farming and in co-operation with the rehabilitation services, we gave Stewart a home, effecting his discharge from the hospital.

At the time, we had an understanding with the rehabilitation officer that we would require formal assistance, not being in a position to, at the time, carry the full responsibility. The rehabilitation officer approached Mr. Doherty, of The Ontario Department of Public Welfare, Port Arthur, in regard to welfare for Stewart. However, he was advised that it might be best to apply for a disabled person's allowance.

This was applied for, refused, an appeal was made, again refused. Quite a while later, Stewart was interviewed by a doctor from Toronto. A third appeal was filed.

Today, my wife received a letter from The Department of Public Welfare,

Toronto; the copy is enclosed, that for sheer stupidity beats anything I have ever heard or read. I ask you in all fairness, I challenge even the Premier himself, how in the name of God can a diagnosed mentally retarded person, suffering in the past from total lapse of memory, be expected to remember anything, and I charge that this is only an excuse to keep from paying out anything.

The man that signed this letter received today, needs to be educated in many things, in my opinion. For anyone to leave the country is not so easy. To visit the USA, one requires adequate identification and birth certificate. To work they need a special visa from the American Consulate. To leave for a foreign country, a passport is needed.

Stewart has not even a birth certificate in his possession. The National Employment Service, Edmonton, Alberta, I believe, will have a record of Stewart's registering in 1958. Is it left to people like ourselves to try to trace and prove what this man himself cannot remember?

Early this year, application was made to the township of Paipoonge, in which we reside, for welfare on Stewart's behalf and since that time it has been a constant fight to receive anything. First we received an order for clothing, not even adequate; then one food budget for \$15. We are constantly put off with a steady chain of excuses, one being that the government will only pay a percentage of a certain amount. I am sure it must be more than \$15. Overall, in two years we have received \$67 from welfare. Every cent was a major campaign. If there is any justice or fairness in the province, then I hope you can find it for us, for I am fast losing faith in the country I served for. I would sincerely appreciate the enclosed letter back when it is no longer of any use . . . and so on.

(Signed)

R. ANDERSON

The enclosed letter, Mr. Chairman, is a letter signed for Mr. W. A. Chalmers, I take it, director, Welfare Allowances Branch. It is not signed by Mr. Chalmers; actually it is initialled as signed for him. The letter is dated February 13, 1964, to Mrs. Anderson.

The application of Mr. Stewart Hillocks for an allowance under The Disabled Persons' Allowance Act has received careful consideration and we would advise as follows:

The Act provides that an applicant must have resided in Canada for ten years

immediately preceding the date of application or if he has not so resided, has been present in Canada prior to this ten years for an aggregate period equal to twice the aggregate period of absences from Canada during those ten years. We regret that Mr. Hillocks did not provide us with proof of ten years' residence in Canada. We are therefore unable to grant an allowance on his behalf at this time.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that somebody in The Department of Public Welfare definitely slipped in this case. Surely it is obvious that a mentally retarded person would have difficulty in trying to remember where he had been, over a period of ten years any place in the world, whether it be in Canada or anyplace else.

I suggest, sir, that at this time, if this sort of thing is going on in The Department of Public Welfare, and cases are coming to the attention of the elected members of this Legislature because of this type of action on the part of senior civil servants, that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare would do well to chastise people very effectively in cases of this type. I investigated it personally, and this definitely is a deserving case and has been for a long, long period of time. I recommend it to the hon. Minister's attention.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I would just like to point out this: Can my hon. friend establish the fact that the person has been here ten years in Canada? Because you know, we have no discretion here. This is a federal rule and we have no discretion under that particular—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How could he get out?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I do not know but if it can be proved that the man has been for ten years in Canada, I will be very glad to have a close look at the case and I would appreciate it very much—

Mr. MacDonald: Suppose we put it the other way, that he was not here ten years.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am sorry to say that I have no discretion on this. The regulations are federal regulations and the onus is entirely upon the person, but if eligibility can be shown to me, I will be very glad to take up the case and then the discretion will be taken away completely. That is, I will be within the discretion of dealing with it. I completely agree with my hon. friend that this is too rigid and I hope that when we go to Ottawa on the shared programme discussion next month—that is May 11, 12 and

13—we will be able to "unrigid", or loosen, many of these regulations. This is one with which I do not agree, I can assure you.

Mr. MacDonald: With respect, Mr. Minister, this is not rigid; this is nonsensical.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I agree there, too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: This is not rigid; this is nonsensical. The person could not leave the country unless he had a birth certificate. He would have to get permission from a consul. He would have to get a work permit in the United States. Obviously he has not got any of those. Their bits of information indicate he was in Winnipeg, he was in Edmonton, he was in various other places—always in Canada. In other words, there is plenty of evidence to suggest he has been in Canada all the time. To impose upon him the requirement to provide documentary proof that he has been in the country when he is a person who is retarded and is subject to amnesia, I think the department has made itself a bit ridiculous in this. I do not think it is the rigidity of the federal regulation.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I want to bring something to the attention of the hon. Minister, too. I listened with great interest to the very articulate hon. member for Scarborough West when he pointed out there should be a change in categories and need should be of prime consideration.

Recently in my own area, a man was drowned. He had taken his car out on the ice and unfortunately the ice was not strong enough and he was drowned. The car had to be taken up because it was a menace to navigation. It cost far more to retrieve the car than the widow was able to get from its sale. In fact, the automobile was practically useless. The insurance on the car could not be obtained because it had gone out on the ice.

There is in that home a retarded young man. He is 19 years old now and he had been at one time an inmate at the Smith's Falls institution. The mother gets a disabled person's allowance for him at \$75 a month and that is all she gets. She has a home to look after and she has the boy. She is not eligible yet by age for a widow's allowance. She is in her late 50s. She cannot go out and work because she must look after this young man, so that the \$75 must cover everything of her needs. She has a fairly large home. She was told to get a smaller one but she finds it is difficult to get

any kind of a home in her area at any reasonable rent. With the \$75 she must look after herself, look after the home, and look after her son, because she cannot leave him at all. He would be absolutely helpless and he also becomes very emotionally disturbed when his mother leaves.

I agree with the point that the hon. member for Scarborough West brought out, that there should not be these very rigid categories, but the actual need of the situation should be considered. Possibly she may get some supplementary assistance from welfare, but I still think there should be, from the department itself, a change in the regulations so that cases of this nature may be given full consideration.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like, on this vote, to compliment the hon. Minister's staff. I put it to you this way. I appreciate what is being said by my hon. friends, my colleagues here. There are these limitations and rigidity and there is no question about it. But I would also say, sir, that over the past year, when I think back on notifying your department about a number of cases and I am thinking particularly of your Mothers' Allowances Act, that real kindness was shown and obvious dedication. I feel I would be remiss if I did not congratulate you, sir, on some of the people that you have in your department who do a job with sensitivity and with thought and with kindness. But having said that, I would like to say still that I feel because of the rigidity of this Act there are limitations to what they can do, and I align myself with

the position that if we could in some way broaden these categories it would be a wonderful thing.

Vote 1810 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I would like to express at this moment that I still love everybody in this House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Information and Tourism, and as I said earlier, after that we will deal with the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.25 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	2083
Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	2083
Retail Sales Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	2083
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	2083
Race Tracks Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	2084
Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. Allan, first reading	2084
Industrial Farms Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading	2084
Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading	2084
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	2085
Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld, continued	2086
Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett	2111
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2119

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today in the east gallery students from Ontario Ladies College, Whitby; and in the east and west galleries, students from Central Secondary School, Hamilton.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-62

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a short explanation, there are two amendments in this bill. One will provide that the Act will be made available to the staffs of district assessors and district assessment commissioners. The second amendment is to provide that the system may enter into agreements to manage other pension funds.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, there are two sections to this bill: one provides for grants to municipalities in each year with respect to indigent hospitalization, and the second amendment sets out the schedule of the unconditional grants, in a more proper

form than appeared in the previous Acts. The parts and amounts are gathered together in one schedule without any change in the total amount of grants.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-61

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-61.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the exemption for sales tax to all bequests of personal property instead of just to bequests made to certain close relatives.

Provision is also made whereby municipalities, school boards, hospitals, universities and certain similar institutions may buy materials for construction of buildings exempt from sales tax instead of paying the sales tax and later applying for rebate. Contracts entered into prior to June 1, 1964, will be subject to sales tax and the present provisions for rebate will apply for contracts entered into on or after June 1, 1964. We believe that this will lessen the administration burden for these organizations.

Buses used to provide public transportation within a municipality, purchased on or after March 1, 1964, are exempt from sales tax.

The present regulation requiring non-resident contractors to provide a deposit for their sales tax liability is being expanded to provide alternatives and is being incorporated into the Act.

The other provisions in the bill are of an administrative or technical nature.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make certain clarifications in

the Act. The first section clarifies the definition of "child", to exclude in certain cases an adult who might otherwise be technically considered as a child due to a remarriage or a surviving parent in his or her later years.

The exemption from duty provided last year for pension plans administered in Ontario with respect to the estate of a person dying domiciled out of Ontario is now being extended to grant a similar exemption to other types of employee plans.

As mentioned in my Budget speech, the federal government is decreasing the portion of estate tax which it will retain from 50 per cent to 25 per cent, effective April 1 last. As the federal government has a Royal commission studying the fields of federal taxation, and as Ontario has a committee making similar studies of provincial and municipal taxation, we prefer for the present not to make the change in our Succession Duty Act which would be required in order to pick up the amounts representing the 25 per cent of estate tax which the federal government will be rebating. Instead we have arranged for the government of Canada to remit to us this 25 per cent.

THE RACE TRACKS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves, seconded by hon. Mr. Spooner, first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Race Tracks Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, this legislation has to do with certain administration in connection with the race tracks. It has been our practice to have inspectors at all the main tracks during the days of racing. This we feel to be unnecessary, because the betting is checked by the federal authorities and by the RCMP. In the interests of economy we are therefore withdrawing our inspectors from the tracks.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. Provincial Treasurer would not think of increasing the tax would he?

Hon. Mr. Allan: You never know.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon. Mr. Allan moves, seconded by hon. Mr. Spooner, first reading of bill intituled, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, the amount of the authorization is \$125 million.

THE INDUSTRIAL FARMS ACT

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves, seconded by hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines), first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, this is tidying up legislation. It is complementary to The Female Refuges Repeal Act which was approved just prior to the Easter recess,

THE PENAL AND REFORM INSTITUTIONS INSPECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves, seconded by hon. Mr. Wardrope, first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there are two sections to this amendment. Section 1 is like the previous bill, complementary to The Female Refuges Repeal Act and tidies up some legislation in that respect. Section 2 makes it clear that municipal by-laws respecting jails, which are now subject to the approval of the Minister of Reform Institutions, will provide that—this amendment will provide that it will except by-laws respecting the appointment and provisions of employment of jail employees and officials. The appointment of jailers is still subject to the approval of the Minister.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) of which I have already given notice. The question is as follows:

In lieu of the statement made by the deputy Minister of Highways to the *London Free Press* on April 3, regarding the two south lane sections of Highway 401 in Kent, would the hon. Minister explain why there has been a change since his statement in the House as recorded in *Hansard* of March 16, page 1655?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): In answer to the question of the hon. member for Kent East, I would say:

(a) that we have already been able to

advance the tender call dates for the grading and paving of the south lanes of 401 in the section from Tempo westerly to the Kent county line as stated by the deputy Minister to the London *Free Press* on the third of this month.

(b) we are presently working to determine the extent to which we can accelerate the tender call and subsequent contract award dates on the remaining sections from the Kent county line westerly.

Accordingly, there is no change in the statement I made to the House as recorded on page 1655 of *Hansard* on March 16 last.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope). The amenities have been observed—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Indeed they must be.

Mr. Troy: I understand that the hon. Minister was away yesterday in the province of Quebec so I shall ask the question today. Has the hon. Minister of Mines any pertinent information to give to the Legislature about the reported important copper strike in the Porcupine area?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank sincerely the hon. member for Nipissing and I should like to ask him if amenities is a new word for drill cores or something. However, I have no pertinent information at present but I am advised there will be a full report for the press tomorrow.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Anything the hon. member likes.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, is that report coming from the hon. Minister of Mines?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: This will come from the company officials themselves.

Mr. Troy: Thank you.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. Report of the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation for the year ending December 31, 1962.

2. Report of the Ontario Cancer Institute for the year ending December 31, 1963.

3. Thirteenth annual report of the Alcohol-

ism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation for the year ending December 31, 1963.

4. Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation report on audit for the year ended March 31, 1963.

5. Thirty-ninth annual report of The Department of Health, Ontario for the year 1963.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to inform the House that yesterday I received a telephone call from the Right Honourable Mr. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, in which he informed me that his government was negotiating with the government of the province of Quebec in regard to the relationship between the Canada pension plan and the pension plan as proposed by the province of Quebec at the recent federal-provincial conference.

Mr. Pearson did not tell me the detail but wished me to be aware that these negotiations were being carried on. I assured him that, in the studies we are making in the province of Ontario, I would be more than prepared to meet with the government of Canada and the government of Quebec in order to devise a plan which would be suitable for all of Canada.

As I have said on many occasions, I feel that a plan national in scope for Canada is best. At the conference in Quebec City two weeks ago, it became apparent that the province of Quebec would not join with the rest of Canada and thus a national plan became impossible. In the discharge of our responsibility we must speak for the people of Ontario, and when a national plan became obviously impossible of achievement then we felt it necessary to reconsider our position in the light of the interests of the people of this province.

Events in the field of pensions have been fast moving for some months. If this latest development can bring us closer in Canada to achieving a plan national in character, with the best possible benefits for our people containing safeguards to ensure security, and a plan which can be approved by all the provinces, then the great efforts and frustrations of the last few months will have been justified. Certainly the co-operation of this government can be counted on to achieve this goal.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The seventeenth order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

(continued)

On vote 2106:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, in vote 2106, I think this has something to do with regional associations. I would like to make a few comments and hope that the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) would seriously consider exactly what I have to say here.

The Essex and Kent tourist council commissioned a Mr. Charles T. Greenwood of the University of Windsor to prepare a report on the seigneurial system in early French Canada and the Detroit river region. This report, which is some 58 pages in length, was requested to determine the feasibility and the advisability of constructing a representative seigneurie, in Essex county as a legitimate historic attraction.

Long before the French settlers arrived, the Detroit river region was the site of various Indian villages. During the 1640's the Iroquois destroyed and scattered the peaceful local tribes who had originally received Jesuit missionaries. In 1701 Fort Pontchartrain, or Detroit, was founded by Cadillac. The oldest French settlement in Ontario is just outside of the city of Windsor; an area known as Petite Cote, that is LaSalle, or Sandwich West.

Heavily endowed with history is the area. In 1749, the Church of Assumption began its career as the core of the French settlement in Essex county. The people of the region, and particularly of the Windsor area, are especially proud, because their roots are the oldest in the province and were nurtured in the adversity which creates great men and great traditions. The establishment of the seigneurial village project in Essex county should be given high priority. The French settlers were important in creating Essex county and have given this area a history which is more varied and longer than any other place in the province of Ontario.

Essex county, because of its French heritage, is one of the great bicultural areas outside of the province of Quebec. In these times, when the dual Canadian soul is undergoing a vital re-examination, the attention paid by the county to our French and English traditions could and should be an example of understanding and interest which would undoubtedly promote better bicultural relations within the province, even within the nation. It could lead to better appreciation of Canada by the thousands of American citizens who

enter Canada by way of Windsor each day. In fact, in the first three months of this year, over 1.4 million vehicles entered at the port of Windsor and over 4.8 million people entered Windsor from the U.S.

Now the oldest French settlement in Ontario is in Petite Cote, and just crossing the border you have the Greenfield Village and you have the Ford Museum, which are national tourist attractions. I think the department should seriously consider matching this after some fashion with something similar to what you have in the Ontario-St. Lawrence development. Here you have a natural place for this. You have well over 5,000,000 people within an hour's drive of a tourist attraction that could be set up on the shores of the Detroit river. The shores are deeply steeped in history, dating back to the early days of the 1700's and I would like the hon. Minister to seriously consider the establishment of something similar to the Ontario-St. Lawrence Park Development.

Would he care to comment on this?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, I found what the hon. member had to say very interesting. I might say I met with the members of the Essex-Kent association and the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) on this very project about perhaps two or two and a half months ago. They submitted quite a full brief on this kind of project and I must admit I think it is a good one.

They asked for comments in connection with certain aspects of the proposed operation of this programme which I sent to them, and I indicated at the time and would indicate again, that we will give them every assistance we can in our department to carry out their programme, particularly through the historical branch and through the trained and experienced staff we have established in connection with the reconstruction of Upper Canada Village.

Quite frankly, I think this kind of project, or these kinds of projects throughout the province, have tremendous benefit, not only for the tourist industry but also to teach our own people something of our own history so, if I could put it this way, our children will not think that Ontario was settled by Matt Dillon. This is one thing in which I have always been interested in connection with Upper Canada Village and Old Fort Henry.

However, I think it will be obvious to all the hon. members of this House that to undertake on a provincial scale the many projects that could be considered, of all sizes,

small ones and large ones, all at once, would be very difficult. I would remind my hon. friend that the province has undertaken a further project this year in the Huronia area of reconstruction of Fort Ste. Marie I. It is my hope that when this one has been completed, we will be able to go on further.

However, I would also suggest this: under the centennial grants programme there is a very large sum of money available to the people of the province through their municipalities to undertake just such projects as this and I would hope that this may be receiving consideration in this area. I realize that it requires getting a number of municipalities to join together in a common project, which is not always easy because there may be other projects that are felt to be important in each municipal area. But there is an opportunity there.

I can assure the hon. member that we are very interested, not only in this project but this kind of project, and we will certainly be looking at it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I bring it up not only from the educational value also, but the hon. Minister knows that we have been blighted for quite a while with a serious problem of unemployment, with almost 7,000 people still unemployed, eight per cent of the work force. A project like this, just as it has had an economic benefit to the Cornwall area, the St. Lawrence Seaway area in the eastern part of Ontario, could likewise have a substantial benefit to the community. It could assist in cutting down some of that unemployment. Are there grants available for the initiation of a project such as this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Under the grants system which this department administers to regional tourist councils the funds that are granted, up to a maximum of \$5,000 on a matching basis to a regional council, could be either partially or in whole applied to such a project. That is the only grant which would be available at the present time, other than the centennial grants with which the hon. member is familiar.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, how was Upper Canada Village started then, was it not started by substantial grants from the province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Upper Canada Village is in a slightly different category. Inasmuch as it was the Upper Canada Village part of the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission project, it was entirely financed provincially.

Mr. Newman: Could not a similar project be set up in the Essex county area? Could the St. Lawrence Development Commission not extend its scope to go into the Essex county area?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Of course, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member would remember that Upper Canada Village came about in what I might call an unusual fashion. The structures for the village were going to be torn down because they were in the area which was going to be flooded as part of the power project of the seaway, and it was perhaps a happy chance that the commission was set up and the village came about. But as I say, it started in perhaps an unusual way, somewhat similar to the way Old Fort Henry was restored. That was a project in the 1930s. I guess really as an unemployment project in the Kingston area, as a reconstruction. I think it is fair to say that no government in Canada has undertaken this kind of project for the historical value or the tourist value itself. In the first instance, it has come about by a combination of circumstances. I think the same thing holds true with the federal project in Louisburg in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the grants as given to the regional association of \$5,000 are much too small really for an organization to get moving on a project like this. I think there would have to be a little more assistance from the province, especially in view of the fact that the economic conditions in the area are not as good as we would like to see them. They have improved substantially and we find a new Windsor, a new Essex county there now, but substantial assistance from the province could hasten a project which would be of educational as well as financial assistance to the local area. I would like the hon. Minister to do all he can to hasten the day when we can have this project in the area.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can assure the hon. member, as I said a moment ago, that we are very interested in this kind of project. But I would just remind him that as far as financial assistance is concerned there is a golden opportunity at the present time to the tune of approximately \$2 per capita under the centennial grants programme, a joint federal-provincial programme, for this kind of project. Anything that we can do to encourage that, we would certainly be glad to do.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, concerning this centennial grants project, there are so many other demands from other bodies in the municipality for projects that it would be

most difficult to try to sell this to the community.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, I would raise a question that concerns me. On making a trip last year on the trans-Canada highway west along the Lake Superior route, I found one of the greatest scenic routes that I believe we can find anywhere. But I was disturbed that about every two or three miles you come across a sign that says, "Private property, keep out," or "Private fishing and boating." I will admit there were several very fine public beaches under the supervision of the department. But I would urge that influence be used to provide on that strip from Sault Ste. Marie to the Lakehead, some low-cost or low-rental cabins for the tourists.

I noticed coming back, when I drove through the night, that there were several cars with families sleeping out on the side of the road. I spoke to many of them and they mentioned the fact that there was not enough accommodation and what there was was too costly for a man with a family. I hope that this beautiful stretch will not fall into the same category as many of our tourist areas, which become so highly commercialized that people with families cannot afford to use them in a proper manner, and that we conserve the property along there for public use and not let it fall into private hands completely so that we can use that wonderful strip for what, Mr. Chairman, I believe it should be used for. It is a fine trip, but a long one to make without having suitable accommodation for families to stop at, at a cost they can afford to sleep overnight. I would hope that all departments involved would give this some consideration.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, this perhaps is not proper for me comment on. I would just remind the hon. member of this, that The Department of Lands and Forests has established several parks along Highway 17 from the Soo to the Lakehead. I would say from the policy that has been adopted in the past that, as these become crowded, further parks will be established, and there is a great deal of Crown land in that area as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Gisborn: I agree entirely with what the hon. Minister says, but the point is that there should be, at certain areas, some low-cost cabins. I think the parks are fine, with the tables and the areas cleaned up and cooking facilities, but I think what would help a great deal would be some low-cost cabins that

would accommodate a family for the night at a price they could afford.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, in discussing this vote with the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, the hon. Minister mentioned Fort Ste. Marie. Does the money for that rebuilding come in this vote?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am happy to tell the hon. member that we passed that one. It has been passed earlier—I think it was 2102, sub-item 5.

Mr. Nixon: It does not come under the division of archives?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. In archives there is an amount, you will notice, for archaeological exploration, of I think \$5,000, but that has to do with the Archaeological and Historic Sites Board.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I think one of the phases of tourist development outside the regular pattern that we should give some consideration to is the hostel development. This is something that has never developed in anything like the fashion on this continent or in this province that it has in Europe. I have been interested in some of the literature that is available about the hostel development and the nature trails in the whole escarpment from the Niagara peninsula through to the Bruce peninsula. But against that general background I was interested in a story in the *Globe and Mail* of March 18, which had a little note to this effect:

The Canadian Youth Hostels Association is preparing a brief to the Ontario government asking for the use of the Sigmund Samuel \$150,000 Forest Hill mansion as an international hostel by 1967. Samuel gave the mansion to Ontario for the Lieutenant-Governor's residence but Public Works Minister Ray Connell said this month that his department is thinking of selling it. The association's Great Lakes chairman, Doug McLaren, thinks it would make an ideal hostel, and showplace for the association headquarters as well.

I was wondering if the hon. Minister can tell us whether the government has received this brief and what comments, if any, he is in a position to make on the proposal?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I have to tell the hon. member that I have not seen the brief. As far as I know it has not been received by the government; it may have gone to some other Minister, but con-

sequently since I have not seen it I am afraid I am in no position to comment on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is one other point. I am sorry my actual material in connection with this is up in my office—no, it is not, it is on the way here; thanks so much. I wonder if the hon. Minister can comment, or perhaps he can get his hon. colleague on his immediate right to comment, on the public furor—that may be a bit strong—that arose in the Sault Ste. Marie and Wawa area some time ago with regard to land rights that had been given to the ACR years ago and, if I recall correctly, the newly established procedure of the ACR a year or so ago in making a charge for tourists—the result being that a number of the tourist establishments in the area had withdrawn their activities because they were not in a position to operate economically.

It seemed to me that as my hon. colleague, the member for Wentworth East, has indicated, sir, this is one of the new areas for development of tourism in the province of Ontario with the completion of the trans-Canada highway. This appears to be throwing up roadblocks against the fullest possible development of the tourist trade in that area, and doing so on a basis which strikes me as being highly anachronistic. These great land grants that were given to railways years ago and which they still retain, they are still using as though they were a private preserve. I suppose legally they are a private preserve but I question the morality—if I may use that term—of a railway holding on to such extensive amounts of land when they do not serve the purposes of the railway. It just happens to be an inheritance from the past when railways were encouraged to build by great grants from the public Treasury, including millions of acres in land grants.

Would the hon. Minister care to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, of course this too is not within the legislation of, or any remedy there might be for this problem, is not within the jurisdiction of, this department. I am aware of the problem that is there and I have met with other members of the government who are involved in it directly. I think there have been a number of meetings between The Department of Lands and Forests and the commercial operators who are also concerned, but I do not think it would be proper for me to comment on action which The Department of Lands and Forests might be taking since it is a matter under their jurisdiction.

Mr. MacDonald: If you—I am sorry.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I should comment in my capacity as a member representing the riding to which the hon. member refers, to say this: As my hon. colleague has said, this matter has been brought to his attention, to the attention of his department, and particularly to the attention of The Department of Lands and Forests. I have been kept fully aware of the feelings of the tourist operators in the area, and have had many communications from them extending over a period actually prior to my election to this House and throughout the period since. All of the representations which have been made by individual operators, by chambers of commerce, and other associations have been forwarded on to The Department of Lands and Forests.

I think I may be permitted to say this; study of the whole situation is being carried forward. I know this is being done at least, and I have asked for a history of the whole situation with respect to the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway.

This is general. I know that the railway company was given grants, I believe by the provincial Legislature of the time, with the view that it would construct a railway from Sault Ste. Marie northerly to Hudson Bay. It was constructed as far as what is now the town of Hearst, which is a junction on the most northerly trans-Canada railway. The railway was given certain grants, and they consisted generally in staggered townships, of very large areas of land. In 1941, I believe, a change was made by the government of that day in which certain areas were taken back and I believe ostensibly in satisfaction of a tax account. This is as I understand it. I have not got the reports statistically and factually before me at the moment; these are being prepared.

There is a situation of the nature that the hon. member for York South has outlined in the area at the present time. I must recall to you that in the standing committee when the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) was dealing with legislation having to do with his department and when committees were present from the tourist operators and chambers of commerce submitting their briefs, I raised the matter there. Some discussions took place on it and I think some discussions have gone forward with the railway company. I would have to leave any further comment, at this moment at least, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

I would like the hon. members of this

House to be aware of the fact that the whole matter—and I am very much concerned about it because it is in my riding mainly—is being studied and a solution of the problems—and there are problems—is being sought.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I will just say at the moment that if the hon. Minister states, and I can quite understand that this more appropriately comes under Lands and Forests, then we can leave it until then, but I hoped he would intimate to his hon. colleague that I think this is an issue that we should have at least a preliminary report on, if not a definitive report, if the matter is still under continuing study because, I repeat, I think we are faced with a bit of an anachronism. I happen to have the map in front of me and you have great tracts of territory in townships staggered, as the hon. Attorney General just indicated, in that whole area north of Sault Ste. Marie. Now there may have been justification for this in the first instance, but I do not see why any corporation which is not using it for its primary purpose of a railway should be permitted to sit on great territories of this nature.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: The ACR at the moment claims in one release that they put out after this had developed to a certain stage in public discussion that they have “complete and irrevocable ownership.” I suspect that this is maybe the point that is under study and I will look forward to a report from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would just like to say that I am glad the hon. member has raised this in the House. I know that it is being thoroughly studied and I hope a solution will soon be brought forward.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, item five, grants to regional appropriations. Would you have the list of people who are getting these grants readily available? Could you read them off to us?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are 31 of them, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if there is any specific one? I could give the hon. member the total, which is \$135,109.13; and I can tell him that all the regional associations, except one, obtained a grant; and this year about 80 per cent of them were qualified for the maximum grant.

I will be glad to send my hon. friend this list. I just thought I would save the time of the House by not reading them all.

Mr. Bukator: I was wondering whether it would not be important to have it in the record because—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It will be in the annual report but—

Mr. Bukator: As a matter of fact I think it is in—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It will be in the public accounts, of course, and it seems to me that it is in this year's annual report, although some of it might not be final. I am informed that it is in this year's annual report which was distributed about a month ago.

Mr. Bukator: I can get that information there. The point that I am trying to make, and the hon. Minister might answer my question if he will this way, that there are certain areas that get a grant of some \$5,000, taking in one, two or three counties and it is usually administered, or in some cases administered, under the chamber of commerce. Am I right on this point?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The regional council is generally made up of representatives from a number of chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and perhaps local tourist associations. There is not anything that says specifically of whom a council shall be made up, but it generally represents a number of chambers of commerce and this sort of thing in a region.

Mr. Bukator: To pursue this a bit further, I was making reference to the county of Welland. They have several chambers there, but the chamber of commerce in Niagara Falls—and if my good friend the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) would come to and give me some assistance here—

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): I will do that right now.

Mr. Bukator: Anyhow, he will no doubt read it in *Hansard*.

The chamber of commerce in my riding, in Niagara Falls—the chamber of commerce from Welland, now that my good friend the hon. member for Welland is with me—the chamber of commerce from Welland and the chamber of commerce from Niagara Falls made representation to the former Minister pertaining to the \$5,000 grant.

It takes in part of the county beyond ours, and I think that is Wentworth county. They cannot properly administer, in a council or in a group, this \$5,000 grant because it is not sufficient to make important men, such

as they have on those commissions and in those chambers, sit together to find out who gets a part of the \$5,000. There are grants given to parts of counties, not whole counties, I understand.

If I am right at this point, then I can pursue it further.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I might say this, Mr. Chairman, the tourist regions into which the province has been divided are 32. One of them is Algonquin Park, so there are 31 other regions in the province.

The province was divided on this basis without regard to municipal boundaries. It was divided with the idea of making regions which had a community of interests as far as the tourist business was concerned—one lake, or one attraction, or one river, or something like that. There is no guide by which one can say that a region would have so many townships and another so many counties. One might be part of one county, one might be three counties.

Mr. Bukator: The point I was trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that it might be part of one county. Under these circumstances, then, I can bring it closer to home.

The city of Niagara Falls has the falls and a lot of people come there naturally to see it. We would like very much for the hon. Minister's department to take another look at the region, because the chamber of commerce in that area has a tourist and travel publicity group. They spend, I would guess now, an annual figure of \$20,000 or \$25,000. They could very readily and capably, and very well, spend this \$5,000 to publicize that part of the province—because tourists not only stay there; they travel around through the province, although they may have their port of entry in that area, in connection with the Welland canal for instance.

I do not believe that these three counties, or two counties, can take advantage of this grant because you cannot get a group of people to sit down to find out where they are going to spend that portion of money.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say to my hon. friend that the Niagara-Iroquois region did not receive the maximum grant last year of \$5,000.

Mr. Bukator: The Niagara-Iroquois region? What region does that take in, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Auld: He may need a magnifying glass, but I will send this over to my hon. friend—

Mr. Bukator: I think this is important to the whole province. I think they all have similar problems.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Supposing I send the hon. member this map. It is region number five and he can see the geographic boundaries. I will just say this: I am sure Niagara Falls could be very happy, as almost every chamber of commerce and board of trade in the province would be, to have a specific grant to itself.

However, the total amount of the Budget I have is \$150,000 and I am afraid that we just would not have that much money.

The idea of these regions is to encourage co-operation between municipalities and between local chambers of commerce, so that they can pool their efforts and jointly do a better job, a more effective job than they might do individually.

Mr. Bukator: Well I can just, at a glance, see that this takes in the county of Welland in this region, a portion of Haldimand county—it is a very small map but the area in which to distribute \$5,000 is so great that they just cannot do the job properly.

You had representation here again. Your colleague, the hon. member for Welland, made representation to the department before the present hon. Minister took office; and I have met with the chamber, too, to discuss the possibility of dividing it into smaller areas where these people can take advantage of the departmental grants. Because, in the present circumstances, there is too little to go around, and the job cannot be done properly.

The point I am trying to make is that if the hon. Minister will see fit—and I am quite sure that he will, being the type of individual that he is—maybe I can bring the Welland Chamber of Commerce with my friend the hon. member for Welland, the Niagara Chamber of Commerce, and the hon. Minister might consider their problems. They just cannot go into a whole region to administer \$5,000, because it is not feasible or financially sound.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would just say to my hon. friend that I will be very glad to see those two groups. I might tell them that, in my own area, I have had a somewhat similar request, and I can think of two or three others; so I can assure the hon. member that we are taking a look at this.

Mr. Bukator: Good. Thank you.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister, with regard

to the regional organization grants: I do not see the Nipissing district region; is that the one association which did not get a grant?

Hon. Mr. Auld: They got \$5,000 this year. They did not get anything the year before.

Mr. Troy: Did they not ask for it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: They made no application the year before.

Mr. Troy: Is that so?

How far does the Upper Ottawa Valley Association's jurisdiction extend?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As soon as I get my map back I will—I think it is the north end of Renfrew county. Yes, the top end of Renfrew county.

Mr. Troy: Why is the real upper Ottawa area not included then, because the Ottawa extends away beyond Renfrew riding north? Where would, for example, Mattawa; in what—

Hon. Mr. Auld: That would be in the Madawaska Valley.

Mr. Troy: No. Mattawa, at the confluence of the Ottawa and the Mattawa rivers.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I must apologize to my hon. friend. I should have brought a magnifying glass because unfortunately the print on this map is rather small. That would be in Nipissing I am informed—in the Nipissing region.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have one question I would like to ask the hon. Minister. Many provinces have taken steps to co-operate with the existing or prospective new tourist development, by the provision of funds. I can think of Nova Scotia for one. I was quite impressed with their programme, throughout that province a few years ago, when I happened to be down there. In all of the various developments in the province of Ontario, such as the Ontario Development Agency, is there any source now where the government is willing to go into partnership in the development of the tourist industry, or at least to make loans available?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course the federal authority — The Small Loans Act, or The Small Business Act, I believe it is—makes provision for this and I am informed a number of people in the industry have been able to get funds there. The Ontario Development Agency I believe, has or is in the process of processing several

applications provincially. But I would say that while this perhaps more properly comes in the estimates of my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), the agency has been of great assistance to a number of operators in a way that might not appear to one as likely.

A number of operators have made application. The agency people have gone out to look at their operation and to look at their books, and by giving them assistance in their administrative practices, their bookkeeping practices—in other words, by getting them on a little better administrative basis — these people have then been able to go to the normal agencies and obtain funds. One of the purposes of the staff of this branch is to do that very thing, and with some of the staff that we are in the process of recruiting, primarily graduates of Ryerson's hotel administration course, we hope to be able to be of considerable assistance to the industry in this very way, in helping it have good administrative procedures to that it can tell whether operators are making or losing money and so it can approach the normal lending agencies effectively.

Mr. MacDonald: I am glad to hear the hon. Minister say this and obviously good management under any circumstances is a very important factor. Will he forgive me if I take a rather jaundiced view of these stories in light of the one prize example of an attempt to introduce more effective management? I am now referring to the Fairfield episode up in Owen Sound. That is the one case in the Ontario Development Agency which was publicized, by the government's own decision. One of the efforts there was to introduce more effective management. However, I leave that matter.

There was one other point, but it now escapes me. If it comes back, I shall raise it, Mr. Minister.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on that fateful day of March 19, the same day which I had the pleasure of speaking at some great length, the whole context of my approach to this department was that with the increased competition that our province is facing, we must substantially increase the development of tourist attractions and resorts in this province if we are going to compete in this market. As you will note in the financial statistics, we are spending approximately \$1.25 million on advertising and promotion of our province and slightly less than \$500,000 in the development of the resort areas.

In my speech, I stated we must develop major attractions in all parts of the province and a variety of attractions. We must provide the attractions or harness the existing ones so they will appeal to the tourists. I would just like to reiterate a few of these suggestions I did make at that time and possibly get some comments from the hon. Minister.

One item, sir, was that the province should develop marinas or dockage on the Great Lakes and our inland waterways, in order that we could create more of this type of tourist traffic into our province. Another was that more provincial parks should be introduced into southern Ontario, where they have proved to be economically reliable and they certainly serve the mass population of our province, as well as our neighbours to the south.

A further suggestion was zoning of the type of business established at the entrances or near the entrances of the provincial parks. A suggestion came out of one committee meeting that as new lakes are opened in the development of our province, zoning should be instituted in that commercial establishments be located in one section and the other sections be reserved for the public and private cottaging. Another suggestion I made which could aid in the development of our tourist industry was the idea of strip maps on some of our highway routes, which would indicate the key points of interest and give a concise description of them.

These were a number of the suggestions I made and I would appreciate some comment on them. To follow the comments of my friend, the hon. member for Niagara Falls, in regard to regional tourist councils, that they are devised in relation to a lake or river front or specific area, I just wonder if the hon. Minister could inform the House why the Sarnia-Lambton tourist region was devised as one region in this province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go on at length with these areas which my hon. friend has raised. We did discuss them and I think I commented on them on March 19. Perhaps properly they are not under this vote; they would be on the general comment on the first vote. But the question of zoning around parks is a rather difficult one to deal with, as is all zoning where you divide types of business. It is fairly simple, and it is established practice to zone for industrial, commercial, residential and that kind of broad general division. I am not trying to embarrass my hon. friend, but I would say that one could look forward

to a fair amount of difficulty in trying to carry out his suggestion of zoning certain kinds of businesses around a park or recreational area.

For instance, there are so many businesses these days which are not in any specific field. By that I mean that one drug store may sell only drugs and in another drug store you may have an awful time finding any drugs. How we would establish this kind of thing, supposing we decided to attempt to do this, is something that escapes me at the moment. I would say that the practice which I think The Department of Lands and Forests has carried out pretty well to date, of trying to acquire sufficient property to protect the main recreational area, is probably the most effective one.

In connection with strip maps, I presume my hon. friend is speaking of the kind of map which say, the Ontario Motor League produces. This indicates a route and certain things adjacent to that route, within, say, ten or 15 miles. I might say that one of our publications indicates a number of suggested motor trips around the province, suggested tours of varying lengths, and does in fact do, I think, what he is suggesting. In addition, of course, The Department of Highways last year produced a strip map which refers only to Highway 401, primarily to assist the tourist industry and industry generally in locating their operations in relation to 401 by numbers. I think this has worked out very well.

There were a number of things in my hon. friend's remarks on March 19 which I have re-read and which we are looking at. I think, Mr. Chairman, to stay in some semblance of order, perhaps that is all I should say on this vote.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague from Essex South mentioned marinas. Has your department done anything in connection with promoting marinas throughout the province, or am I on the wrong vote?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We put out a publication called *Cruising Ontario Waters*, which gives general information for people in boats, where to obtain charts, general information on things to do adjacent to well-travelled water routes, and in addition has an insert which gives, as accurately as we can, gives all the marinas on the waterways, their names, and the facilities they have—for instance, whether they have gasoline and diesel fuel, ice, groceries, repairs, shorelines, this sort of thing.

Mr. Bukator: All private enterprise pretty well, are they?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, there are to my knowledge no publicly operated marinas in the province unless the odd municipality may do so.

But I think there are some which may be municipally owned but which are leased out.

Mr. Bukator: I find that we have had co-operation from the provincial authorities, and some of the federal people have been down in the Crystal Beach area, Mr. Chairman, pertaining to the traffic that they have on Lake Erie. There are many boats which come from the American waters into the Canadian waters but have nowhere to land. I know they would like to come into some of our summer resort areas to stop with us and visit and spend some of those American dollars that we need so badly.

I think that some of the people from the department have been looking at the Crystal Beach area for the possibility of a marina that might be operated by the municipality. But we need assistance, if nothing more than engineering and advice from the department, along with assistance from the federal people too, whoever would assist us. I know they have been working for years to bring this about but I can see a lot of potential American dollars coming into this country if they only had a place to land in that area.

We have millions of people to the south of us who have boats, who cruise up and down that lake but have nowhere to stop to land and visit with us.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might clarify what I said, or perhaps we should have defined "marina" before we started. The Department of Lands and Forests, in a number of their parks, do have docks and facilities to land. When I spoke of a marina, I was thinking of a commercial operation which supplies goods and services to the boat operator.

The department, of course, does give technical advice and assistance to any potential operator. We will assist him in getting in touch with suppliers, suggest how he finds out what the potential may be by giving him figures on the boating in the area and this sort of thing. But as for operating marinas ourselves, we do not. I should correct myself, the St. Lawrence Parks Commission has a marina of this kind at Crysler Park which is leased—actually it was built by an operator and in effect the commission has leased the space to this operator.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I now recall the last point I wanted to ask the hon. Minister. There have been a number of stories with regard to tourist operators who have been going on with their business when they were unlicensed, in violation of regulations. There is at least one instance—if the hon. Minister will recall, which I discussed with him privately. Is the hon. Minister in a position to make a statement in such detail as he sees fit within that context, indicating to what extent does the policing, if you will, of tourist operators rest with his department, or if it is just part of the normal operation of the law through the hon. Attorney General's department and local Crown attorneys and so on?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, without going into specific detail, as I think the hon. members would agree might not be wise as far as things under consideration are concerned, there was considerable concern in the French River area. I think the hon. member will remember this. This was about a year ago.

If I could just perhaps recap briefly by giving for this area, which was the most difficult one, the figures as to what happened: There were complaints of some alleged 66 unlicensed operators all over the northern part of Ontario—Kenora region, North Bay region; Kenora would be the northwest and North Bay the northeast. There were 66 investigations made.

It was found that eight were already licensed under The Tourist Establishments Act, which is the responsibility of this department and which is the only provincial statute having to do with the licensing of tourist operations. Municipalities, under that Act, have authority to license also. And I cannot report on what they may or may not have been doing.

It was found that 34 of these investigated were not licensable; in other words they were not tourist establishments under the Act. And I might just say there, Mr. Chairman, under the Act and regulations, you or I or any one of us can rent our own cottage if we wish, but if we have two or more units then we have to be licensed. This is primarily to protect the transients. This does not apply to owners of boarding houses, rooming houses, apartment houses, people on long-term leases.

Subsequently, upon investigation, and when the rules were pointed out, 20 of these were licensed and the remaining four were, in effect, borderline cases. Each one was warned by letter, two of them were such small operations that they preferred to stop

doing what was on the borderline; and they just ceased operations. The other two have finally qualified and received their licences. Without going into the detail, I might just say I am informed it was decided not to prosecute these two because they were borderline cases; there was a good question as to whether a licence should have been obtained.

I might say though that, partially as a request by the operators themselves, with the full-time staff which the department will have as of April 1 of this year, we hope to be in a position to take a little closer look at this situation and perhaps be able to follow up some of these things a little more elaborately than we did in the past when a large proportion of our staff were only casual summertime employees.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): I might say that we are all interested in trying to attract as many tourists as possible to this province. I am not an expert in this field but I, for one, feel that good fishing in some of our small lakes is one of the things which attracts tourists. I often wondered if the department ever gave a thought to restocking some of these lakes. Some of them do not seem to have too much fish. Would that not be one way of encouraging tourists to come? I know, if you are talking to a tourist and he has a good day of fishing, he says, "I'm coming back next year".

Mr. Troy: "The damndest big fish . . ."

Mr. Spence: So I think this is just one of the things which would attract more tourists, if we had more fish in some of our lakes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: My, that is a temptation!

Well, I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that of course we realize, and I agree with the hon. member, that good fishing is important; but here again the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is in charge of the restocking and the fishing. We never suggest to him that he cease doing this.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I wonder could I ask the hon. Minister, through you, whether the Ottawa tulip festival gets a grant from the department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, it does not. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the department has no authority to make grants other than to the regional associations, and certain associations such as Norglac, and a Lake Superior association, which are joint provincial and certain U.S. state organizations. But

no grants are made to the festival, or any of the fall festivals and that sort of thing.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would the department consider sending staff to areas which would have something similar to the Ottawa district, like the tulip festival—to advise them as to how to promote a programme?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, we have in the field, through our regional offices, staff who work closely with various organizations, both regional and local, in terms of chambers of commerce and boards of trade, in giving planning assistance, arranging publicity assistance. We do a great deal of photography, for instance, for these people.

In certain areas, if we have the staff available, we will send some of our attractive guides—the girls you see downstairs and from the other tourist section centres—to assist in the registration of large conventions or office work and so on, in connection with some of these festivals. We try to co-operate in every way we can, short of making a specific grant of funds.

Mr. Newman: You do not send specialists from your department into an area to make concrete suggestions to assist the area in the promotion of festivals at all then, do you?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, this is, of course, one of the reasons for the establishment of the regional tourist councils we were referring to a few moments ago. Of course various branches of the department—the publicity branch and the development branch are two—hold seminars and area conferences. In fact, we are having an area conference between the regions and the development association in Peterborough later this month for the purpose of getting people together, having them ask questions as to the possibilities of certain proposals, ideas, summer festivals, winter carnivals. We have encouraged the holding of a large number of winter carnivals which I think on the whole have been successful this year. There are summer festivals and the cavalcade of colour in the fall in Muskoka which has become quite an annual event. This kind of thing we do.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

My purpose in asking all of this is that we did have an international freedom festival in the city of Windsor-Detroit and it was a most outstanding thing the very first year because of the attraction, sir, and that was Her Majesty the Queen. Since then the festival has not been able to get on its feet to the

extent we would like to see it. Now here you have a natural.

Two countries, living at peace with one another; two great cities, one of the great cities of the western world, Detroit. If the department could possibly send some type of assistance into the area, maybe the freedom festival could get back onto its feet and once again be the tourist attraction that it really should be. Here we have two nations living in freedom, at peace with one another; what an outstanding example to show to the rest of the world. There is no Berlin wall separating the two nations.

I think the department could come along and give some sort of assistance. Maybe the municipality did not ask for it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That may well be the answer, but I can assure my hon. friend that if there is a request we always try to oblige; but on the other hand we do not poke our nose in without an invitation.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a further question of the hon. Minister regarding the tulip festival? Has the board of trade or any organization from the Ottawa area ever asked for a grant in order to promote the tulip festival?

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the Ottawa tulip festival is certainly one of the outstanding events in eastern Ontario and thousands upon thousands of people come from all over Canada and many states of the United States to see the tulips at that season. I am wondering whether a request has ever been made by the authorities in Ottawa for a grant towards the publicizing of that festival.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that from the knowledge of my officials here today, no request has been made. But in all fairness I would say that probably no request was made because it is not very likely it would be granted.

Vote 2106 agreed to.

On vote 2107:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, in this vote I presume that it is the historical advisory board that recommended to the hon. Minister that the development of Fort Ste. Marie be proceeded with, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The project of Fort Ste. Marie is, as I say, in vote 2102 which we have passed. But in connection with it and the vote we are now on, 2107—

Mr. Nixon: Was the development recommended by the historical advisory board?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We are now on vote 2107, are we, Mr. Chairman?

No, the archaeological and historic sites board is, of course, aware of Fort Ste. Marie and the other historic sites in the area. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the archaeological and historic sites board and two other members of the board are also members of the committee which is in charge of the restoration of Fort Ste. Marie in the Huronia project. But as far as it being generated by the archaeological and historic sites board, the answer is no. It was a project which, I suppose, has been discussed at many levels of government and by many groups in the province as a project and the government decided it should go ahead.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask if the hon. Minister and his advisors consulted the historical advisory board as to the historical value of this particular site for the expenditure of such a large amount of money to develop it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh yes. As I say, as a matter of fact three members of the archaeological and historic sites board are members of the committee which is charged with carrying out the restoration of Fort Ste. Marie. The board has been well informed about the plans for establishing the project for some time before it was decided to go ahead.

Mr. Nixon: But it would not be unfair to say that it was done without their specific recommendation, it was not based on this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh, no.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to say something about archaeological and historical sites in general. In driving through the province we see, year by year, development of this programme and whenever time permits we stop at the sites that are designated. But it seems to me that a large number of these sites would benefit from some development. Certainly just the placing of the impressive plaque does little towards retaining the site in any of its historic naturalness. I would like the hon. Minister to comment on the possibility of setting aside some money in the future to allow the historic sites board to select some of these better sites and assist in their development.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that I would agree with my hon.

friend that there are a number of interesting and important structures, or remnants of structures, throughout the province, many of which have already been commemorated by plaques erected by the board. Here again it is strictly a question of funds to do it and then funds to maintain them afterwards. One thing that we have done in the department to advance this kind of thing is to encourage work along these lines under the centennial grants programme, because I must say that I feel that this is a golden opportunity to preserve a great many of these structures around the province. But while I think it would be excellent if the funds were available; and of course the federal government has certain authority under their board, which operates under Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, to do this kind of thing, and in fact have done so on one or two occasions, it is again strictly a question of the funds being available.

I think that we have made a good start and our board, as I mentioned in my remarks when I presented the estimates on March 19, is made up of a very capable and dedicated group of people who have given a great deal of time in their work and are pressing forward.

We are putting up about 40 plaques per year. Now, there is a great deal of research involved in doing this and we have made available to local historical societies and municipalities, and so on, the facilities of the archives and the historical branch and museum advisors—the historians on the staff of the branch—to give them assistance.

We are now prepared, although I do not suppose we could look after 100 requests at once, to give technical assistance through the staff that we trained when we were doing the reconstruction and restoration work at Upper Canada Village. In fact we have done this on a couple of occasions so far and are in the process of so doing.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister speaks of the money being available he of course must bear in mind that he is spending more than \$1 million in the restoration of this one site at Fort Ste. Marie, and it might be advisable in the future to examine the possibilities of even setting aside a relatively small amount, so that year by year some of the more important sites could be purchased, or at least the local municipality or some other responsible group could be assisted in the development. I would like to ask him what happens if a designated site is sold and perhaps earmarked for destruction or changing into some redevelopment of some

sort? Has he got any power to maintain it as an historic site?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Here again I would just say, Mr. Chairman, it is really a question of funds. If there were a site which we wanted to preserve, it could be purchased. In the final analysis this would be the action that would have to be taken. Even if there were authority—I think the federal government has authority to take historic sites—people still have to be compensated for them, so that really the authority, unless there is a statutory fund or a large vote of money set aside with it, would mean very little. We obviously could not tell people that they could not do anything with their house, they could not change it, they could not sell it, they were not allowed to tear it down, if we were not prepared to compensate them for any loss that might be incurred.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister one question with regard to research that he has done in connection with these historical facts. I have been informed that in one particular circumstance—I think it was the plaque commemorating the birthplace of Sir William Hearst—the plaque had to be completely torn down as the information on it was not correct at all. Furthermore, I was informed that the sons of Sir William Hearst were not invited to the occasion when the plaque was presented to the municipality that he came from. The only way the sons happened to know about it was by reading about it in the papers. If these facts are correct, I am wondering just how much research was done in this particular instance.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The two things that my hon. friend mentioned—one, actually I presume it was the lettering that was on the plaque—

Mr. Whicher: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It may be that a change was made because of something that came to light after the original inscription was prepared. While there is very thorough research done by the historical branch in the archives and elsewhere I would be the last to say that we might not make a mistake sometime or that it is not possible. This is one of the problems which the board has in setting out the inscriptions—that the interpretation of some word is obnoxious to somebody, or unacceptable to somebody such as a relative or historian, and that a change must be made.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that there is

room for approximately 110 words, I think, on the plaque and this sometimes requires a great deal of discussion to get on the relevant important points or aspects of the person or event being commemorated.

Regarding the second point, generally the request for a plaque is generated from a local historical society, council, or local group. It is generally the policy of the historical branch, which is actually responsible for carrying out the decision of the archaeological and historic sites board, to leave the arrangements for the ceremonies in the hands of the local body because normally the local body would be more closely in touch with those people in the community who should be invited. If someone was overlooked in receiving an invitation to one of these ceremonies, it is certainly most regrettable but it would be primarily, I would expect, the responsibility of the local body which was sponsoring the unveiling, rather than the historical branch itself. I am sure the hon. members would agree that it would be very difficult for a member of our staff to be able to go into a community, without a great deal of time being involved, to organize such a ceremony, and it is more desirable that the originating body should be in charge of that.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabour this but I understand in this particular instance it was not a word or two that had to be changed on the plaque, but the whole message. I suggest that the hon. Minister inform the committee, whoever they may be, that from now on their research of this material be a little more efficient.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, commending the hon. Minister and his department on their policy in regional development—giving the autonomy to a local region in areas for development—I think it is an excellent policy and also their move on historic sites has been commendable in that area.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister under this Section 7, 2107, about an amount of \$37,000 in 1963 for museums to sundry municipalities. We have been building our own museum there, 100 per cent local funds. I am wondering if the hon. Minister could tell me the yardstick to qualify for a grant titled "museum."

Hon. Mr. Auld: In the first place, Mr. Chairman, the museum must be owned by the municipality. A grant is paid on a percentage of the maintenance costs—it is not a capital grant but a percentage of the

maintenance costs, in other words, a proportion of the salary of the curator. If my memory serves me correctly most of the grants would go up to about \$1,000. **Owen Sound,** I would tell the hon. member, received two years ago \$966.66, and last year \$1,000, which would be this maintenance grant that I mentioned.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Minister. On a different note on tourism, our hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) developed at some length the very poor job done by your advertising agency last year in tourism. May I ask the hon. Minister, has he retained the same agency this year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that that was on a vote that we have already passed and agreed to.

Mr. Sargent: I think I am entitled to an answer on that question, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not on this vote.

Mr. Sargent: I am entitled as a taxpayer to know if you are retaining the same agency.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would suggest that the hon. member put it on the order paper if he wants an answer, but to save him a little trouble I would say it is a different one.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I support strongly the suggestions of my friend, the hon. member for Brant. As the hon. Minister very well knows, passing through my area is the original trans-Canada route. The first business in Ontario was established on Lake Nipissing. If at all possible, if there were grants to assist municipalities, not in building but in keeping alive an historic route, then they would be most advisable there.

Vote 2107 agreed to.

On vote 2108:

Mr. Troy: Well now, comes around this vote and I suppose some of us are batting our heads against a stone wall. But still, like Horatius at the bridge, we are undaunted. I want to ask the hon. Minister a couple of questions. First of all, what is the age qualifying an adult under The Theatres Act?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Eighteen.

Mr. Troy: Eighteen? For adult entertainment, the age limit is 18? What is the difference between adult and restricted?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, there are three categories. We operate on a classification system. One category is the adult classification, which is a guide. People of all ages can go but it is a guide to parents that this film is deemed to be more suitable for adults. Then there is what is called in England the universal class, which is suitable for everybody. Then there is the restricted classification, which I think is the one the hon. member refers to; and admittance is only given to those 18 years of age and over.

Mr. Troy: Is there any identification form they have to carry?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Troy: Are there any women on the censorship board of the department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes.

Mr. Troy: Fine.

Now, I want to read a letter I got from a constituent of mine. He is a little premature; he calls me the Honourable Leo Troy, but those things come in time:

I am taking the opportunity of expressing to you, our elected representative, my deepest disgust at what is perpetuated upon the public in the guise of entertainment and under the all-protecting mantle of free enterprise.

My wife and I attended a movie last Saturday night, a movie entitled for your information "Four for Texas". It was passable as far as we were concerned and we enjoyed it. However, the movie was on the restricted list due to a little more of Anita, the actress, being on view than usual. As far as I am concerned what was shown was not particularly suggestive or really objectionable in any way. Then came the preview of coming attractions and one of the little gems was an endearing little number called "Dementia 13".

This is a sick movie in the same class as "Psycho", "The Birds" and other trash, calculated to shock and frighten audiences to its core. It did me.

The preview started off with a man purporting to be a psychiatrist, who very sternly tells the audience that after seeing "Psycho" some poor sick person had gone out and committed three murders. This, of course, is an achievement no doubt Mr. Hitchcock is proud of, if it is all true, that is.

Then they proceeded to show signs of violence, various murders, etc. being com-

mitted and the *pièce de résistance* came at the end. A nearly nude young girl was shown in a pool of water, then she screamed out, a camera shows an axe descending, the screaming stops, the scene shifts to a dark room and a pair of very bloody feet and then the camera travels up the girl's corpse showing every gash and slash and I mean deep gashes and blood all over everything. The last scene is a blood-stained axe.

I do not possess a weak stomach having seen several nasty auto accidents, but this shook me. In fact, the radio commercial brayed over the local radio station in the usual sickening style claims that the picture shows us an authentic portrayal of as beautiful an axe slaying as is allowed.

The other little offering was with Boris Karloff, I guess it is. And "Blood in living colour". I forgot to mention that the usual dope about a psychiatric test before being allowed to view "Dementia 13" was included.

Now this is the type of advertising we get; and although it has nothing to do with television certainly the censorship board must have seen that stuff, and they allowed it to be presented. Then we have the advertisements in the newspapers; and, of course, you have to be awfully careful what you say because I notice one of our Metropolitan newspapers will not put in the advertising about the demon liquor, but they certainly accept every day the filthy lucre for the advertisement of pictures.

This is a copy of a—well, it is partly an editorial in a northern Ontario newspaper. It points out that in the days of Barnum and Bailey, when Mr. Barnum was mulcting the public, he had in one of his sideshows the words, "To the Egress", and nothing else. So the public in their numbers flowed along this passageway and you know where they went—outside. But they thought they were going to see something else altogether; they thought they were going to get into one of those special shows, but it was just an exit.

So it says the same thing with the newspaper business in the advertising of their films.

As Barnum used to watch the people go out, he would say, "Of course, there is a sucker born every minute". In this editorial:

The come-ons I am talking about this week are the ones you find in your daily newspapers on the entertainment page. The enticing, seductive, persuasive advertisements announcing the bill of fare at the local movie houses are becoming bigger and bolder every day.

For example, in the three northern Ontario newspapers which are mentioned here—the *Sault Ste. Marie Star*, the *Sudbury Star*, and the *North Bay Nugget*—all of these newspapers carry movie advertisements because they are, of course, paid for the space.

In carrying out a little experiment, this editorial writer clipped the entertainment pages from all three daily newspapers on Saturday, March 14. He laid them out on a large table and compared them. The *Sault Ste. Marie Star*—here are some of the titillating bits from it: “Love With the Proper Stranger”—in the advertisement copy it said that this is “their second meeting. Their first meeting was casual and yet there came a moment when everything was risked with the proper stranger.”

Another was entitled: “Nude in His Pocket.” The copy read: “Sexy, saucy, compelling. You name it. That has it.”

Well, that would bring on the suckers. It is very neat copy and very compelling.

The next was a movie advertised, which was so bad they censored its title. The copy read like this: “At last a film that dares to shock you with a new kind of raw, naked power and realism. The daring movie that people are talking about, the kind of adult drama that audiences have been waiting for.”

And so on. “Too Young to Love” is another one: “Fifteen-year-old party girl. The picture that exposes the modern madness called young love.”

The other, “The West End Jungle” was about “the girls that tamed London,” and so on.

And then we have, of course, the one that the *Harvard Lampoon* considers the worst picture of the year, “Cleopatra”, which was shown here and it is the biggest bathroom in history.

“Every ticket holder guaranteed a seat,” the advertisement said, “this is the closest you can get to a bath tub without a bath.”

Now, sir, I know you have your censor board, but certainly I do not know that they do much censoring about the advertisements. Some of them are very lurid and in most cases they are come-ons to bring the public out just the same as when you go to the news-stands and find these books with very intriguing pictures on the cover but if you read through the book you wonder where the dickens that incident happened.

Again seriously, sir, I think that possibly it may be just as I have read about these people that are on the hon. Attorney General's committee with regard to obscene literature.

After reading that trash and looking at things for years and years they certainly get fed up, so possibly it might be a good idea to do something, possibly change the people on the censorship board and bring in some new blood and see what their ideas are.

I certainly think that we are getting a little out of hand. If these things were as they are supposed to be, then something might be done about it. But as I say again, suckers are born every minute, and you get them still at the movies.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I notice that there seems to have been a broader approach to film censorship, an easing in some restrictions; not particularly in Ontario but across the western world. Would the hon. Minister agree that this is the situation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could sum it up this way. What we are doing in Ontario and have been doing for some time, is to establish a system of classification. I think every hon. member would agree that what is one's man sweet is another man's poison—I am afraid that the exact expression escapes me—and it would appear—

Some hon. members: One man's meat is another man's poison.

Hon. Mr. Auld: One man's meat is another man's poison; and there has never been any unanimity in society on what people should read or see or in fact what they like to eat or what they like to look at in terms of paintings.

I think that to give one example, at the moment the film which won the academy award, “Tom Jones”, a couple of nights ago, I understand is still banned from one of the western provinces. Now that gives a pretty good indication of the extremes there might be.

I would say that the system which has been in operation in Ontario for some time, and which is being studied, I may say, by some of the other jurisdictions and being implemented by other jurisdictions, is the one which has probably worked out most satisfactorily. I will not comment on the reading of the editorial by my friend the hon. member for Nipissing. I have had one letter which I shall mention which was from a lady who said that she had been to a film and thought it was shocking, but just to make sure, she went back three times.

There will always be a difference of opinion, and I think that the system of

classification whereby the viewer or the patron can get a fairly good idea of what kind of a film it is before they go in, is probably the best one that we will reach. I do not think that we will ever have perfection.

This system does have some benefit in connection with the come-on type of thing which the hon. member mentioned. I just say this too in that connection, that there are only two kinds of advertising to my knowledge which are restricted in any way. One is film advertising and the other is liquor advertising, but there is nothing to prevent an advertiser for any other product in using almost any kind of photograph or word or phrase to encourage people to use or to buy his products.

Mr. Troy: There is The Pure Foods Act.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Troy: Under The Pure Foods Act what you say must be factual.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is nothing to prevent you having a pretty girl selling cornflakes. I think this is one of the points my hon. friend was making a moment ago.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say I think that our board has done an excellent job in establishing and carrying out this classification system and I think in all fairness that it is probably working as well as any other system in North America; and better than in many other jurisdictions where there may be in effect no control and simply a number of court cases on some sort of an obscenity law, so neither the public nor the trade have any idea as to what they can probably do, and the public has no idea of what kind of films are being shown as far as they and their own children are concerned.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on this I am interested in two points that the hon. Minister raised. First of all, I am thinking of the remark in which the hon. Minister mentioned that there was no unanimity in connection with what one person likes and another dislikes and which was referred to as one man's meat and another man's poison.

On the other hand, by the very fact of having established the provincial censor and a provincial censorship board he is suggesting that there must be standards of poison for some people and meat for others. I think this must be clear to the hon. Minister that he is describing certain standards for our community. I am not saying whether this is good or bad. I am asking the hon. Minister—he

has given three standards—I am sorry, I am thinking of the three categories that there are.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, three classifications.

Mr. Thompson: Now my question is that I am not sure that a Legislature should judge morality, but apparently there is a set-up for this purpose and we are discussing a man who judges moral influences and we are going to pass on his salary. Could the hon. Minister tell us what are the categories and has there been a change? What is the first category of film and why would this type of film be dangerous except to the very adult and mature person? Then you have the second-class category of film which a general group can see, and I think your third category is for a family group.

I do not go to the films very much, so I am not sure, but I understand the third category means that young children would not be endangered by the kind of thing that is depicted. Tell us what kind of things are you looking for in the first test that make you think they are very dangerous; and when you are answering I wonder could you say, has there been a modifying of the standards in the past four years; has there been a change in the past four years?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I thought I mentioned at the outset on this vote, there are three classifications. You might say the unclassified which seem to be suitable for all ages; the adult which the board regards as perhaps unsuitable for children or of not too much interest to children—that classification was first adopted in 1946; and then the restricted classification which prohibits anyone under 18 years from viewing the film—that was instituted in July, 1953. Now I think it is obvious that if it is classified as restricted, then it is felt that this is totally unsuitable for persons under 18 years of age.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask: what are the standards which we are safeguarding? Is it murder and sex that are the deep concern, that children should not be exposed to this? What is the censor watching to cut out in this classification?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would think that it could be many things, Mr. Chairman. It could be a great deal of violence. There could be no particular sex to it. Or it could be some sort of perversion, for instance. In filming some of the novels which have been published over the years and which have received wide critical acclaim. Perhaps some of the things

that were described in those novels are quite proper for adults to read and to see, but adults would not want their children to see them. It would be very difficult for me, Mr. Chairman, to run down a list and even then it could not be accurate, because under certain circumstances one thing might be acceptable and under another it would not. I would refer my hon. friend to films that he has seen in which perhaps some of the words used, if they were used in another context, would not be in very good taste or perhaps it might be considered that they should be deleted, but in a certain context in a certain historical period they might be quite proper. I hope that will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. Thompson: I gather, sir, this really becomes a subjective decision by the censor rather than an objective criterion that he has to go by. By that I mean, he does not have a set of rules saying that if a man or woman is hit over the head eight times instead of four, then this comes under one restrictive class or another. We rely on the good taste of the censor and on his personal decision on this. Am I right in this, sir?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say, Mr. Chairman, it would be a combination of both objective and subjective.

Mr. Thompson: I have seen a film which was shown in Europe and then I have seen the film which has been censored by him and I could see the reason why he deleted the certain part, but many of us are not able to assess whether he has good taste or not because we do not see what he has done. How, sir, would it not be a situation of relying on his subjective decision?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Of course, what my hon. friend says holds true in any operation where deletions are made, whether it would be in the field of films or books, where a book may well be censored by the publisher simply because he feels this is either not in good taste or it is not good business. I do not know how we could ever define a field as nebulous and as changing as the classification of films. As I say, it is a changing field and things that are acceptable today perhaps may not have been 50 years ago and vice versa. I think it is a question of having a body of people whose judgment is generally accepted by the public, which indicates that they are in tune with the times. I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, that it would appear to me, from my observations of the scene in Ontario insofar as films are concerned, that this is exactly what we have at the present time.

Mr. Thompson: In view of this, I have a feeling that the hon. Minister has a certain reluctance about censorship by government and yet I think also he feels that there is a necessity for some kind of control so that there is not open license with respect to films being shown. But he is suggesting that there are changing moral attitudes and I would agree with him on that. Do you have a change in your board that reflects the new thinking of people? What is the composition of the censorship board and the background of the censor?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I could give my hon. friend the basic details of the members of the board. Mr. Silverthorn, who is the chairman, has been in the public service since August 27, 1934. He worked in the business college field and completed public school, high school and business college. Mr. McFee, the vice-chairman, has primary and secondary education and was in professional sports for a number of years. He entered the public service in 1935. Mr. Knowles took primary and secondary education here in Toronto, worked for the *Evening Telegram* for a number of years and British and Colonial Press Limited, and entered the public service in 1950. Mrs. Dunlop, who had primary and secondary and business education, was a member of the school board in Toronto for a number of years. She entered the public service in 1963. Mr. Scholes, who was educated here in Toronto in primary and secondary education, has been on the board since 1945.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, with no reflection on the present persons of this board, it might be helpful to complement the board with people who have other areas of criteria of taste. I am thinking of such people who are actually in the creative field. I understand from what you are listing that most of the people have academic accomplishments in business school and so on. I am thinking that after all, this board is the group that is establishing the tastes of not only our young people but of our adults as well in the field of theatre. I would think that perhaps we could broaden it to reflect others as well as the interest of a few.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would not quite agree with my hon. friend that the board is establishing the tastes of the young people. I would think that it is keeping current with the pace of the young people's parents and the people at large in the province. But of course, it is always well to ensure that we are keeping up with the times. I think that

the board has done this up until now but my hon. friend's suggestion is a good one.

I might just say that from what I am told by the board, probably there is less difficulty in dealing with the films produced by the major permanent producers in this country, and in other countries, than there is with those films which are made by independents—I would not call them fly-by-nights—some from many parts of the globe including North America. In these latter cases there is no continuing organization which wants to stay in business and wants to please the public, to perhaps educate the public but not just to try to shock the public. It would appear that more and more there is responsibility in the industry. There will always be the fellow who comes along with something that he wants to make a fast buck on and which would cause a great deal of concern if it were perhaps shown without being classified, but that appears to be less of a problem now than it was a few years ago.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I would just end with this, that I have talked with several producers—I am not acquainted with many producers of films but I have talked with several—and on the whole they feel that there is an understanding of their work by the board. However, they have mentioned to me, and I am not going into this in the House, two situations of censorship where it seems that the censor, probably with a very genuine interest in safeguarding the morality of the people, cut out a particular situation that was not really an immoral situation. It was something like cutting, according to the producer, a soliloquy out of Hamlet, and to him it destroyed the whole dramatic effect of the film.

I felt surely this would not be the situation but I am not sure whether we have people who have been in the artistic field on the board, and for this reason I suggest that we might complement it.

Mr. Troy: There may be, Mr. Minister, changes certainly in our morals but nevertheless, as far as I am concerned, adultery is adultery just the same as it was 2,000 years ago; lust is still lust.

But I was going to ask you: What about this? Can the censor board—as pointed out in this letter the psychiatrist sternly tells the audience that some poor sick person, after seeing this film "Psycho," goes out and commits three murders. Now how does the censor board know that there may not be some sick person in the audience? Just because you say "adult entertainment" it does

not mean that the people there, of 21 or 31 or any age, are adults in mentality.

You talk about mature persons. Some people I know are well beyond the age of voting and they are no more mature than a little babe in arms. And I think, sir, that this man has a very good point here about these films of violence; because if you publish things or show things you may induce a person, who is sick in his mind, to go and do it.

I remember in London during the war years, when I was on leave, some girl jumped out of an apartment building and was impaled on those iron fences you find around these apartments. In a week there were two more of the same type just because, I suppose, they brooded on it.

Then we find a double bill advertised. One may be for adult entertainment, the other is general entertainment. If the adult entertainment comes first then what happens to the youngsters who may be there? No, the family film may come first and what do they do then? Does the theatre manager say, "Now all you youngsters have to get out of here. There is a film you are not supposed to see"?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, just to interrupt and explain to the hon. member, perhaps I did not make clear that "adult entertainment" is simply a guide. There is no restriction. The only classification which carries with it a restriction, as far as children are concerned, is the restricted classification. "Adult entertainment" is simply a guide to the parents as to whether they want to let their children go to the theatre to see the film in question or not; or whether they want to take them.

Mr. Troy: Are they allowed to go in without their parents? Under eighteen, is it restricted? They are not allowed, eh? So there is no age limit any more so far as an adult entertainment film is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Never has been.

Mr. Troy: Never has been? Oh, what do you mean? I think you had better look back to your regulations.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member for Nipissing that lust remains lust, licentiousness remains licentiousness, and adultery remains adultery. And I do not know how, sir, in the field of film censorship, we establish absolute standards. These things

pervade society, and I am not at all sure that society need run from the evidence of them in the film industry.

The other aspect which interests me in this particular vote, and I follow here on a point raised by the hon. member for Dovercourt, is that I think there is a tendency to censor excessively in Ontario, a tendency which is reflected in the makeup of the board.

I, too, think that one would do well to have theatrical people on the board, artists of various kinds, academics from fields of higher education, teachers from fields of secondary education, people representative of the legal and jurisprudence community generally, who reflect in the course of everyday work changing social attitudes. I do not think we are bound by moral absolutes here; but we must try to reflect general changing social attitudes.

I am not sure that what the French see, the English see, the Germans see, and the Scandinavians see, should not be seen by the people of Ontario.

I have never been able to comprehend why certain slices of films are deleted. I have never been able to fully comprehend why we have such delicate moral sensibilities as compared with the others. I suspect that there is a sufficient degree of sophistication on this continent to comprehend certain films and to not be destroyed by them. I therefore simply rise to echo strongly the suggestion that the board might be broadened to reflect the maturity which has become evident in the postwar period in European censorship areas, and that might have a salutary effect here.

Let it be said to my hon. friend opposite that I am a little embarrassed by the western province which has seen fit to censor "Tom Jones," and it is totally beyond my understanding how this kind of thing can happen.

Vote 2108 agreed to.

On vote 2109:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Perth.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it comes under this vote or not, but I would like to say a few words regarding the tourist industry and how it affects the riding which I have the honour to represent.

Also, regarding the historical branch, it was my pleasure to take a part in the unveiling of a plaque honouring the late Timothy Eaton in the county of Perth in the village of Kirkton, where he had his first

store. I would like to commend the department and the officials of that branch for the very fine arrangements they made on that occasion; and I want to assure them that the women's institute which brought about this study and made this presentation is very happy in the consummation of having this plaque placed there.

In connection with the tourist industry itself, I do not think there is any place in the province, other than Niagara Falls, which is possibly more interested in tourists. And the incentive is there in one of the greatest attractions this province, possibly all Canada, has—and I refer to the Stratford Shakespearean Festival which starts its 12th year this present year. This has received support from all over America. As a matter of fact, in the 12 years, attendance has gone from 68,000 to over 300,000. The box receipts have gone from \$206,000 to approximately \$1 million.

The shows themselves, which originally ran for six weeks, have been extended to 16 weeks. Including rehearsal times, the actors are now hired for a six-month period. So you can see the employment which has developed from what started as a small industry, you might put it, yet is now the biggest single tourist attraction there is, other than Niagara Falls, in this country, in my estimation.

I would like, with the hon. Minister's permission, with that of Mr. Chairman, to show a brochure of this festival; and if you have not already visited Stratford, it is a very beautiful city, try to come up to the festival this year.

Thank you.

Vote 2109 agreed to.

On vote 2110:

Mr. F. Guindon (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a few minutes to give you some idea of the work of the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission and to tell you of a few of the plans we have for it.

First, however, I feel that I must pay tribute to the memory of one of the men whose dreams and whose work made this entire project possible. On November 27, Dr. J. L. Carrol died in Brockville. Dr. Carrol had been associated with the commission since its earliest planning stages and, in the final years of his life, had devoted a great deal of time and effort to the commission. He was one of the first members and served as vice-chairman until his retirement

in December, 1962. His death was a genuine loss to our commission. We feel that Upper Canada Village and the commission parks system will long stand as a memorial to this dedicated man. And, to commemorate the doctor's name, it has been decided that the museum of the river—a museum designed to show the importance of the St. Lawrence River in the development of Upper Canada—will be called the Dr. J. L. Carrol Memorial Museum.

This has been a year of considerable change for the commission. This change is best reflected in the proposal, now given Royal assent, to alter the name of the commission to the St. Lawrence Parks Commission. The dropping of the word "development" from the title reflects the end of one era of the commission's history and the beginning of another stage. After years of operations, we feel that the major phase of our work no longer is in the field of development. While we hope to continue to expand the parks and historic sites system in the years to come, the main role of the commission now is an operational one.

But the changes in the past year have been more than those of title and philosophy. In placing increasing emphasis on the operational aspect of the commission, its first general manager, Mr. O. R. Dalzell, was hired last year to direct the day-to-day work of the commission. Under his direction many new procedures and systems have been installed to give both added economy and added flexibility to the commission.

Another step, once again reflecting the commission's changing role, was its transfer to The Department of Tourism and Information from The Department of Economics and Development. Once again the thinking was that with the planning and development stages behind us, the commission was naturally suited to be a part of the department concerned most directly with tourism in Ontario. Although this change came about only last August, it already has begun to show results. We feel there is a great deal of scope here for co-ordination between the activities of the department and those of the commission. Already the organization and methods branch of The Provincial Treasurer's Department has undertaken a study to reduce overlapping in the administrative branches. This study, we believe, will lead to increased efficiency in the commission operation. Sharing services with the department, whenever possible, will lead to overall economies.

Last year's operating season was by far the most successful in the commission's his-

tory. During the five months that the parks, campsites and historic sites were open to the public there was a total of 2,016,000 admissions. It marked the first time that the total admissions passed the two million mark and was an increase of more than 250,000 over the previous year.

By far the largest increase was shown in the use of our parks and campsites. Last year, 1,337,000 persons visited these parks and campsites. This year the total was 1,600,000. Fort Henry also showed a significant increase in visitors, rising by 16,000 admissions to a total of 186,000 persons. In addition, it is estimated that another 18,000 were present for the joint sunset ceremonial performed by the Fort Henry Guard and the U.S. Marine Corps.

At some of our parks and campsites, overcrowding has been a major problem. The only way of meeting this problem is through enlargement of our facilities and last year saw the opening of two new parks and campsites.

The largest of these is Grenville Bay, just east of Prescott. It proved highly popular during its first season of operation and was visited by a total of nearly 20,000 people. The other new addition was the seven-acre Fairfield Park west of Kingston which had a total attendance for the season of just less than 46,000 people. Thus these two parks accounted for about a quarter of the overall increase in attendance at all the commission sites.

However, many of our parks, particularly those at the eastern end of the 170-mile system, still suffer from overcrowding and we anticipate in the years to come that this Legislature will be asked to approve funds for even further extensions of the commission properties and facilities.

To some extent, 1963 was the year of the Fort Henry Guard. On two separate occasions—and on two separate continents—the guard provided some of the most colourful highlights of the summer season. For two and a half weeks in June, the guard appeared twice daily at the highly regarded Royal Tournament in London, England. The Royal Tournament is considered one of the world's great military displays and the inclusion of the guard—which is, do not forget, a unit of summer soldiers—was a great honour to the unit and to the province of Ontario. As can be seen from the press clippings, it certainly is no exaggeration to say that it was the hit of the show.

The guard's invitation to the tournament, to appear with such illustrious company as the Royal Marines and the King's Troop of

the Royal Horse Artillery, was its second appearance there. It marked the first time in the 73-year history of the tournament that any unit from outside the British Isles had ever been granted a second invitation to appear.

During its stay in England, the guard also had the honour of being inspected by the Honourable George Drew, then Canadian High Commissioner in London, and by Her Majesty the Queen. The inspection by the Queen, accompanied by the President of India, came at the official opening of a showing of Canadian art in London. But, if the guard as a whole was a hit at the Royal Tournament, the various members of the unit were equally popular outside the confines of Earls Court.

Londoners were extremely impressed by the appearance and manners of these young university students and they proved to be the finest possible ambassadors for this province.

The second highlight of the Fort Henry season came in late August. Approximately 18,000 people jammed Fort Henry to watch the guard perform a joint ceremonial with the Presidential Review Unit and Drum and Bugle Band of the United States Marine Corps. This marked the second visit of the Marine Corps to Fort Henry and symbolized the extremely close friendship between these two groups.

One other new departure this year involving the guard was the production of a recording of the weekly retreat ceremonial. The ceremonial was first performed on a weekly basis this year and the recording of the drill team, battle tactics and fife and drum corps has proved an extremely popular souvenir of the fort.

Plans have started for a recording featuring Upper Canada Village and it is hoped to have it produced in time for sale when this year's season opens May 15.

The year also saw other new attractions designed to publicize the commission and draw tourists to the area.

One of these was the first annual Upper Canada Village regatta held last June. More than 25 sailboats from all over Ontario and northern New York state took part in the two-day regatta held on the St. Lawrence river right opposite Upper Canada Village and Crysler Farm Battlefield Park. The regatta organizers were extremely pleased with the response and a second regatta has been scheduled for May 30 and May 31 of this year.

On January 18 a somewhat different race—although it once again used the St. Lawrence

river—was held in the Long Sault Parkway area. This was a sports car race on ice sponsored by the Cornwall Light Car Association. And to those who might doubt the drawing power of such an event, I would like to mention that nearly 1,000 cars jammed the spectator parking area.

The commission is normally thought of as a summer operation. However, we have moved this year to add an early spring attraction in the parkland to the north of Upper Canada Village, an old-fashioned sugaring-off. In the midst of a stand of some 1,200 maple trees, the commission has reconstructed an old sugaring-off shanty. It is open to the public and can easily be reached by a trail running into the bush from the highway. It was in full operation a few weeks ago and a large number of spectators were on hand to watch the processing of the maple sugar and syrup. The produce of the sugaring-off was placed on sale at the shanty site and in the regular commission outlets at Upper Canada Village and Fort Henry.

A complaint often heard at the village was the lack of activities outside of a tour of the village itself. This year, we will be taking two major steps to overcome this problem.

In June we hope to open a nine-hole golf course on the park property immediately north of the village and Crysler park. This will be the first stage of an 18-hole tournament course and should prove very popular both with tourists and with residents of the area.

The second project is a miniature railway to carry visitors throughout the park. Proposals for the railway, a replica of those of the mid-nineteenth century, already have been called and it is hoped to have it in operation this summer. The first stage of the miniature railway will carry passengers from the store at the entrance gate to the village, along the river side of the Crysler Battlefield memorial mound and along to Crysler beach. The second stage, when completed, will be an extension to include the railway museum and the marina to the west of the park.

Visitors to Upper Canada Village this year will see several changes and additions. Besides the opening of the Dr. J. L. Carrol Memorial Museum to the public, Christ Church will be seen in its fully completed condition for the first time.

In conjunction with the cheese centennial committee, a reproduction of a 100-year-old cheese factory will be constructed between government house and the museum of agriculture. Opening of the cheese factory will commemorate the first production of cheddar cheese in Ontario in June, 1864.

Because of the extremely heavy demand for the bread produced in the village bake-ovens, a second bake house will be opened this year. The new bake house will double the quantity of bread produced in the village. The extra bread will be offered for sale at the village store and will be used in the restaurants and dining rooms of the village. A woodshed also has been added to the schoolmaster's house—after all, where else could the poor man do his caning of the pupils—and a drive shed has been built to house the doctor's gigs.

All of these, Mr. Chairman, are part of our continuing programme to make Upper Canada Village, Fort Henry and the parks and campsites of this system the best development of its kind in North America. I would like to thank the hon. members for their attention to this report. I trust I will have the support of all of them in voting for sums needed to carry on the work of the commission.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on vote 2110, but before doing so I thought it only right that I should congratulate the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) on his attire this afternoon, brightening up the rather sombre, and I might even say conservative-looking, men on the Opposition. I would like to congratulate him for giving us this little breath of spring on the other side of the House. I might say that he is second only to our own hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mrs. Pritchard) who, from this particular row here, it is always a pleasure to see and to wonder at the very fine-looking hats that she invariably wears.

Now in commenting on vote 2110—

Mr. Sopha: What is the matter with the Leafs?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They needed the hon. member for Kingston last night.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member should see if he can keep up his stick-handling now.

Mr. Apps: As I was saying, commenting on 2110, being the member for Kingston and the islands, I too would like to add my congratulations to the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission for the wonderful work that they have done, particularly east of Kingston. I would also corroborate entirely the statements from the hon. member for Stormont, Mr. Chairman, that the sunset cere-

mony at Fort Henry is one thing that everybody in this country should see, because I think it is the finest spectacle of its kind in the world.

But I was rather abashed to hear him say that the planning and development work of the commission was now over and I would respectfully suggest to him that it is only half over. Granted, it could be all over on all that section east of Kingston, but I would submit to him, and through him to the commission, the fact that there is an area west of Kingston that can certainly stand a great deal of planning and development yet. I would hope that his commission in their future plans will not overlook this area, which sometimes is called the Quinte Parkway, because it is one of the most beautiful, and at the same time historic, drives in eastern Ontario. As I mentioned before, this is from Kingston west to Adolphustown.

I would like to pay tribute here to a group of very dedicated citizens of that area, and in Kingston, who in their efforts to preserve some of this shoreline, the historical value of this shoreline, have spent a great deal of their time in order to provide a plan for the overall development of this particular area. I would hope that the commission would very seriously consider the implementation of this plan in their development of this area.

I know there are certain difficulties in this. I know that it can be done. If the commission will take a look at it, use this plan as a guide and in co-operation with the municipalities concerned, lay out a plan for this area that will preserve this beautiful drive and also the historic possibilities of it. I would suggest if they will take the time to lay out this plan and gradually develop it over the next ten or 15 years, and promote it as they go, then they will have west of Kingston the same type of drive, historical areas, picnic grounds and parks that they have so successfully completed east of Kingston. I would hope that they will consider this very seriously. I would hope also that they will make up their minds and do it.

As I mentioned before, do it gradually. Pick up some land as it becomes available, promote those particular areas as they become available and so induce commercial activities to come in as well and in that way it will benefit the municipalities financially as well.

I realize, at the present time, many of these municipalities look on this plan with a little bit of disfavour because they feel they are going to lose assessment if some of this land is used for parks and picnic ground development. But I maintain that if this area is picked

up gradually, promoted and developed, the commercial developments which will come in because of that will far outweigh any revenue the municipalities might lose through making this land into parks.

So at one time I am congratulating the commission on the wonderful job they have done, and it has truly been a wonderful job, from Kingston east, and I am also suggesting to them that their planning and development is only half over and that now is the time to start looking at the land from Kingston west, to do the same job there as they have done so capably east of Kingston. Thank you.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, I would also like to congratulate the commission on the fine job they have done throughout the area and particularly, of course, I want to refer to the Adolphustown Park and the new Fairfield Park, which are in the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox.

The Fairfield park is a new one which was opened last year. It is approximately four acres in area and, in its first year of operation, had an attendance of over 45,000 visitors. We owe a great debt of thanks to the Fairfield family. This property was originally acquired, and a fine frame house was constructed, by William Fairfield, who was a United Empire Loyalist, in the year 1792. It has been continuously maintained and inhabited by this family throughout the intervening years and, of course, just recently, they made available to the commission and to the people of Ontario, this beautiful historic property and its furnishings. Certainly the response of the general public is gratifying indeed.

I also understand that, in due course, a Mrs. Mabel Fairfield Gutzeit of Bath, who also has a very historical property and possessions, is going to donate this to the province, and I know that in future years the people of Ontario will greatly appreciate her generosity, also.

In regard to the Adolphustown park, we really ought to be very grateful for assistance we have received there. In the beginning there was the UEL burying ground with a memorial, and this was in a very sad state of repair. The United Empire Loyalists Association of Toronto, assisted by the late Mrs. R. S. McLaughlin of Oshawa, kindly restored this cemetery, made it a place of beauty, and then presented it to the province—on condition they acquired it as a park. The province acquired some 30 acres at that time and, later, 30 acres more. Originally the park was started under Lands and Forests.

Of course, when the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission was established, they took over the provincial parks in Lennox and Addington county.

I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston and in many ways I agree with what he has said. However, I will say that, in all honesty, I feel that association of Kingston which is promoting a parkway has perhaps a different viewpoint to what I have on a great many matters. I feel that one of their outstanding members thought that he would like to compare this area, and make it a second Niagara parkway; and others compare it with what has been done at Upper Canada Village, and along the St. Lawrence. My own feeling is that this location is unique in itself, and can stand on its own merits, providing it is developed in the proper way.

I do not think it should be called a parkway. I think that a better name suggestion might come forth. A name which has been in my mind is "Quinte Scenicway"—because it encompasses the beginning of the Bay of Quinte at the eastern end, in Lennox; and the end of the Bay of Quinte, near Trenton. A name should be provided which will describe the whole length of Highway 33 from Kingston to Trenton, most of which of course is entirely through my riding.

Only by so doing are people going to be invited to come in, both from the west and from the east; and there are certain assets which appeal very much to the travelling public. I know, even as far north as the Lakehead, on a northwestern Ontario tour several years ago, I met people who, when they saw the name of my riding on my coat lapel, said, "Oh, I have been down there and I have crossed over that free ferry. That is a magnificent drive." That is the kind of reputation that drive has.

Furthermore, a great many people do not know of the beautiful view which can be obtained from Lake on the Mountain, just on the Glenora side of the ferry crossing, and which is only approximately about two miles from the Adolphustown park. So I feel that all of the tourist advantages of the area could best be described, and brought to the attention of the people of Ontario and of our visiting tourists, by a name which would encompass the whole length of that section of highway.

I am going to say, and this has been intimated by the hon. member for Kingston, that certain local people have had a concern about what would happen if more parks were established, because certain things have

not developed at the Adolphustown park, in connection therewith, as we might have expected. The park itself is beautiful and that is something of which we are very proud, but nevertheless there was a reduction of over 16,000 guests there last year.

Efforts have been made to operate a concession in the past but they were given up because there was not enough business forthcoming. I had rather expected that perhaps a motel or restaurant or some business might have located adjacent to the park and it would have been of benefit to local people. This has not occurred. What has happened though, is that 7,841 more vehicles passed by the gates of Adolphustown park, many of them Kingston people. I know that some of them went to the Outlet Beach Park in Prince Edward county because of its magnificent beach.

Well now, Adolphustown park and the parks along this area cannot compare in certain respects. They attempted to have an artificial beach. I think an improvement can be made on that and the swimming could be improved, but still it can never equal the natural beaches in Prince Edward county. Therefore, the development along this road should be in line with the unique assets we have. The number of people who camp there in tents is limited, and this is not overly productive as far as the local people are concerned. Consequently I feel that something more is needed there to make that park active and give it variety, which I am sure will make it unique among all the parks in the province of Ontario.

I might say that adjacent to that area there is perhaps one of the most famous muskellunge fishing grounds which can be found anywhere. A resident of Adolphustownship by the name of Herbert Punchard regularly catches 'lunge there every year. He has had his picture appear in the paper with 30-pound 'lunge and rare indeed is the year he is not successful. Sometimes he catches three or four.

Just around by Amherst Island I understand that there is some of the greatest bass fishing that can be located anywhere. A conservation officer invited me to go fishing with him one time. He said he was not a fisherman because he did not have the patience. But he said here was one place he liked to fish because he said he was really kept busy.

Just around the corner on the other side there is Hay Bay, which is famous for its pickerel fishing. A little farther along is the scene of the famous Harmsworth boat races.

I would suggest that the commission look

very carefully into this whole situation. It might be able to interest a commercial fishing operator to take certain paying guests, visitors to the park or tourists, on fishing trips if there were enough indicating their willingness to go. Just let a few 'lunge be caught there and a few good bass, and people are going to want to fish those waters. There should certainly be landing docks at Adolphustown or at other property that can be acquired, and pretty soon the people will be fishing on their own.

Furthermore, this is often what happens: People talk about the highways being crowded on holidays. Sure it is crowded because the people say, "All we can do is go into the park, sit down at some picnic tables, there is some water there if there is not good swimming, and we can just go there and do that." They feel they might as well go out and sit along the highway because the park has not enough to offer to these people. After they have once visited it and seen its beauty and its historic sites, they realize they cannot even buy the children an ice cream cone or anything of that kind. Things have got to be done to improve that situation and I think that is where the start should be made rather than by the acquisition of land. I think it is all right for land to be acquired but I think that the land should be acquired with specific purposes in mind, not just to get land. Another thing that would be very useful would be a dock at which small boats could land. Perhaps there should be some playground equipment for children. There perhaps should be amusements available so that people can do something. It is not everybody who can enjoy lying around for three or four hours at a time and doing nothing.

I think that in our area we do have a situation that, as I have said, is unique. It is probably one of the most scenic views to be found anywhere. It is historic, and I agree with the statements that have been made by the hon. member for Kingston that it is certainly worth promoting. I would suggest that the commission look into this whole proposal, keeping in mind local assessment opinions and I would urge that an effort be made to see if steps can be taken that will result in local people securing a greater benefit than they have had until now.

We are grateful for the park but we feel it really has not attained the potential which it should. I am sure that with a little effort and a little thought, the commission will make it perhaps one of the very best parks in the St. Lawrence development.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister or the reporting member of the commission, if some young student who was going to major in history wanted to get a job at Upper Canada Village in the summertime, to whom would he write?

Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, there would be no problem at all. The young student applies through our personnel officer. He gets an application form. I would suggest that he should apply early, in January, preferably.

Mr. Troy: Too late this year.

Mr. Guindon: As far as I can recall, I think we have about 75 vacancies for this coming season. We certainly had over 500 or 600 applications.

Mr. Troy: You are selective, though. You will take the best—

Mr. Guindon: No, the personnel officer does the selection.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am quite impressed with what has been said about this park and commission. I am rather a dollar-and-cent man myself. How much money does it make or lose for the province of Ontario?

Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, I think if you want to know as far as operation and maintenance is concerned, we cleared 75 per cent in the last year. I will get the exact amount.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to phrase my question this way: How much was taken in and how much was spent?

Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member mean how much money was spent since the beginning?

Mr. Whicher: No, in the one year.

Mr. Guindon: In the one year? The estimated operating cost was \$982,000 for 1963-64 and the revenues were \$750,000.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, in other words, this was a net cost to the taxpayers of roughly \$232,000 last year?

Mr. Guindon: A deficit.

Mr. Whicher: I believe there is consideration that the cost to the people who use the parks might be increased so that the provincial parks, as far as operating expenses are concerned, would be put at a break-even point. Has this been investigated because—

considering the fantastic costs of all departments of government—I would be very pleased if this would come to at least the break-even point.

Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, as you know the commission has no jurisdiction in the fixing of admission fees. This is done by the Parks Integration Board, but as you are well aware, at the present rate of \$3 for a season, this is mighty cheap to give a family the right to be in the parks all over the province, whether it is a park under The Department of Lands and Forests or the commission, so it is up to government policy whether or not it will be increased in the future.

Mr. Troy: I would like to ask the chairman of the commission, has your tavern in the village a licence?

Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, we have no licence for the tavern, but there are places around Morrisburg and Cornwall which would certainly answer the hon. member's needs.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What is served in the tavern? Not lemonade, I hope.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would the commissioner explain what the \$67,000 was spent on for Dalton K. Camp and Associates?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the commission's advertising programme is handled by D. K. Camp and Associates and probably has been as big a part in making the operations of the commission successful from the outset as any other thing. The breakdown—

Mr. Whicher: Does this come under tender?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Whicher: It is just given to them?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Actually, what the commission did was in 1960 to ask for proposals from, I think, six or seven advertising agencies. The Camp Associates proposal was the one that the commission felt was the best and that is the one that was adopted. The breakdown is \$14,890 for newspaper advertising, \$14,869 for billboards, \$22,100 for the main folder, and then there were certain other folders on camping and so on; posters, \$663; other services, press release forms, general publicity and so on, made up the balance.

Mr. Newman: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: He is not the man who produced the bilious canoes, is he?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not for the commission.

Mr. Singer: Oh, not for the commission.

Mr. Newman: Would the hon. Minister tell me, does the department make any attempt to sell that whole complex to the schools by publicity sent throughout the schools of the province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not throughout the province. Indirectly the commission has had a programme of a prize—in fact, I think it was three prizes for different groups of grades—for an essay on the village or an essay on the period indicated by the village. This has been primarily through the eastern Ontario region and was worked in conjunction with school inspectors and so on.

Now material is of course available to the schools and a great deal is disseminated to teachers whose classes are going to be visiting the village. There have been, I am informed, about 50,000 students at the village during the month of June who came in their classes, and probably this is the most graphic way of getting the story across. But what the commission has had to do in the past, and it has been working more successfully as people get used to the system, is to ask the teacher to write in for material before the class comes so that they have some discussion about it, they have some knowledge of the things they are going to see and they organize their tour a little better. I can assure the hon. member—I do not suppose, being a teacher, he would need this assurance—but if you get 1,000 children in a village with 30-odd buildings and one teacher for 30 or 40, without organization there is a tendency to become chaotic.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister then that he have a showcard, probably 18 by 24 inches, sent to each one of the schools each week selling some portion of the province of Ontario, a nice colourful card, exactly the way tourist travel agencies do, like the various European companies? If this showcard, set up on a bulletin board, were changed each week, I think it would not only be a good geography lesson to the students in the schools, but also would attempt to sell the beauties of Ontario throughout the province by means of the schools.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I have just one more question to ask. I have noticed in the last few days on television, on one of the stations in Toronto, the province of New Brunswick is advertising extensively through the television media and I have been rather impressed with the manner in which they

have done it. Has the hon. Minister seen this, and if so have we in his department any comparable advertising through this TV media?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, again I think we are a little out of order, but I would be glad to answer—

Mr. Whicher: Well, this advertising came up under Mr. Camp.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is no TV in that amount, but there might be. Very briefly, because I want to give any information we can, The Department of Travel and Publicity, now The Department of Tourism and Information, has used TV to a limited extent in the past, generally for what you might call spot promotions, for something like the tulip festival, in a fairly limited area. We might possibly be doing that this year in connection with skiing in certain limited areas where it is within a day or two's drive of a specific skiing area. But to undertake a large programme on television, which is a very expensive medium to use, would require then a great reduction—that is operating within the same budget—a great reduction in the funds spent in newspapers, radio and magazines. It is a question of—perhaps if the hon. member looks into it, he will find out there is an agency acting for New Brunswick, I think he may know the agency—it is really a question of who you want to reach and for what purpose. It may well be that for certain kinds of programmes TV is more effective than some of the other media and this is one of the things that is being studied and one of the things which our research branch will be looking into.

Vote 2110 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, before going into the detailed estimates of this department, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to my predecessor in the department, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay). I am sure that all hon. members of this House, as well as the people of Ontario, were sorry to learn of the hon. member's resignation as a Minister of the

Crown because of ill health. As Minister of Energy Resources and Economics and Development the hon. member gave unsparingly of his time and energy for the benefit of the citizens of our province. And it is largely due to his untiring efforts as Minister of Energy Resources that I am able to present to you today a favourable report on the operations of this department.

I would also like to compliment my deputy Minister, Mr. Hilliard, and all members of the staff for their loyal support, co-operation and assistance since I took over The Department of Energy Resources last October.

In introducing the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management I would like to make a few remarks first, regarding the energy industry.

It should not come as a surprise that energy consumption in Ontario in the past year reached an all-time high. In this province we consumed more natural gas, more oil, and more electric power than ever before. I will go into more detail on this later. It is a very important sign of the health of the economy in this prosperous province. About 37 per cent of all energy used in Canada was used in Ontario. We expect that, by 1975, energy consumption in Ontario will be nearly twice what it is today. The energy studies branch of the department estimates that at that time 25.7 per cent of all energy used in this province will come from coal, coke and manufactured gas; 47.1 per cent from petroleum; 20 per cent from natural gas; 5.9 per cent from water power; and 1.3 per cent from wood, liquefied petroleum gas and nuclear energy.

In the years to come one of the main tasks of the department will be to see that the energy from different sources will at all times be available in abundance and at the lowest possible cost. Without this we could not maintain the necessary economic and industrial growth of this province.

At this point I would like to review briefly each of our energy sources.

The first—oil. In 1963, we used nearly 120 million barrels of oil, that is 4,200 million gallons—an increase of nine per cent over the previous year. While part of this came from refineries in Quebec and western Canada the greatest part, about 80 per cent, was produced by refineries located in Ontario.

The Ontario refineries can process 306,200 barrels per day—an increase in capacity of ten per cent over 1962. Ontario refineries account for 30 per cent of the total Canadian refinery capacity. Some major companies

plan substantial construction of additional capacity but no details have been released to date.

Ontario's own production of oil was 1,205,000 barrels in 1963, or about one per cent of our requirements. While this is a drop in the bucket it is, however, an important segment of industry in Ontario. The department encourages the development of the oil production in Ontario in a number of ways. For example, we provide well records and maps at cost. We give out reprints of Acts and regulations at no charge. The staff of the department give advice, information and supervision at no charge.

The interprovincial oil pipeline extension from Waterdown to Buffalo was completed in 1963 and crude oil from western Canada is now flowing to American refineries in Buffalo. The Imperial Oil Co. pipeline to the new Toronto International Airport, linking to existing lines from the Sarnia refinery, was completed in 1963 enabling direct delivery of aviation fuels. Part of the trans-northern pipeline, carrying Montreal-refined products to Toronto, was reversed in October 1963 resulting in Ontario-refined products displacing foreign oil eastwards to Kingston. The section of the line between Kilbrie near Kingston and Maitland near Brockville has been taken out of operation. This pipeline now supplies Montreal-refined products to the Ottawa Valley only.

I stated earlier that the department is vitally interested in encouraging oil production in Ontario. Continued exploration for oil resulted in the discovery of three new oil pools in 1963. They are located near Duart in Kent county, Verschoyle in Oxford county, and Brigden in Lambton county. Some drilling is still required to determine the commercial potential of these pools but all are most encouraging. Since the beginning of 1964, one additional pool has been discovered in Dunwich township in Elgin county.

Oil production, from those Ontario oil fields in which secondary recovery projects are in effect, forms an important part of the overall total.

There are presently 14 such secondary projects approved by permit or board order. In all cases water is the displacement fluid used or planned. The fields involved are Grand Bend, Warwick, Petrolia, Oil Springs, Shetland, Glencoe, Rodney and Becher. Eleven are in operation, one is under construction, and two are temporarily suspended for alterations.

The amount of additional oil which will be recovered by these projects cannot be

accurately forecast, but a conservative estimate is five million barrels.

A more or less typical case is provided by the operation in the Glencoe Field. Here an experimental flood in 1956 to 1958 showed promise, and a full-scale flood was begun in 1958. Annual production in 1957 was about 14,000 barrels. In 1963, the total was about over 36,000 barrels and this rate should be maintained for some years. Total ultimate recovery is estimated at 350,000 barrels of oil from the portion of the field under flood, which will require the injection of about 2.5 million barrels of water.

Natural gas: During 1963 Ontario consumed 167 billion cubic feet of natural gas, an increase of 12.3 per cent over 1962. The increase is lower than we expected at the beginning of the year. This is mainly due to the unseasonably high temperatures in the last part of 1963.

It is expected that natural gas sales in Ontario in 1964 will reach the 200 billion cubic feet mark.

It is interesting to note that in 1963 there were 622,504 customers using natural gas in Ontario; 91.6 per cent of them were residential users consuming 37 per cent of the total. Only one per cent were industrial customers but they used 49.8 per cent of all natural gas.

Production of natural gas in Ontario in 1963 amounted to 15.9 billion cubic feet, an increase of two per cent over 1962. The Ontario production represents nine per cent of the total consumption of natural gas in the province.

Accompanying the growth in consumption is an increased use of the gas storage facilities. Last year we put 26.2 billion cubic feet of gas in storage and we took out 24.4 billion cubic feet. The Ontario Energy Board authorized further storage facilities by granting permission to Tecumseh Ltd. to inject, store and withdraw gas in the Kimbal-Colinville, Seckerton and Corunna pools, thereby increasing our storage facilities by about 40 billion cubic feet of working storage.

In order to transport the gas stored in these pools to the major consumption areas, Union Gas Co. was authorized to commence construction of a 142-mile-long, 34-inch pipeline extending from Dawn township in Lambton county to a point near Oakville at a cost of \$24 million. The first phase to be completed in 1964 is 60 miles from Dawn township to London at a cost of \$10 million, 95 per cent of which will be spent in Canada.

Very recently, Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Ltd. applied to the National Energy Board for

a certificate to construct a number of compressor stations in Ontario. The stations will be located near Vermilion Bay, Martin, Raith, Hurkett, Jellicoe, Klotz Lake, Calstock, Kapuskasing, Potter, Swastika, Marten River, and Sundridge. The total expenditure involved is close to \$20 million for the Ontario portion of which about 70 per cent will be spent in Canada.

Liquefied petroleum gas: A fast-growing source of energy in this province is liquefied petroleum gas. It is used for a large variety of purposes. We expect that when the pipeline from Empress in Alberta to Winnipeg is operating large quantities will find their way into Ontario. This will probably lead to a greater use of propane appliances, such as forklift trucks, heating for cottages and trailers, and greater use on farms. We will work closely together with industry to see to it that safety is not sacrificed in a period of rapid expansion.

Electric power: This will be fully discussed by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) who will report on the activities of Ontario Hydro. However, I would like to point out that last year in Ontario 39.5 billion kilowatt hours of electricity were generated, an increase of 1.8 billion kwh over 1962, or 4.8 per cent. This is also a new record for Ontario.

Uranium and nuclear power: Canadian production of uranium in 1963 dropped to 8,141 tons, a decrease of about 300 tons over last year. Of this Elliot Lake produced 72 per cent, or about 5,860 tons; Bancroft four per cent or about 326 tons; while the balance of 24 per cent or 1,955 tons was produced in Saskatchewan. The labour force in uranium mines in Ontario dropped from 3,580 in 1962 to 2,900 in 1963.

By the beginning of 1965 there will probably only be two uranium mines operating in Canada—one in Saskatchewan and one in Ontario, Rio Algom's Nordic Mine at Elliot Lake. We expect that the uranium production will decline for the next few years but that an upturn in sales can be expected by about 1970.

The nuclear power demonstrator—NDP-2—in Rolphton, Ontario, is now in service and is mainly used to gain the necessary experience for the staff to man the CANDU reactor once it goes into operation, as well as gain the technical experience necessary to make CANDU a success. The CANDU reactor being constructed at Kincardine is expected to be finished in 1964 and to commence regular commercial service in 1966. The construction is on schedule and well within cost estimates.

Inspection services branch: After having reviewed the various sources of energy for which The Department of Energy Resources has some responsibility I would like to give you a brief review of the key branches in the department.

During 1963 the inspectors of the inspection services branch carried out 20,524 inspections of fuel oil, natural gas, pipelines and liquefied petroleum gas installations.

The function of the department in the inspection field is probably best explained in the policy we follow in appliance inspections. The department stresses the education of those doing the work rather than the policing methods. As far as the appliances are concerned, I can say we have a specification for every type of oil, gas and propane unit and every manufacturer must use these with his product. We also designate the agencies who will test to authorized specifications and place their seal of approval on the appliances. Certain units and appliances are made up for special purposes and will not be production line units. The department will, however, test and approve non-production units if necessary. A total of 2,763 units of this type were approved by the department in 1963. The number of gas, oil and propane appliances and installations in the province at the present time runs into the millions and this creates a considerable inspection load.

Gas fitters, maintenance fitters and pipeline inspectors are now required to have a government licence. Every appliance installation job and all pipeline installations must be directly supervised by a man holding a certificate. From commencement of this programme in 1961 to the close of 1963, there were 6,432 gas fitters, 737 maintenance fitters, 908 pipeline inspectors certified by The Department of Energy Resources.

Prior to December 31, 1963, a voluntary programme of certification resulted in 320 persons receiving liquefied petroleum gas fitters certificates. Since the start of the new year, with the change in regulations, the certification of liquefied petroleum gas fitters has become mandatory. To date, 431 certificates have been issued.

We have distributed several thousand code books during the year and have sponsored an active programme of trade instruction in all parts of the province. I think the best example of this are the classes that were sponsored by the department beginning in April 1961.

To date, sir, approximately 3,000 persons have attended lectures throughout the province and this emphasizes our objective—educa-

tion, in addition to our inspections, is the best approach to fuel safety.

The department has co-operated with the Provincial Institute of Trade Schools in establishing a course for gas fitters. This technical instruction course in gas fitting and servicing has been most enthusiastically received by the trade. The inspection personnel of the department are taking an active part in the course acting as instructors, until such time as the school can develop its own teaching personnel.

We have also produced a manual written in non-technical language to further assist tradesmen. And we have also produced a special manual to assist many small gas companies in their operational and maintenance procedures. We are planning to continue this programme by following the same procedure for all propane fitters in Ontario as was used to licence the natural gas fitters. We are also studying the feasibility of certifying personnel in the fuel oil business similar to natural gas and propane.

Members of the department during the last few years have been working together with representatives of other provinces and associations to effect changes in certain standard codes, and work in this field is continuing.

In November 1962 The Department of Energy Resources issued its first licence to an oil distributor who will distribute fuel oil by pipeline from one main tank to a number of houses in a subdivision. Before issuing this licence the design of this plan was studied from a safety requirement standpoint and before the oil lines in the ground were covered. The system was inspected to be certain that the installation followed the proposed design. In 1963 another licence was issued and two applications are presently being considered. The licences issued were for two subdivisions near Ottawa. The licences under consideration at the present time are for another subdivision in Ottawa and an industrial development in Scarborough.

I would now like to turn to the drilling and production branch. I have already stated earlier that the government is encouraging by various means the exploration and development of our native sources of oil and gas. In 1963, 216 wells were drilled in Ontario and of these 35 were drilled in Lake Erie. Twenty-three of the Lake Erie wells were successful in finding gas thus adding significantly to Lake Erie's gas reserves. Some of the 23 were new pools and 1964 drilling will evaluate these discoveries. Lake Erie is now an important source of natural gas account-

ing for more than 23 per cent of our local production.

The section of the oil and gas industry concerned with lake drilling is fully aware of its obligations to the general public and to the fishing industry. It is continuing to take many steps to help eliminate the hazards from lake production of which the public has been fearful for the past two drilling seasons. The rotary drilling equipment mounted on a converted lake freighter, has proven very effective. At the beginning of the 1964 lake drilling season, a major drilling and production company on Lake Erie will place in operation a newly designed, engineered and constructed drilling barge, on which will be mounted rotary drilling equipment. Blow-out preventers will be used and sewage treatment equipment built in. This same company is designing new well-head assemblies of a simpler design and with a newly designed protective device to allow fishermen's nets to pass over the well-head without fault. In addition, a flexible hose take-off from the well-head in the gathering line is also being designed to help prevent line separation during winter and spring ice conditions on the lake.

A general meeting of all three parties, that is, fishermen, drilling companies, and government, held in the fall, did much to allay the fears of the fishing industry. The department will continue to do all in its power to reduce conflict to a minimum. The Ontario Petroleum Institute, as in past years, has been doing a fine job in promoting technical consultation between the exploration, drilling and production personnel of the oil and gas industry and the department will continue to provide all possible support. The Ontario Gas Council continued its activities in 1963 and held seven meetings. Through the council, the government has obtained industry's views on various matters such as proposed legislative changes, and the wording of proposed new regulations.

The gas and petroleum association is now organizing a committee along the same lines as the gas council so that there will be continuous consultation between the producing industry and The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

The last item I would like to discuss is the Ontario Energy Board. During 1963 the board received 87 applications of which 70 were heard, 13 were withdrawn, and four were heard in January, 1964. There is a great variety in the nature of these hearings. Nineteen hearings were held under The Municipal Franchises Act, 17 hearings were held under

The Ontario Energy Board Act and covered such subjects as rates, authorization to inject gas and arbitration.

Thirty-four hearings were held under The Energy Act covering such items as leave to construct pipelines, pipeline expropriation, secondary recovery of oil, designation of storage areas.

A major public rate hearing of Northern Ontario Natural Gas and its subsidiary Twin City Gas Co. commenced in September, 1962. Hearing of evidence and cross-examination was completed in 1963 and the board is now preparing its reasons for decision which have now been issued.

A second major public rate hearing which had begun in 1962 was that of United Gas Limited. It was concluded in mid-year and the reasons for decision and the rate order were issued in July, 1963.

A new storage area in Zone township was designated and will provide a potential working storage of about 4.9 billion cubic feet of natural gas. In November 1963 the board heard the application of Tecumseh Gas Storage Ltd. for authority to inject, store and remove gas from three of the previously designated Imperial pools namely, Kimball-Colinville, Seckerton and Corunna. Following a two-day hearing in Sarnia the board granted permission thus providing an additional 40 billion cubic feet of working storage.

Throughout the year the board has continued its study and investigation of natural gas storage and related problems. The report of this is now in the final stages of preparation and will be completed at an early date. The fact that the board exists and handles problems very fairly, has led to a more flexible outlook on both sides.

In 1963 the board lost one of its members in the death of Mr. J. J. Wingfelder. His valuable knowledge and experience will be greatly missed.

I would now like to make some comments on the programme of the conservation authorities branch.

Since the passing of The Conservation Authorities Act in 1946, 32 conservation authorities have been established throughout Ontario, embracing 465 participating municipalities and covering an area of 21,952 square miles. Since the beginning of 1963, two new authorities have been formed — the Raisin River Conservation Authority in the Cornwall area, and the Sault Ste. Marie Conservation Authority. Two of the older authorities, the Twelve-Mile Creek Conservation Authority

and the Sixteen-Mile Creek Conservation Authority, both in Halton county, have been combined into one, called the Halton Region Conservation Authority.

The most important and costly phase of the work of the conservation authorities is the construction of water conservation and flood control projects. On smaller schemes the province's contribution amounts to 50 per cent of land acquisition and construction costs. The grant in larger capital works is 37.5 per cent and is supplemented in most cases by a further 37.5 per cent grant from the federal government. The authorities are responsible for raising the remainder from their participating municipalities. The total cost of projects completed, under way, or planned at the present time amounts to nearly \$136 million.

Agreements were reached in 1961 with the federal government on three large schemes—\$38.9 million flood control scheme for the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, \$10 million flood scheme on the Thames river and the \$1 million Parkhill Dam on the Ausable river.

The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority programme involves the construction of 15 dams, the acquisition of 7,200 acres of flood plain lands and the creation of ten new recreation areas extending over 2,500 acres. These recreation areas will be within 40 miles of downtown Toronto. It is expected to take ten years to complete and will cost about \$38.9 million. On this scheme the Ontario government will defray 37.5 per cent of \$24 million of these costs and 50 per cent of \$14.9 million.

The Thames river scheme will consist of eight sub-projects including the construction of six dams, one at Mitchell, two near St. Mary's, one near Woodstock, one near Thamesford and one at Stratford, and three major channel improvement projects. Work has been completed on the Mitchell projects and is well under way on the Wildwood Dam. It is expected that the general contract for the Woodstock Dam will be awarded and that work will start early this spring. The Wildwood Dam will be completed this year and the Woodstock Dam will require two or more years.

The Credit Authority has presented a flood control brief to the province and to Ottawa. This covers nine projects to be undertaken during the next ten years, estimated to cost \$6.6 million. In addition, the Grand River Conservation Commission and the Grand Valley Conservation Authority are preparing briefs for presentation to the provincial and

federal governments for flood control and water conservation works at an estimated cost of over \$24 million.

During the past year, expenditures for major flood control and water conservation projects under agreements with the two governments amounted to \$7 million. This included \$3.5 million for property and \$500,000 for engineering work. In all, about 3,000 acres were purchased and construction and engineering work has been started or completed.

In 1963, 12 partial or complete conservation reports were published, covering surveys on the Mattagami, Big Creek, Lower Thames, Crowe Valley, Sydenham, Whitson, Otonabee and Otter watersheds.

Twenty-one conservation authorities have also undertaken the establishment and management of authority forests. Under these agreements, which run usually for 50 years, the Ontario government refunds to the authority half of the cost of land, and for the period of the agreement the province assumes the entire cost of establishing and managing the forest. During this past year, 9,000 additional acres were acquired, bringing the total areas of authority forests to 69,000 acres. As part of their forestry programme these authorities assisted private landowners in planting 1,750,000 trees in 1961. In addition, authorities have continued to subsidize and provide technical assistance in the construction of community and farm ponds. Last year, 175 ponds were constructed, bringing the total to nearly 2,900.

Another aspect of the overall conservation programme is the acquisition of surplus land, not already devoted to authority forests, bordering a large reservoir, a community pond, or some other conservation project developed by an authority, and the conversion of some of the attractive and otherwise suitable sections into parks, thus providing recreational and other facilities. During 1963, 2,923 acres were added to these conservation areas, bringing the total coverage to 31,723 acres. Within the 110 conservation areas, 71 parks have been established covering 5,180 acres.

During the coming years, surveys will be carried out on six of the authorities at an estimated cost of \$130,000.

During the coming fiscal year, the department will take steps to initiate an increased programme of development and protection for the province's water resources.

In addition to the normal, ordinary and capital programmes of the Conservation Authorities Branch, I am asking the approval

of the Legislature for special and increased amounts in both ordinary and capital expenditures to commence a number of programmes and projects relating to water.

While discussions leading to new programmes are proceeding daily, it can now be determined that ordinary expenditures will be required for research leading to an understanding of our long-term water requirements in this province, and the most economical way to develop our water resources over a period of years to meet these needs.

On the other hand and on a short-term basis, it is felt that the government may be required to develop an emergency water supply programme which will provide general assistance in areas of this province where prolonged drought over reasonably large areas creates a hardship on our production and our people.

With regard to the increased capital works programme the government intends to review carefully the need for increased provincial financial participation in water development and management and to determine if the lack of finances at the local level is a limiting factor in an accelerated water management programme.

A review will be initiated of all of the hydraulic reports of each conservation authority and all the small reservoirs originally recommended in the conservation authority reports. These will be examined to ascertain their relative importance in a water management programme, cost estimates will be prepared and a list of priorities for construction developed in relationship to the needs of our economy.

I would ask all hon. members of this House for their support, so the department may carry out the programme.

On vote 601:

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I suppose the first thing that I should do on occasions such as this is to congratulate the hon. Minister on his taking over the portfolio of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Now, this is the first time, of course, that he has presented his estimates to this House and while I may not agree with everything that was said, I think it was a very interesting analysis of many facts and figures that can be digested, probably at a later time.

While I wish to congratulate him on going into the Cabinet and becoming the head of this particular portfolio, nevertheless I must say that I find it hard to believe that such

a portfolio is necessary in a government of this province at all.

I have been very tempted to say this afternoon what was suggested to me a couple of years ago, I think it was, by the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby). One time when he was criticizing hon. members of the Opposition, he said, "I cannot understand why you do not stand up and say to the hon. Minister, 'Obviously you need this amount of money, it is going to be used for a good cause and we will be glad to give it to you,' and then sit down and it would save a great deal of time."

I am tempted somewhat to do that this afternoon, because, quite frankly, the amount of money that is going to be used in The Department of Energy and Resources Management for what could be called new projects in connection with this portfolio, is very minute indeed. We have involved in it, of course, the Ontario Energy Board, the Conservation Authority Branch, the Ontario Water Resources Commission and Water Management Programme, all of which in years gone by have been in other departments of this government of the province.

When one looks over the amount of money, the grand total of \$33,732,000, which includes both the ordinary expenditure and capital disbursements of this portfolio, and then you realize that only \$671,000 actually comes under the authority of the hon. Minister, one can very well ask why this portfolio in this government is necessary at all.

For example, this year, \$20 million of this amount is going to be spent for the Ontario Water Resources Commission for capital disbursements, and \$3.1 million is being spent for ordinary expenditures. In other years, this particular commission has been in other departments of government. I would suggest that it could very well be in The Department of Municipal Affairs or some other department, just as easily as in The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

This portfolio could very easily be compared with a holding company we read about on the Toronto or Montreal stock exchanges—a holding company which keeps together these other various commissions which, in other years, have been in other departments. And the speech, as far as I could follow, given by the hon. Minister this afternoon, was really a great number of statistics dealing with the oil and gas industries in the province of Ontario. It dealt with the sales and consumption of the same. And really, why we have to have a Minister to give these figures to us in this Legislature is beyond me.

At various times, hon. members of the government ask us in the Opposition, when we say that too much money is being spent and suggest that economy should be practised: "Where would you economize if you were running this government?" I am saying to you, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, that one place where some economy could be practised in this government is by not having a Minister of Energy and Resources Management at all.

Now, I am not saying this personally about the hon. Minister. You could put him in some other department over there, because I am sure it would not be hard to find another department where he could be used; but the facts and figures are right in front of us, on page 49 of the estimates of this province for this year. Other than the boards and commissions I have mentioned, only \$671,000 is being spent under the direct office of the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman, because he has so very little control over the expenditures of this department, it is very hard to be critical of that amount of money he is spending. One has to go into other areas, other commissions, in order to be the least bit constructively critical of this department at all. I propose to take one or two of these, which will be elaborated upon when they come forth. I understood the hon. Minister to say that Hydro would be discussed by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer), and no doubt we will discuss that at the proper time. When the Ontario water resources are explained a little more fully, we will discuss them, too.

Take, as an example, the Ontario Water Resources Commission. I remember, some years ago, when it was started in this Legislature. At that time the then Prime Minister of this province, in telling us how many billions of dollars would be necessary for this commission in years to come, attempted, of course, to give credit to the government for the vast and huge sums of money which would be spent by the various municipalities of this province. Of course, at that time, we, in the Opposition, pointed out, and quite correctly so, that every dollar which was going to be spent had to be paid back by the municipalities, even though the water resources commission was putting up the money in the first place.

This, of course, has been borne out; and many of the municipalities which have taken advantage of the legislation are now paying this money back. I would say this: I think it has done an excellent job in the overall

picture. On the other hand, I would say that in many of the smaller municipalities of Ontario there has been a decided lack of leadership by the water resources commission.

Generally speaking, it is the smaller municipalities in the province which take advantage of this legislation. Generally speaking, it is the smaller municipalities which do the borrowing of the money from this commission. Large municipalities, such as Metropolitan Toronto, can borrow the money they require for water works and sewer projects cheaper on the open market than they can from the Ontario Water Resources Commission. It is for this reason that I believe the commission should show leadership, not only in the planning of the sewage projects or water projects in the various municipalities in the province, but also they should attempt, through their engineering facilities, to make sure that once the capital money is spent these projects run properly.

As an example, I am going to read a paragraph or two from the paper of one of the municipalities in my own area, and I would say that this is common throughout the province of Ontario. This is from the *Kincardine News* of Wednesday, March 18, and it is headed: "Council Not Happy With Sewer Story."

The project is under the Ontario Water Resources Commission. I believe that the money was borrowed from this commission in order to initiate this project, but this is what the paper says about the council:

Council were generous at their Friday night meeting in their criticism of the contracting company installing the local sewer system, after most of the council had attended a meeting with the officials at the town hall the day previous. The attitude of council was summed up by a statement made by Councillor Gordon Campbell when he said: "I have never seen a man who knows so little about what he is doing. All he has got is excuses."

An hon. member: Was that the Minister?

Mr. Whicher: No, that was not the hon. Minister, but the Minister may be responsible. To continue:

Councillor Lantink put the blame on the engineering firm of Dillan and Company.

"Dillan has admitted that we have a poor contractor," he said. "Why did they not tell us before?"

Taking the blame from both, Councillor Gordon Campbell stated that the fault lies not with the contractor or the engineer but with the system which forced the town to accept the lowest tender submitted regardless of the contract. Mr. Campbell told council that even if the contractor has to be replaced and another brought in, the town would not be out any money. We may have the roads out for two or three years though.

I just read these few paragraphs to show you that in the town of Kincardine, which borrowed money from the water resources commission, which had accepted the engineering and technical advice of the water resources commission in putting these sewers into being in this town, are far from happy at what has taken place.

The town is in a mess, the contractor—according to what I have read in the paper—does not appear to know what he is doing. If this were just an obsolete case then I would hesitate to bring it to the attention of the Legislature, but in many municipalities throughout the province of Ontario, and in several in Bruce county, they have not been satisfied with what is happening.

May I point out to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that in the smaller towns of the province we simply have not got the engineering facilities to know how to deal with the expenditures of such sums of money in dealing with water and sewer projects. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the hon. Minister, if he is going to be in charge of the commission, to emphasize to them most emphatically that these towns do not just need the opportunity of borrowing the capital money to go ahead with these various projects; they need the engineering advice to be able to carry them through to the completion of the same, and advice to help run the project after the whole thing is completed.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bruce; do you want to continue for a while?

Mr. Whicher: No; I am willing to continue but—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. chairman, if it is necessary I will move that the committee adjourn until eight o'clock.

Some hon. members: Oh, no, no!

An hon. member: We are not sitting to-night!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, no, my error. This is all my error. I was thinking in terms of a night session tonight. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress. I must admit that I was thinking in terms that we were coming back at eight o'clock.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, you only sit on hockey nights.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will remember that and see that we maintain that record of only sitting on hockey nights.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to give the order of the remaining departments in the estimates, after these present estimates. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) will deal with the water resources commission section; this comes about because of the Easter break. Had these estimates been dealt with prior to Easter, of course the new department would not have been set up. The bill setting up that new department was given Royal assent prior to Easter, so in dealing with these estimates that portion concerning the conservation authorities, which, after this, will be administered by this department, will be dealt with in the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests—in which department they are now. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will deal with water resources and with the water resources commission. When this is completed we will deal with the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, following that, Education, following that, Attorney-General, following that, Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 16, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Persons requiring special residential and sheltered care, bill to provide homes for, Mr. Dymond, first reading	2123
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	2123
Consideration of report of the Ontario Police Commission on organized crime	2124
Recess, 6 o'clock	2159

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, students from Earl Haig Secondary School, Willowdale.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin) moves that the fees plus the cost of printing be remitted with respect to Bill No. Pr25, An Act respecting the Norfolk Hospital Association.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

HOMES FOR PERSONS REQUIRING SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL AND SHELTERED CARE

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to establish and operate residential facilities for persons requiring nursing, residential, specialized or sheltered care. By this, we hope to get out of our hospitals for the mentally disturbed those people who no longer need to be there by virtue of their psychiatric disability, and to establish them in properly controlled centres.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, and on a point of order, I would like to attempt to correct the record of something which happened in the House yesterday.

Yesterday, in the estimates of the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), when he was asked how much Dalton Camp and Associates got from his department for advertising purposes, he told us that in his opinion this was the only government agency from which Mr. Camp received money. On looking over the public accounts for last year I find, in The Department of Economics and Development, that Dalton K. Camp and Associates Limited received \$163,119.75.

I realize that this information was probably given incorrectly, inadvertently, by the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information, sir, but on the other hand he said that the net profit to Mr. Camp from his department would be approximately \$14,000. Using this same percentage of profit on The Department of Economics and Development, we find that the net profit there would be approximately \$30,000. So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House that Mr. Camp is indeed doing very well through the various agencies of this Legislature.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. The Niagara Parks Commission financial statements for the year ended October 31, 1963.

2. Annual report of the Niagara Parks Commission for the year ending October 31, 1963.

3. 1963 annual report of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario.

4. Forty-fourth annual report of The Department of Labour of the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963.

5. Ontario Northland Transportation Commission 63rd annual report for the year ended December 31, 1963.

Clerk of the House: The 4th order: Consideration of the report of the Ontario Police Commission on organized crime.

ONTARIO POLICE COMMISSION REPORT ON ORGANIZED CRIME

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in speaking in the debate on this report, I would like to point out that this report was tabled in the House by the then Attorney General (Mr. Cass) on March 19, 1964 and, in order that we may keep the record clear, although this report is dated January 31, 1964, it was received by the Attorney General on March 9, some ten days before it was tabled here.

In placing this report on the order paper for debate and discussion, I feel that it is necessary that this report be examined and debated in the Legislature in order that we may have, first of all, a full examination of the facts contained in it. We want also to examine its findings and perhaps relate them to the findings of other reports which have been made in this area of crime in Ontario. I am referring specifically to the Roach report and to various comments which have been made by individuals throughout the course of the last few years.

All of this goes to the end that we, here in this Legislature, and the people of the province of Ontario, may have some comprehension and understanding of the extent of the existence of crime here in the province under its various names and classifications; that we may understand the problems of law enforcement, the place of the police forces and the administrative forces, the justice forces of our province, and the problems which are created by the existence of crime.

We want also to see what has been done to meet the existence of crime in the province, what has been done to meet these many difficulties, what remains to be done, what lies ahead in what, I think we all realize, is an ever-present and ever-continuing battle against the forces of crime and evil which are always present in our society—indeed, which are always pressing hard against our society in their efforts to infiltrate, in their efforts to develop, in their efforts to worm their way, if I may put it that way, into the lives of our people, where they will prey on the helpless and where they may establish their empires.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, since taking office as Prime Minister of this province, that the whole question of crime and the enforcement of law in the province has been one which has concerned me very deeply. Through the years it has concerned the government, which I have headed.

Mr. Speaker, we have been concerned with the protection of our society against criminal

elements, whether on an individual or on a syndicated basis, which exist and, indeed, which may exist in the future in the province.

If the hon. members go back to *Hansard* of December, 1961, and carry on from there, it will be found that a very substantial part of that record has been devoted to the consideration of crime and the steps which have been taken by this government to deal with this problem, to ensure that crime shall not flourish in this province and, above all, to ensure that crime shall not gain a foothold from other jurisdictions to infiltrate our province.

A bill to establish the Ontario Police Commission was introduced into this House on November 28, 1961, and the creation of the Ontario Police Commission was contained in The Police Amendment Act, 1961-62. This gave to the police commission the power, among other things, of investigating, inquiring into, and reporting to the Attorney General upon any matter relating to the maintenance of law and order in Ontario. It also gave to the commission, or the person holding an investigation under section 48, all the powers and authority which may be conferred upon a person appointed under The Public Inquiries Act.

The 1961-62 Act also defined the powers of the police commission relative to the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police, and it was phrased in these terms:

Subject to the direction of the Ontario Police Commission, the commissioner has the general control and administration of the Ontario Provincial Police Force and the employees connected therewith.

That Act, the 1961-1962 Act, also gave the police commission the power to inquire into and report to the Attorney General upon the conduct or the performance of duties by any chief constable or any other police officer, constable, special constable, or by-law enforcement officer; to comment, too, on the administration of any police force, the system of policing in any municipality, and the police needs of any municipality.

Thus we established the police commission in that year, with these powers, to deal in two areas: (1) with the administration of the police of the province, so that our law enforcement facilities would be adequate and would be improved; and (2) to carry out investigation in order that we might learn the extent of crime and the criminal elements in our province.

Now, sir, in the session of 1962-63, the function of the commission was more elaborately spelled out in The Police Amendment Act.

At that time we introduced section 39(B). In addition, in 1962-63, we made a change in section 40(2) of The Police Act, which now reads as follows:

Subject to direction of the Ontario Police Commission as approved by the Attorney General, the commissioner has the general control and administration of the Ontario Provincial Police Force and the employees connected therewith.

The section to which I was referring deals with the functions of the commission. In order that we may understand what the commission does, I am going to read this into the record:

It is the function of the commission:

(a) to maintain a system of statistical records and research studies of criminal appearances and matters related thereto for the purpose of aiding the police forces in Ontario.

(b) to consult with and advise boards of commissioners of police, police committees of municipal councils, and other police authorities and chief constables, on all matters relating to police and policing.

(c) to provide the boards and commissioners of police, police committees of municipal councils, and other police authorities and chief constables, information and advice respecting the management and operation of police forces, techniques in handling special problems, and other information calculated to assist.

(d) through its members and advisers to conduct a system of regular visits to municipal police forces throughout Ontario.

(e) to assist in co-ordinating the work and efforts of the police forces in Ontario.

(f) to operate the Ontario Police College,

which had been just recently established:

(g) to conduct investigations in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(h) to hear and dispose of appeals from members of police forces in accordance with this Act and the regulations.

(i) to exercise the powers and perform the duties conferred and imposed upon it by this Act.

All these functions—they are set out in this particular section—deal with the function of the police commission in relation to other police forces in the province.

With regard to the police commission and its creation and functions, I would just like to quote some remarks I made in 1961 when,

in the debates on December 11th, page 284, in referring to the police commission, I said:

It is our intention that this commission will examine on a continuing basis, over a period of time, all matters having to do with crime in Ontario and all matters having to do with the administration of the various police forces. One can see the advantages in such a body. In the first place, it is completely free from all external influence and will operate on a continuing basis over a period of years and thus will develop a knowledge of the organization of our police and the enforcement of our laws over a long period of time.

In addition it will develop continuing knowledge of the broader trends of criminal activity, not only in this jurisdiction but in the jurisdictions that surround us.

And that, sir, I think pretty succinctly sums up what we were attempting to accomplish with the police commission.

When The Police Act was introduced the Attorney General of those days, who is now the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), in that debate said as follows—and this is on page 344 of the same *Hansard*:

I would point out that under section 48 of The Police Act, as amended by section 6 of the bill before the House, this new commission is given the widest powers to make inquiry into law enforcement.

In order that matters between sessions may be attended to without delay, where requiring action, the commission would report on any such inquiries provided in the bill. It could, of course, report and comment on the same matter in its report to the Legislature. However, that report would come later when the Legislature is in session.

These provisions are all designed to give the board an independence of action and of reporting commensurate with the importance which is attached to the creation and functioning of such a commission.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the personnel of this board will be of such strength and experience as to give to it a very extensive insight into the varied and complex problems with which it will be dealing. As I see the proposed commission, it will have vision, it will play an important part in improving public relations of our police, improving the education and training of our police and, as time goes on, it will grow in the public estimation and will have an ever-increasing good influence upon

the police and their work and upon law enforcement in the province. It will also serve as an excellent body for co-operation and for confidential interchange of views and information with comparable, or other high-level, police and crime investigatory bodies in other jurisdictions.

Now, sir, it can be very clearly seen that the establishment of the police commission at the very outset of my term of office is an indication of the very great importance I have attached, and all persons on this side of the House at least have attached, to the fact that crime in our province shall be contained and that all steps shall be taken in order to contain crime. And in order to exclude that crime which would like to be here, we would have the necessary bodies and the necessary administrative bodies to meet the requirements of the day.

Further, Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my term of office here, as a result of some very serious allegations of wrongdoing which were levelled at certain senior civil servants in The Department of the Attorney General, and as a result of statements regarding the establishment and the extent of crime of all kinds in the province, it was decided by this government to conduct a complete investigation of all these matters by a Royal commission. Mr. Justice Roach was appointed a Royal commissioner in December, 1961, and I am just going to put into the record his terms of reference.

The terms of his commission are as follows:

To inquire into and report upon:

1. the administration of the laws and regulations regarding the incorporation and operations of social clubs having regard to allegations made by the leader of the Opposition in his speech of November 29, 1961;
2. any improper relationship as alleged by the leader of the Opposition in his speech on November 29, 1961, between senior officials of the legal staff of The Department of the Attorney General and any person or persons, and more particularly relating to: (a) the termination of investigations; (b) the suppression of evidence; (c) the payment of money;
3. the extent of crime in Ontario and the sufficiency of the law enforcement agencies to deal with it.

When I put this commission before the Legislature, I said the following:

I would like to repeat that I feel it is of the utmost importance that there be no

doubt in anyone's mind in this province concerning the honesty and integrity of our officials, the sufficiency of our laws and the adequacy of our enforcement agencies to deal with the criminal elements that exist in every society. More particularly, we must have confidence that we can deal with any criminal element that may choose to attempt to cross our borders from another jurisdiction. We can all be certain that a most complete and impartial investigation will take place, that the necessary machinery will be established to deal with these matters in an efficient and complete way. I can assure the hon. members of this House and the people of the province that I and this administration will be satisfied with nothing but the best in the administration of justice and the maintenance of law and order. We will welcome the report of this Royal commission and if any action is necessary as a result of the report, we will be standing ready and able to take it.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you the position of this government has not varied one iota from the position that we took back in those days of 1961. Indeed, the requirement today stands even higher than it did then, that the conduct and the investigation and the administration of justice in all its phases in whatever area it may be, must be at the highest possible level in our province. We are dedicated to this principle as the record clearly shows. We have clearly taken full and meaningful action, and I want to make it absolutely clear that we have never deviated from this position, and we never will.

I think this is indicated by the facts that are brought out in this report. The easiest way to keep criminals out of this jurisdiction is to make it a very unhealthy place for them to be.

Mr. Justice Roach subsequently made a very complete and I think a very meaningful report in accordance with those terms of reference. In the report were many recommendations. This government has seen to the carrying out of many of those recommendations. I will deal with this a little later.

In keeping with our continuing concern that the government must at all times be vigilant, particularly in dealing with these matters concerning the prevention of crime, the prosecution of criminals, and the prevention of the establishment here in Ontario of syndicated crime—and I will deal with the definition of these matters in a moment—but particularly in dealing with the establishment in Ontario of syndicated crime which ap-

peared to flourish in some of the jurisdictions upon which we border, the government felt it was absolutely necessary to ensure that when Mr. Justice Roach completed his investigations under the terms of that commission, the Ontario Police Commission should be standing by to take on the obligation and duty of continuing where the Roach commission left off, if this should prove to be necessary.

This is one of the responsibilities and duties committed to the Ontario Police Commission, and this, I think, is made clear by section 48A of the Act, which provides that the Ontario Police Commission may investigate, inquire into and report to the Attorney General upon any matter relating to the maintenance of law and order in Ontario.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I think is one of the great factors in the development of crime which we must never forget, and that is that it is an ever-changing theme. What is true today may not necessarily be true two or three months from now. I think that this is self-evident. It is to me. Any investigation into crime can only see what the situation is at a fixed position in time. As we see, and as one sees as one follows one's newspapers, a constant battle is going on with crime pushing in and the forces of law and order pushing out. Thus the police commission, in its role of a body standing by continuously to do these things, serves a very important purpose in this whole problem.

From there we come down to last summer, when in August, Commissioner Harvison of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police spoke at the Canadian National Exhibition. He made some remarks that disturbed people greatly, remarks that would lead one to believe that syndicated crime, organized crime, international crime, was about to move into Ontario. The Attorney General, sir, on August 21, 1963, issued a press release in which he said that he had conferred with the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police and Chief Mackey of Metropolitan Toronto Police. After conferring with them he had asked His Honour, Judge Macdonald, the chairman of the Ontario Police Commission, to exercise the powers conferred upon the commission, which I have mentioned, in order to investigate matters relating to the maintenance of law and order in Ontario, to find out if there had in fact been any change since the findings of Commissioner Roach. The Roach report had been brought in in March. That is the basis of the report, sir, which we are discussing today.

Exhibit 2 of this report is a letter which

I will not read, of course, but to which the hon. members can refer. It is exhibit 2 in the report, a letter dated August 31, 1963, signed by Judge Macdonald, in which he points out certain facts arising from Harvison's speech and he says in the last paragraph:

To summarize, we are of the opinion not only by reason of Commissioner Harvison's speech, but because of other information received and allegations made as well, (a) that a further intensive inquiry is called for at this time by this commission to determine the extent, if any, of both foreign-controlled, syndicated crime, and organized crime of proportions capable of being converted into the former, there may be in this province; and that witnesses appearing to have knowledge be examined publicly or privately on oath to assist in determining the matter. And (b) that the inquiry be a continuous one and that our investigative staff be augmented further, as may be needed to maintain a constant oversight into crime conditions. (c) that the commission initiate discussions with police authorities concerned to endeavour to establish between the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and provincial and municipal police a better co-ordination of law enforcement effort on a permanent basis as outlined above.

Mr. Speaker, this report resulted from the events I mentioned to you. I would point out to you that in the report itself it is described by the chairman of the commission and by the commissioners, as an interim, or a preliminary, report.

In that regard I refer to page 11 of the report, where the members say:

We consulted the deputy Attorney General as to our legal powers while conducting our inquiry *in camera*, and were advised that there was considerable doubt as to these, which should best be resolved by legislation to clarify. Accordingly, we decided to await a decision as to such legislation and its enactment, if favoured, before undertaking the private questioning of reluctant or hostile witnesses.

This would necessitate the making of a report, in the meantime, which could best be described as a first or preliminary report. We think, therefore, that it may be of value if we report conclusions which we have reached on the acceptable evidence and information heard so far.

I want to make it very clear to the House, to the hon. members here and to the people of the province, that the records I have

touched upon here show that this government is very deeply concerned and ever-vigilant in the matter of the investigation of suppressive control over crime and, wherever possible, the complete elimination of crime in our province.

We see this as one of our prime responsibilities, as one of the prime responsibilities we have as a government to the people of the province. And under no circumstances, Mr. Speaker, will we shirk this responsibility.

The report which we are examining today, and debating this afternoon, was asked for by this government as part of a continuing process, which I have outlined to you, a continuing battle against the criminal elements in our society, as a continuation of those steps which we took back in 1961 and which, I might say, have had quite effective results, with which I shall deal later. Suffice it to say now, this report constitutes another move in what I think we must all realize is, and will continue to be, a constant and a ceaseless contest, really, between good and evil in our society.

In examining the report of the commission, I think it is essential, if we are to have a full understanding of what we are discussing, that we look to the definition of these terms—"organized crime" on the one hand, and "syndicated crime" on the other—in order that they may be fully understood.

This differentiation between organized and syndicated crime arose in the Roach report. Mr. Justice Roach tried to bring some order into this matter by defining organized crime and syndicated crime, and this report we are debating today has accepted his definitions. But I sometimes wonder whether these definitions are accepted by others outside the area of those who are familiar with these two reports and basically familiar with the differentiation which Mr. Justice Roach made. Because it is really only a definition of a term.

One can read in the paper, in another newspaper or a newspaper, perhaps, from another jurisdiction, a reference to organized crime which might not have the same meaning Mr. Justice Roach attaches to organized crime, as opposed to syndicated crime in his report—which definition has been accepted by the Ontario Police Commission.

There has been a good deal of confusion of the two terms, by everyone speaking generally about crime. I think there has been some confusion in the newspapers. I think, indeed, that it is difficult for the public to distinguish between these two. But, on the other hand, if we are to analyze these two reports, one of which follows the other, I think we must look at these definitions and see what they

mean—what the words mean in the definitions which have been adopted.

In the foreword to this commission report on page 4, the commission adopts the definitions which were accepted and laid down originally by Mr. Justice Roach.

In his report—this is on page 5 of the Ontario Police Commission report, it says:

Mr. Justice Roach, for the purpose of his inquiry, formulated certain definitions for the terms used, and for the purpose of clarity in this report, we have adopted these definitions which are found at pages 351-354 of his report and these read as follows:

"The term 'organized crime' appears to have been coined in the present century. I am not aware of it having been used earlier.

"It relates to an association of persons whose business is crime, and to the criminal activities conducted by them as an organized group.

"The commission of any crime, except one committed in the heat of passion, involves some degree of organization. The lone robber plans the course of conduct that he will follow in committing a robbery and even if he commits a whole series of robberies his conduct does not come within the meaning of organized crime.

"Two or more persons may collaborate and formulate their joint plans for the commission of an isolated robbery but their commission of that offence does not bring it within the term organized crime.

"Together they might even commit several robberies at isolated times getting together and formulating their plans for each one separately, and in the intervals between them having no association or relationship with one another. One robbery having been completed each goes his separate way, with no plans between them to become associated one with the other in the future. Each of those robberies would be an isolated occurrence and would have no relation to the others notwithstanding that they were committed by the same persons and notwithstanding also that, if it so happened, the same procedure was followed in all of them."

"Organized crime" denotes a subsisting association as a social organism within the social body. Within that association are individuals or groups of individuals having a special function to perform and co-operating with one another as interdependent parts of the whole in such a way that together they operate a system

and their purposes or objects are criminal. There is a continuing, subsisting conspiracy between them, evidenced in part by the substantive offences committed by them.

Organized crime does not have to be nation or state or province wide. Its existence is not determined by the area in which the conspirators operate, although it is not likely to be confined to a relatively small area.

Here is a reference:

Fagin and his band of pickpockets in London were engaged in organized crime but I am not aware that Charles Dickens described their activities as such.

Neither is it necessary that the association be organized with the precision of a well-run commercial organization. It may be relatively tenuous and loose-knit. The "fence" who operates a pawnshop in the city of Toronto and the housebreaker with whom he conspires to provide the outlet for the stolen loot, together are engaged in organized crime and this notwithstanding that the pawnbroker is also engaged in legitimate business and the housebreaker, perchance, works in a factory by day and carries on his housebreaking at night and at irregular intervals. What brings their activities within the term is this, namely, that there is a continuing, subsisting arrangement between them by which the stolen loot is disposed of and converted into cash.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): What page are you on?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Six.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This may be a little slow, but I want particularly some of the newer hon. members of the House who have not been through this before, to understand that there are some very specific differences. If we are to understand the extent of crime in our province, I think it is necessary that we understand what we are talking about.

There is a misconception, more widespread than I should have thought, that there cannot be organized crime unless there is a "Mr. Big" at the top and in control—an underworld tycoon such as Al Capone in Chicago, Louis Lepke and "Legs" Diamond in New York, and other gangland leaders who established criminal empires in the United States.

Now what he is saying is that some people think that to have organized crime you have to have a Mr. Big. In fact you do not.

Fortunately we have not had characters of that ilk in this province but we have had organized crime and specifically organized gambling.

That is the organized crime definition. Then Mr. Justice Roach turns to the second term, "syndicated crime", and he says:

This term, too, seems to have been coined in the present century. It denotes a subsisting association of criminals which is so highly organized that it has acquired exclusive control of crime over a given area—in other words, a monopoly.

The monopoly does not necessarily include all organized crime in the area. In a given area there may be one or more syndicates exercising exclusive control in different types of crime. One syndicate may have exclusive control of gambling, another of prostitution and another of narcotics. These syndicates are jealous of their respective monopolies and in their own way guard the areas over which they have control against the intrusion into their field of any opposition. Their common enemy are the honest police; their common confederates, the crooked police and crooked politicians. If they are to thrive they need the assistance of both. Their methods of crushing any opposition that threatens their monopoly are varied and usually subtle. They resort to violence only as a last resort. With the aid of crooked police it can be arranged that criminals who set up in opposition to the syndicate are caught. "Knocked off" is the term they use.

The terms "organized crime" and "syndicated crime" are frequently used as though they were interchangeable when in fact they are not. There can be the former without the latter but there cannot be the latter without the former.

In other words, a prerequisite for syndicated crime is organized crime.

On that same page 6, Mr. Justice Roach's finding in his report, dated March of last year reads:

As a result of my investigation—and it was as complete as I was able to make it—I now report to you that there has never been, as far as I was able to ascertain, any syndicated crime in this province but there has been organized crime.

I will refer later on to his conclusion and elucidate it a little further. I might just as well, to keep the record straight, read his finding in connection with syndicated crime.

He says:

My investigation did not disclose that there was organized crime in the province to any alarming extent except in the field of organized gambling, which, of course, included gaming and bookmaking.

Sir, I wanted to get these definitions clear, because this report today uses the same words that Mr. Justice Roach used in these definitions he established some time ago.

The next point I would like to deal with is, what does this report reveal in relation to the existence of crime in the province of Ontario, and what conclusions can we draw from the facts that are revealed in this report which we are speaking about today?

I am going to refer to Mr. Justice Roach's findings which I just mentioned, because he continues. I was reading from a quote from him in this report. In his own report, at page 357, as I have pointed out to you, he said that there was no evidence of syndicated crime in Ontario, but he said there had been and was indubitably organized crime. He adds:

... except in the field of organized gambling, which of course, included gaming and bookmaking.

Then he goes on to say:

In the field of organized illegal gaming, Feeley and McDermott were the leading figures, together with some lesser lights associated with them. Earlier in this report I reviewed the history of their operations and I need not repeat what I said there. Their activities ended when Wright was arrested on May 28, 1960.

I think it is interesting to note here, in view of his remarks, that since he made these, both Feeley and McDermott are languishing in jail.

Now, when we come to this report we will find that there is a comment to the effect that the gambling activity is less than it has been and I think that these two things are directly related. In other words, Mr. Justice Roach found these men were leading figures in illegal gaming and they have been removed from the scene.

Sir, in this report of the Ontario Police Commission, the position in relation to syndicated crime is confirmed. It is confirmed by Commissioner Harvison, whose comments, as I have pointed out, had much to do with the start of the investigation leading to this report. However, I would warn most strongly against permitting the conclusion which appears in this report, to develop in any one of

us any sense of complacency or any sense of security, concerning the overall situation in Ontario crime and its development in the province.

I pointed out to you that this is an interim report. It has been in preparation since last August. I would say the fact that we do not have, and that this report finds that we do not have, syndicated crime in the province, following along after the same finding by Mr. Justice Roach, is a tribute to the law enforcement agencies of our province. I think that we should pay tribute in this respect where tribute is due.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: However, I would point out to you that the threat is always there. There was a threat in the remarks of Mr. Justice Roach in which he says in effect that organized crime is a prerequisite for syndicated crime. While he does not find syndicated crime, he certainly finds and makes a finding of organized crime. Commissioner Harvison of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, I think, sounds the same warning note. This report itself sounds, in my view in any event, the same warning note.

On page 20, to illustrate what I mean, perhaps I should go to the bottom of page 19 where this report comments upon Mr. Justice Roach's conclusions. This is the report of the Ontario Police Commission commenting upon the report of Mr. Justice Roach and making some comments which I think are relevant and important. This report says, referring to Mr. Justice Roach:

He believes, apparently, that there is organized crime in Ontario in the fields of narcotics, counterfeiting, fake stock rackets, theft and disposal of stolen bonds, as well as in gambling and other offences, which latter offences primarily concern provincial law enforcement bodies.

Mr. Justice Roach, in fact, said there was no organized crime to any alarming extent, except in the field of gambling.

What he meant is a matter of interpretation, but certainly it can never be interpreted in any event that he found there was no organized crime in any field other than gambling. I think we must read into it that he did find indications of organized crime, but only to an alarming extent, in the field of gambling.

This report goes on to say:

He apparently makes no positive finding regarding these other criminal activities,

and if he is suggesting in a negative manner that it may or does exist he is obviously of the opinion that, if it does, it does not exist "to an alarming extent." With that, Commissioner Harvison might agree, because he says:

And he goes on to quote Commissioner Harvison.

"Our agencies are coping with the situation here, having in mind recent prosecutions and convictions."

What he sees, however—

And I will deal with Commissioner Harvison directly:

—are attempts by American syndicates to get into Canada, and that is what he fears and wishes to warn us about. At the same time he says that they have not, so far, succeeded in doing so.

So there is the situation as found in this report.

On pages 140 and 141 of this report, and this is in an appendix dealing with the comments made by Commissioner Harvison at the Canadian National Exhibition on Friday, August 16 last, there are some comments of his which, I think, should be considered when we are looking at the overall picture in the province.

Commissioner Harvison had a news conference at the Canadian National Exhibition and this was taped by radio station CKEY. He said:

I gave a talk to the Canadian Club in Toronto some 18 months ago at which time I said the U.S. crime syndicate was making incursions into Canada. I have not changed my opinion since that time. Any incursion by an American crime syndicate is serious and will become increasingly serious unless we do something to prevent them coming in.

You will note that he says into Canada; he does not say into Ontario.

He was asked:

How extensive are they, and what are they, and what are we doing?

His reply was:

They have increased somewhat during the past year; they go up and down. Police activity and legislation drives them out of the country but Canada is presenting an increasingly attractive target as we become wealthier, our cities become larger, and they are constantly trying to get back into the country. I think the threat is a serious one.

Commissioner Harvison was asked another question:

Would you say maybe we were ripe for a real invasion of organized crime from the States here, with our laws the way they are, or are we getting on top of the situation?

And he replied:

I certainly wouldn't say we are ripe for it. Your enforcement agencies, I think, the legislators, are aware of this danger of the American syndicates moving in. I think they are aware, too, of the tremendous power of the syndicate and the difficulty of keeping them out, so I wouldn't say we are ripe for an invasion. I wouldn't say there were any large loopholes in our laws, always provided the laws are strictly enforced and that heavy sentences are handed out.

Commissioner Harvison, at page 142, says:

I think an honest police force is completely necessary if we are to combat the syndicates or the Canadian home-grown organizations but an honest police force is only one of the requirements, one of the many requirements, of battling the criminal syndicates.

You must back up the honest police forces, you must have honest legislators, honest counsellors, honest courts, honest lawyers, and there must be honesty right down the line, because if there is dishonesty anywhere then the corruption creeps in there.

Another question asked the commissioner was:

Commissioner, what would you like to have in your power or at your fingertips right now, in the RCMP's fight against organized crime, that you don't have now?

And he replied:

I think we are reasonably well equipped now.

He was also asked:

You don't need any changes in legislation? You don't need any changes in legislation that would help?

Commissioner Harvison replied:

The matter of change in legislation is now under study by the Canadian Chief Constables Association and the recommendations that have been studied during the past year or two will be presented at the conference in Hamilton this coming September.

In answer to another question, he said:

We have had considerable success during the past year and I think the situation is probably better now than it has been in some years. Because several of the recent and extremely important cases are now before the court, I can't go into any more detail than that.

Those are the comments which were made by Commissioner Harvison in those days—as a matter of fact, last August.

Then he was asked:

Where would you say, what part of Canada would you say, organized crime has the tightest hold on right now?

He replied:

I wouldn't say.

Are you saying that you don't know or that you don't choose to say?

I am saying that I don't choose to say. I don't like evading questions but I just don't think it would be a wise thing for me to say at this time. I think that if we are really going to fight organized crime, if we are going to prevent the sort of sprawling crime they have in the United States, then we must avoid sensationalism and avoid pointing fingers anywhere and just get out doing the job. So I, for that reason, won't answer that question.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are the opinions Commissioner Harvison had, as reported in this report.

I think we have been aware of this situation for some considerable time and, if we go back to 1961, even in those days, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of that day, the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, on November 28, 1961, said in this House at that time:

There have been indications that organized crime may be infiltrating into some parts of Canada from the United States where they have been plagued with it for a long time. Every effort should be made to prevent any attempt to develop that sort of thing in this country and particularly in the fair province of Ontario. This bill should help substantially to meet any offensive of that nature.

So this, Mr. Speaker, is I think, the conclusion which must be drawn from this report, in its position as the sequel to the report of Mr. Justice Roach and this conclusion, I think, must be drawn from the remarks of Commissioner Harvison. We do not have syndicated crime in Ontario. Syndicated crime has been kept out of Ontario by efficient police work

and by constant attention to the handling of crime as it exists on the local scene and on a local basis in various areas of the province.

But I think the conclusion is inescapable from the comments that I have read—I think we are all aware of this and I think this is what we find worrying—that there are criminal elements poised and waiting, if an opportunity offers, to make such inroads as they can. I think this is what Commissioner Harvison was referring to when he mentioned the increasing wealth of our country, the increasing growth of our cities. He is pointing out that the criminal elements are waiting and are ready to establish themselves if they find it possible.

To put it another way, they are standing ready to attack us and to move in if our guard goes down and if we, in the way we handle our affairs in the province, permit them the opportunity or provide an opportunity for them. I see this as being the concern expressed by this report. I see it as well in the conclusions drawn about the extent and ramifications of local crime which falls—certainly not all of it does, but it may fall—into the category of organized crime, both in this report and in the report of Mr. Justice Roach.

In the examination the commission has made—and I am not going to go into it in detail, but it is in this report—into law enforcement and of the situation across the province, I think there are some very heartening developments revealed there in the area of local enforcement. There has been the establishment of intelligence units, and there is a growing co-operation developing among the police forces of the larger centres. In reference to Metropolitan Toronto particularly, on page 73-D, the following conclusion appears, which I would like to refer to. There is, preceding this quotation, an analysis of various types of crime but this reference refers to organized crime and I would point out that this is in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Organized crime is thought to have decreased greatly in the last three years and is described as 50 to 100 per cent better. The social clubs were responsible for much of this crime and their partial elimination has resulted in much better conditions. Large-scale bookies are, at least temporarily, not functioning, in the opinion of senior police officials.

That is the comment in this report dealing with gambling, which was the area of organized crime that Mr. Justice Roach was concerned about.

Sir, if you review the situation which this report reveals in dealing with crime locally across our province, I think we may draw the conclusion that we have alert police forces that are working constantly and achieving a large measure of success in handling the day-to-day problems of enforcement and discouragement of crime. This is done through constant action on their part, and as I say, the measure of success is dependent, of course, upon a constant alertness.

It might be interesting to look at some of the things that have happened across the province in the last few years. When we discuss crime in a general way, I think sometimes we do not really give credit to our police forces for some of the work they have accomplished. While these are being discussed in the abstract, at the same time we have some very loyal policemen and law enforcement officers who are doing a very fine job of ensuring that the criminal elements in our society go to jail and are punished rapidly. I have already mentioned the fact that Feeley and McDermott, who were referred to in Mr. Justice Roach's report of some 13 months ago, are in jail, and we notice as a result of that, some decrease in the gambling activity in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Just as a matter of interest, I would refer you to what was really a very large criminal operation indeed. That was the robbery in Brockville some years ago, in 1958—the Brockville Trust Company bond theft, as it was called. We must not overlook the work that was done in the solution of that particular crime. It had international ramifications. The investigation into that robbery in the town of Brockville reached into South America and Switzerland, Chicago, New York, Montreal, and many other places, and all the police forces had to work together. They achieved a remarkable degree of success. Many of those involved were located and charged and convicted. In the process of that, several notorious criminals were picked up and jailed on other counts as well. Here was an example of a very large and a very complicated and certainly an organized crime, in the single element in any event. It was not part of an organized crime in the definition of organized crime, but as a unit of organization it was certainly a very complex one and it was solved.

In 1959, the following year, a large car ring operated in eastern Ontario. In this case cars were being stolen in one province, transferred to another province, relicensed and then resold. That ring was broken up. A similar ring was broken up in western Ontario

within the last year or so. An Auto Theft Branch, for instance, has been established in the Ontario Provincial Police force to deal with this type of activity.

As the years went by there was a theft in St. Catharines, for instance, at the Premier Trust Company. It was a large, single, organized crime. Some of the culprits were picked up in the province of Quebec and convictions were obtained. This is the result we must continue to accomplish in our province if we are to keep crime out. If the criminals come here and are unsuccessful and go to jail, not only will they not bother us any more but it is a very great deterrent as far as others are concerned.

I could give you a good many other cases. There was a Hamilton resident who had the name of the Enforcer. He was prosecuted here in Ontario and went to jail here. Then he was taken, of course, to New York on many more serious charges.

You remember, of course, that gangland murder that took place here in Toronto, a double murder. In that case too there was a very quick arrest and a very quick trial and a very quick carrying out of sentence. And this too—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Are you sure he was guilty?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Pardon?

Mr. Whicher: Are you sure he was guilty?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not question the rulings of the courts. Excuse me one moment, Mr. Speaker, I have been handed a note here.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): We are divided; I am sure he was guilty.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But the point I make in mentioning these particular cases is that, when we are dealing with crime, I think we have to take into consideration what is done by our police forces, and the great effect there is in rapid investigation, rapid arrest, rapid trial and rapid punishment.

I feel that while we can be confident—and I think we have evidence that justifies confidence—in the efficiency and vigour of our police forces, I think that we must also recognize that in this field of activity any relaxation is the greatest threat there can be to the present situation because, as I have said before, it is a constantly proceeding battle. We must examine, very carefully, recommendations which are made to us in regard to strengthening our police forces and the means of enforcing our laws.

We must be always alive to the constant, continuous improvements which are necessary in methods of detection and methods of investigation. And I think one thing we must view with ever-increasing alarm, and this has been echoed by many people, is the increasing use by the criminal element in our society—not only here but all over the world—of the many and varied means of communication and the very rapid means of transportation which are available. We are all aware of how easy it is to move, not only about your own jurisdiction but about the world, today. It is nothing to speak to someone today who will say, in a very casual way, "When I had lunch in Rome yesterday," and this sort of thing.

Properly organized, these modern facilities are of great value and can be used by the criminal element in our society to very great effect. The use of electronic devices, all of these things, can be turned to anti-social and criminal use, as they are. They constantly increase the difficulties which face our law enforcement agencies in their battle against crime.

I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, to what has been done by the government since the Roach report was tabled in this House and brought in last year. There were recommendations scattered throughout the whole report, not gathered in any one place; many of them have been implemented by the government, and I would like to point out those which have.

May I say that Inspector Stringer has been discharged from the Ontario Police Force; Deputy Commissioner Bartlett has been discharged; there was one Sam Balsom, who was mentioned in that report, and he is presently being prosecuted. The Ontario Police Commission has been authorized to establish a central record bureau for intelligence operations, which would be available to all of the police forces in Ontario; this was recommended in the report.

There are studies presently going forward to provide for more efficient organization of the smaller police forces in the province. The recommendation, of course, was that some of these smaller police forces be eliminated. I can only say to the House that this is a very large task indeed. It can only be accomplished on a long-range basis and will take some time, but nonetheless a start has been made.

In regard to social clubs, of course the hon. members of the House are aware that legislation was introduced to give the Provincial Secretary authority to cancel the charters

of social clubs which have not been used. The Provincial Secretary has also been given authority to require social clubs to appear before him for inquiry when their operations are in question. These provisions are of the utmost importance in dealing with the control of gambling in the province, and have gone a very long way indeed in helping us block gambling activity.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that we are taking all the necessary steps we can to provide the machinery to develop the organization to provide the means whereby we will be able to fight this continuing battle which has been going on as long as I have been here and, I am sure, will be going on long after I am gone. I think the steps we have taken have assisted a great deal in ensuring that syndicated crime has not been able to enter our province, has not got a toehold here; and, also, that local crime, organized or otherwise, is kept under close control.

I would say, if we have alert and well-informed police forces and if we add an equally alert and well-informed public, then these are the best weapons we can find in this constant struggle.

After analyzing the police commission report—without going into too much specific detail as to its findings because it has been circulated and, I assume, read by all the hon. members—but after analyzing it and examining the conclusions reached there, and after studying very carefully its list of recommendations, one is compelled to move to that final and most difficult area of determining what the government must do to meet the threat that is posed, and to what extent these recommendations contained in the report should be implemented.

The Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Robert Kennedy, who was here earlier this week, appeared before the United States Senate committee investigating syndicated and organized crime operations in that country. When he appeared before that committee he said, and I quote:

Organized crime not only becomes more refined in its activities but also takes advantage of modern developments in transportation and communication. As it does so, and as it grows richer and more powerful in the process, it can more easily elude enforcement efforts.

That is the end of his quote. The point here is, Mr. Speaker, as the elements of criminality and their methods become more sophisticated, and take further advantage of the marvels of modern science, so must our

police forces and our methods of doing investigative work. And in the field of enforcement so must we develop likewise if we are to keep pace in what is really a continuous, never-ending contest.

The concern of this police commission, as contained in this report, as I read it, is that we must develop a modern, up-to-date means to conduct investigations which will reveal to us the extent and the existence of potential, syndicated, criminal elements in our society here—and in any moves which may be made to enter Ontario.

We are asked in this report to do certain things to meet the problem, to meet this threat to our society. I think it is a threat which we all recognize. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the great responsibility we bear is to ensure that, in our zeal to meet this enemy, we do not in any way damage the rights and privileges, the freedoms and liberties, in fact the inalienable rights which every man enjoys by the mere fact that he is in this province and is alive.

Mr. Speaker, certain legislation was presented to this Legislature by the former Attorney General which, while intended to meet some of the requirements of the Ontario Police Commission recommendations contained in this report, proved to be highly offensive to us all. I can only say that the legislation was brought forward in good faith, with no thought that it would have the effect ascribed to it. Never would I, Mr. Speaker, or any hon. member of this government, or any hon. member of this Legislature that supports this government, tolerate the passage of legislation which would strip an individual of his basic rights and privileges.

This legislation will be examined before a standing committee of this Legislature and no doubt much more will be said about it there. I am establishing here the principles I feel must guide us as we approach the problem of examining the conclusions and the recommendations of this report.

First, we must continue to accept the responsibility, as we have over these past years, and I think with some success, of developing ways and means of dealing in this day, with the threat that crime may pose to our society. Secondly, in doing so, we must be ever-vigilant that we preserve the rights and the position of any individual in our society. Sir, these are the two great principles involved, and in my view these are the two standards that any action we take must meet.

There are among the recommendations, some that are bound to be controversial,

some that are bound to be interpreted as constituting some infringements on the rights of individuals. I refer, for instance, to the recommendation of the necessity for photographs on drivers' licences; the recommendation of licences for all types of firearms, and limiting of those to people 16 or over; the requirement of the production of means of identification by persons suspected of criminal or illegal activity; some alterations in bail requirements—it is recommended in the report; and the whole problem of wire tapping, which is recommended in a fashion. This is just to name a few of the recommendations that I think, if improperly handled, could be done in a way that could constitute, or could worry people about, an infringement of their rights.

Implementation of any of these recommendations will be done only after the closest and most exhaustive investigation and examination of the possible effects of any such implementation. We must subject any action that we take on these recommendations to these two principles I have set forth. This, Mr. Speaker, will take some time, and of course any such specific action will be brought back to this House.

As I pointed out in the beginning, sir, while this report is dated January 31, 1964, in actual fact it was received on March 9. I think we have all learned that matters as important as these cannot be done in a hurry, but I offer my assurance to the House and to the people of Ontario that we never will be party to the destruction of these basic rights that we all hold to be so very, very dear.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is of such great concern to the government, of such great concern to me personally, that I have already taken steps to devise the best means possible to ensure that these basic rights of our people are not in any way affected or disturbed, even though this could happen inadvertently. I have had conversations with Dean Leal of the Osgoode Hall Law School. I can assure you that I intend to continue the investigations that have been started, in order that we may devise a means of ensuring forever and under all circumstances that these very basic rights belonging to the people of our province will be protected, even though we cannot in any way escape the responsibility of having to devise means of meeting this other threat that appears to be menacing our society as a whole.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in or about the year 1775, England found itself in substantial difficulty, which threatened the future of that country, because of the agitation that

was taking place in the American colonies. The government of that day in England saw fit to introduce into the House of Commons a statute that prescribed that anyone landing from a foreign country in England could be carted off to jail immediately and kept there. The use of the prerogative writs such as Habeas Corpus and others would be denied to those people.

There was a gentleman who held a seat in the House of Commons for the electoral district of Bristol, whose writings and speeches and record as a member of Parliament are outstanding in our history of parliamentary government, in our history of the development of the democracy which we all believe in. His name was Edmund Burke. About that time, sir, he felt called upon to write a letter to two of his constituents who were sheriffs of the city of Bristol. Among other things in that letter, this is what he said:

I confess, gentlemen, that this appears to me as bad in principle and far worse in its consequence than a universal suspension of The Habeas Corpus Act. And the limiting qualification, instead of taking out the sting, does in my humble opinion, sharpen and envenom it to a greater degree.

Liberty, if I understand it at all, is a general principle, and the clear right of all subjects within the realm, or of none. Partial freedom seems to me the most invidious form of slavery, but unfortunately is the kind of slavery the most easily admitted in times of civil discord, for parties are too apt to forget their own future safety in their desire of sacrificing their enemies. People without much difficulty admit the entrance of that injustice of which they are not to be the immediate victims.

In times of high proceeding it is never the faction of the predominant power that is in danger, for no tyranny chastises its own instrument. It is the obnoxious and the suspected who want the protection of the law. And there is nothing to bridle the partial violence of state factions but this, that whenever an Act is made for cessation of law and justice, the whole people should be universally subjected to the same suspension of their franchise.

The alarm of such a proceeding would then be universal; it would operate as sort of a call of the nation. It will become every man's immediate and instant concern to be made very sensible of the absolute necessity of this total eclipse of liberty. They would more carefully advert

to every renewal and more powerfully resist it.

These great determined measures are not commonly so dangerous to freedom. They are marked with too strong lines to slide into use. No plea, no pretence of inconvenience or evil example which must in their nature be daily and ordinary incidents, can be admitted as a reason for such mighty operations. But the true danger is when liberty is nibbled away for expedience and by parts.

The Habeas Corpus Act supposes, contrary to the genius of most other laws, that the lawful magistrate may see particular men with a malignant eye and it provides for that identical case. But when men in particular descriptions marked out by the magistrate himself are delivered over by Parliament to this possible malignancy, it is not the Habeas Corpus that is occasionally suspended, but its spirit that is mistaken and its principle that is subverted. Indeed nothing is security to any individual but the common interest of all.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that these sentiments should be our text for this debate this afternoon.

We are not called upon here this afternoon to hear particularly about the great efforts the government has taken to preserve law and order in the province of Ontario because, Mr. Speaker, our record in this regard leaves much to be desired. Mr. Speaker, many of us sat in the House in the year 1961 and knew that this government was dragged, kicking and screaming, into a problem which they said up to that point had not existed at all. Mr. Speaker, you will remember on November 29—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister should be the last one to open his mouth.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests interjects, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased that he interjected. I have not got all of the speeches he made here, but in my files, Mr. Speaker, I have clippings at least four inches thick from repeated speeches made by the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests when he was the Attorney General, when he said: "There is no problem in Ontario. There is no organized crime. There is no necessity for investigation. There is nothing wrong that we can't control. Let me control it and everything will be fine".

Mr. Speaker, of all the people in this House who should say nothing on this point,

the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is the leading example.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to say that any such suggestions as the hon. member has just made, whether they were in the press or where they were, were taken out of context. On no occasion, throughout the whole time of my occupancy as Attorney General, did I do anything but try to get after the criminals in this province; and we had a pretty fair success at it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose this afternoon to argue with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. The record speaks for itself. It is abundantly clear. Nothing I can say is going to change it. Nothing he can say has changed it yet.

Mr. Speaker: it was interesting to listen to the hon. Prime Minister's review of the various events which led up to these two investigations. As I mentioned, he left out some significant parts of the preamble. He left out the discussions which raged in the early months of 1961, all the way through until that eventful day on November 29, 1961, when my leader, John Wintermeyer, stood up in his seat and delivered the speech which brought on the Roach investigation.

That, sir, was an act of political courage, of integrity, of the acceptance of the duty of his role as leader of the Opposition, which will stand for many a year in the proud annals of the functions of this Legislature, and so it should. And even after that speech was made, the complaints, the niggling, the denials continued, until some eight days later the brash hon. member for London South (Mr. White) stood up in his seat and issued a very foolish challenge that the speech be read outside the Legislature.

That challenge, sir, you will remember, was accepted. The speech was read outside the House, and it was as a result of the public reaction, and as a result of the comments in the newspapers, that finally—notwithstanding the objections of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and those he was able to convince on that side of the House—the hon. Prime Minister did, two days or three days later, the following Monday, announce to this House that he had appointed the Honourable Mr. Justice Roach to investigate a situation which, up to that time, the Attorney General had said did not even exist.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): The hon. member, I do not think, has the record very straight.

Mr. Singer: Well, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan)—was that the hon. Provincial Treasurer? No, I am sorry, the hon. Minister of Mines.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): A fatuous remark like that—the hon. member should know where it came from.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: I was a little surprised because the hon. Provincial Treasurer made a remark earlier; but the hon. Minister of Mines I could expect that from. I am not even going to dignify it with a reply.

In any event, sir, that is the reason why; and there is no other reason. It was not the great zeal exhibited on the front benches of the government which brought about these inquiries. The reason these inquiries were brought about was because the Opposition, led by its leader, Mr. Wintermeyer, saw the problem and recognized the problem; and he took action as a responsible leader of an Opposition would do.

Well then, we had the Roach inquiry. That started early in 1962 and, finally, the report came in in 1963. In that report, as the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, among many other things, Mr. Justice Roach said:

My investigation did not disclose that there was organized crime in the province to any alarming extent, except in the field of organized gambling which, of course, included gaming and bookmaking. It is impossible to say at any given time, with absolute assurance, that there are no organized criminals operating in our society. The best, at any given time, one can say is that there does not appear to be.

And, just about at that point, Mr. Justice Roach left that particular phase of it.

Another interesting part of the record—and we must go along by parallel steps when we examine the record—which goes along with this part of the record, is the appointment of the Ontario Police Commission, and the various discussions and disagreements which took place between the gentlemen on the police commission and the new Attorney General. Because the new Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, did not seem to have the same faith as the old Attorney General did in the role of the police commission.

When the hon. Prime Minister was reciting to us the various changes in the legislation concerning the police commission's duty, it was reasonably obvious that there was a real struggle going on as to what the Ontario

Police Commission was going to be allowed to do. Obviously the new Attorney General did not want them to have anything to do with the provincial police; so the legislation was changed and changed and changed, until the police commission was pretty well left out in the cold insofar as the Ontario Provincial Police was concerned.

Let anybody rush to the bulwarks to deny this, Mr. Speaker, I can refer only to the report of the Ontario Police Commission, and the remarks put in there by, apparently, the chairman, which were tabled in this House, just a few weeks ago.

You will recall, sir, on page 13, of that report, that the police commission said this:

The commission this year finds itself in a position where it is unable to make a very useful report on the operations of the Ontario Provincial Police force. Despite its statutory responsibilities under section 40 of The Police Act for giving direction to the commission of the force, considerable uncertainty has existed with regard to these responsibilities which we hope can be removed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not require any great genius to discover that what they, in polite language, refer to as "considerable uncertainty" means, in plain English, that the Attorney General, their boss, and themselves were not able to agree. The Attorney General did not want them to have anything to do with the provincial police, and they wanted to have something to do with the provincial police.

Then they go on and quote the sections of The Police Act prior to 1962. The hon. Prime Minister has already read them; I am not going to repeat them. They talk about what happened in 1962, the changes which were promised, and the interchanging of a few words which, in effect, meant that the new Attorney General was saying to them, "Keep your hands off the provincial police. We will look after that. You just better go off and do something else because I did not think of appointing you in the first place."

However, the amendment, as interpreted and practised by the Attorney General—

they go on to say on page 14

—left us in a powerless consultant and discussion role with the commissioner reporting to the Attorney General and taking his instructions directly from him without information or reference to ourselves.

After two joint meetings, when efforts to develop some mutually satisfactory method

of procedure proved abortive, the commission gave up any further attempt to influence OPP policy and the force, for the most part of 1963, and especially since August, has been operated by the commissioner as approved directly by the Minister.

We are prepared—

say the commission:

—to withdraw from the field if that is the wish of the government.

Well, the former Attorney General, I think, had made himself reasonably clear on that.

But we did ask, if so, all reference to our responsibility for the OPP be deleted from the Act.

They go on in this tone for another page and a half and they say how sorry they are that their role in having something to do with the OPP has been taken away from them. What happens next, Mr. Speaker?

We have a county court judge, and a general, and a former policeman, sitting around with titles—they are all members of the police commission but they really have nothing to do. Well, lo and behold, Commissioner Harvison made another speech and this gave them all a bright idea.

Commissioner Harvison said there was organized crime in Ontario, and they could not understand how there could possibly be organized crime in Ontario because Mr. Justice Roach had just said: "Well, if there was organized crime it was only alarming in gambling." Surely this did not tie in with what Commissioner Harvison had said, and certainly here was a field where at long last the judge, the general, and the former policeman could get to work. They were going to do something; they were going to fix things up.

So. Mr. Speaker, they wrote a letter—they wrote a letter, and I think the hon. Prime Minister had the facts just a bit twisted. The Attorney General did not suggest to them, they suggested to the Attorney General that they be allowed to embark on this new investigation. They set out in their letter the reasons why they should do it, and the hon. Prime Minister read parts of that letter. On August 31 that letter was written, and on page 8 there is a reference to it in this report.

They reported to the Attorney General on August 31 that, because of what Commissioner Harvison said, it was important that a further inquiry be made into organized crime, that the inquiry be a continuous one, and that the commission initiate discussions with police authorities to endeavour to establish between

the RCMP and provincial and municipal police a better method of co-ordination.

I think it is rather important that the record be corrected in this aspect, Mr. Speaker, because it was not the Attorney General who showed his concern about this and asked the commission to do it; it was the commission, which was having a fight with the Attorney General and were looking for something to do, which came to the Attorney General and said: "Let's have another investigation. Let's investigate the report that Mr. Justice Roach just made, because maybe there is something wrong with it."

In case anyone thinks I am overstating the point, let me read from page 8 Mr. Harvison's remarks:

—implied (a) that the report of Mr. Justice Roach was incomplete or incorrect in its findings; and/or (b) that something had occurred in the succeeding five months to indicate that syndicates had made their appearance in Ontario during that time.

It is a rather fascinating thought, Mr. Chairman, that all of the forces of government which, as we heard at great length this afternoon, are ever alert, always on guard, did not realize in the five-month period that the situation had so deteriorated it was necessary to make another investigation!

In any event I would think that the new Attorney General was quite anxious at that point to get the police commission out of his hair. They were complaining about not being allowed to do anything with the OPP so he said, "By all means, go on out and have another investigation. Get out of my hair! Go away, do not bother me!"

Little did he know what that report was going to bring up. Little did he know what the recommendations were going to be. And little did he anticipate the storm that it was going to arouse.

In fact, when this report was tabled in the Legislature, you will remember, sir, that the Attorney General was shocked about the form in which it appeared and did not hesitate to tell the press that he was most shocked at the way in which it had appeared.

Insofar as the recommendations in the report are concerned, I am going to deal with them in due course. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is most important that the record be set abundantly clear. This investigation—the second one—was needed for no other reason, in my mind, than to keep these three gentlemen busy—the county court judge, the general, and the former policeman—because

they had nothing else to do. They had a job, and they had to keep themselves busy and "out of the Attorney General's hair".

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is now a magistrate.

Mr. Singer: Well, yes.

An hon. member: It's a new title, a new appointment.

Mr. Singer: So they go along and begin to conduct this investigation. Along the line, Mr. Speaker, they felt it was somewhat important to contact Commissioner Harvison. Commissioner Harvison was unavailable; he was in Europe. But, fortunately, and they say in their report:

Fortunately we had in our possession a transcript or a tape of that speech that he made.

And I think one of the radio stations, CKEY, took that tape and they gladly made it available to the commission for their help. They played the tape, and transcripts of it were taken, and there are substantial portions of it quoted in the report. Then they said: "Well, things are really serious; let us see what Commissioner Harvison has to say."

In November, 1963, Commissioner Harvison sent them a telegram and said:

There is really nothing new that I said in my speech at the exhibition. It is what I have said on many occasions before. It is what I said to Mr. Justice Roach. It is how the situation was then and it is how the situation is now. It really has not changed materially.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this did not perturb the fearless three—the judge, the general and the policeman. They had a job, sir, and they were going to go out and they were going to do it, come what may. So they did it, for some 280 pages. Then, Mr. Speaker, some of their ideas of their importance begin to emerge as you read through the sections of their report.

On page 12, for instance, they refer and compare themselves, without shame, without embarrassment, to the Denning commission in the United Kingdom. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Denning commission in the United Kingdom was concerning itself with whether or not matters which affected the security of the United Kingdom might have been revealed to potential enemies of that country. I would have thought that at least some mild modesty might have crept into the thinking of the judge, the general and the policeman, in comparing themselves to the Denning

commission—which was charged with a far more serious and grave responsibility. But if that modesty did exist, Mr. Speaker, it failed to find its way into this report. And so they carried on.

Somewhere along the line, I would have thought that they might have been impressed with one of the remarks in the transcript of the address by Commissioner Harvison. That is his comment number five—where he says there are no large loopholes in our law, that all was provided, if the laws are strictly enforced, and that heavy sentences are handed out.

Let me pause at this point and elaborate on this. The hon. Prime Minister touched on this in his remarks.

He made other references to one of the appendices where Commissioner Harvison's remarks are quoted at greater length. I would have thought that this would have sounded a warning note to this police commission that at least there was one gentleman in this country, a gentleman who occupied probably the most senior police position and who was carrying out his job and carrying it out well, who felt he did not need the type of recommendations that the commission was later to bring in. What did Commissioner Harvison say? He said there are no large loopholes in our laws, all was provided, if our laws are strictly enforced, and that heavy sentences are handed out.

He was concerned, Mr. Speaker. He was concerned in 1961 and 1962 and 1963 and in the years previous to that, with the fact that our laws were not being strictly enforced, with the fact that our law enforcement agencies somehow seemed to be a little slack in carrying out their jobs.

He was concerned, sir, with the sort of thing that Mr. Justice Roach referred to when he was referring to charter clubs. He was referring to such things as the fact that gamblers were able to obtain through The Department of the Provincial Secretary, letters patent incorporating social clubs and/or get control of charters originally granted to others, and that this was an important contributing factor in enabling them to carry out their illegal operations.

This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that we all know full well was under the control of this government and its Cabinet Ministers and its civil servants if they chose to enforce the law. But the government did not, until all this fuss blew up. It did not until all this discussion took place. It did not until the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests had to move from his previous portfolio into the one

he now holds. They were not concerned with this at all, but they had the machinery available if they wanted to use it.

Again, quoting from Mr. Justice Roach's report, Mr. Speaker, as it is referred to in this report on page 74, he reports that the club X and the club Y were granted charters notwithstanding strong adverse police reports, and that the club Z and the club A and the club B were granted charters without referral to the police for a report. Mr. Speaker, what greater condemnation could there be of government procedures that were available to them than those remarks of Mr. Justice Roach?

These are the things that must have been implied in Commissioner Harvison's remarks and the tenor of those remarks did not change through the many years. These are the things that this government could have done. There are actions it could have taken. There are remedies it could have enacted. It could have done all these things without coming to this House and asking for these arbitrary powers that infringe on civil liberties.

I have been trying to understand why this police commission brings in a report that contains so many arbitrary suggestions. I just cannot find it in my mind to follow their thinking or their reasoning, unless, Mr. Speaker, it is the thinking and reasoning of those people, and there are many of them in our society, who believe that the politicians should not have the responsibility of running this country or this province, that such responsibility better devolves on nameless and faceless civil servants who run around giving orders and conducting investigations, or on the police who should not be under the control of the politician, or on the military.

If these three gentlemen belong to that group, then, Mr. Speaker, I say they have no place in our administration at all, any one of them. One has already gone, two of them have been reappointed. I say they have no place in our administration at all, because our administration, as imperfect as it is, our democracy as imperfect as it is, is the best system that the mind of man has been able to come up with in lo, these many hundreds of years that it has taken to develop it.

We must jealously guard the rights and privileges that have been fought for and established over these many hundreds of years. We must ever be on the alert not to allow the type of thinking that is expressed in this report to nibble away at these rights and privileges. As Edmund Burke said, while it is easy to point at the hideous person or

the suspect person and say we are only going to take his rights away because it is a great time of emergency, once you take his rights away you have taken away the rights of all of the people and you have destroyed a little bit more of our democratic system.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the tenor of the debate that I thought should be well established early in the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister.

Unfortunately, as carefully as I listened, this did not seem to come through. To my mind, this report in its arbitrary approaches, is a document that should have no place in the public annals of this province. All of the focuses, all of the emphases, all of the onuses, they describe are put in the wrong way. They talk about accused people or suspected people as though they had already been found guilty. In one stage here they refer to some lawyers, whom they had cause to suspect. They bemoan the fact that they did not have really the power to cross-examine those lawyers and they hoped, if I remember the phraseology correctly, that the suspicions against them would be disproved when the Legislature saw fit to give them the power.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, in all the hundreds of years of tradition that we have had in building up our system of English law and justice, if we have established anything, we have established the presumption, in the eyes of anyone who has any understanding of our law, that people are presumed innocent until they are proved guilty. That is not good enough for these three gentlemen, for the judge and the general and the policeman. They are hoping that maybe when they get additional powers they will be able to allow these lawyers to prove that they were not guilty of some gossip that was heard about them. That is what they say. It is this sort of emphasis throughout this report, Mr. Speaker, that disturbs me so much.

I am pleased to hear the hon. Prime Minister say, and I am sure he says it sincerely, that he is not going to allow any infringement on civil rights. But the hon. Prime Minister cannot escape the responsibility for what has happened. He cannot escape responsibility for having allowed this police commission to get off on this investigation and bring in these arbitrary recommendations. He cannot escape the responsibility for having allowed his Attorney General to bring in Bill No. 99 and the other four bills that are equally obnoxious—the bills relating to credit unions, automobile salesmen, mortgage brokers and real estate brokers.

There is a disease that has begun to affect some of the thinking on the front benches of the government and in the civil service that advises them. This disease is: If the Opposition complains about something and if it complains loudly enough and long enough, and the newspapers join in and support it, then, "We are going to show them. We are going to show them that we are going to take action, and it does not really matter the form that action takes. We are going to answer that criticism and we are going to eliminate forever that cause of complaint. We will fix the Opposition."

The question is going to be asked before this debate is over, "What are we going to do about it, what do we suggest?" Well, let me answer the question now, and I will repeat the answer later on during my remarks.

What we would suggest is this, Mr. Speaker, that there is no excuse for the arbitrary encroachment on civil liberties as exhibited in the thinking of this commission, in the thinking of the government, in the introduction of these five bills to which I have referred.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: How did this government vote?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister of Mines—I would like to hear his opinion, does he like the five bills as they are presently written? Would he want to answer that?

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): He has never read them.

An hon. member: If he did, he would not understand them.

Mr. Sopha: Because he mutters.

An hon. member: I hate a mutterer.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Thanks! That is a great compliment coming from the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

May I inform the members that I am going to insist upon the proper order of debate. When a member is speaking I want the other members to listen unless he is out of order in some remarks that he has made pertaining to them, and if they are of that opinion they may rise on a point of order to the chair and state their point of order and correct whatever the member has said that is out of order. I am going to insist upon

this and I want the debate to be carried out in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was suggesting that when the question is asked, and I expect it will come from the government benches during the course of this debate, "Since you brought the matter up, since Mr. Wintermeyer delivered this speech that focused attention on the system of organized crime that existed in this province, what are you going to do about it? Since your members have talked about the horrible actions of used-car dealers, mortgage brokers and what-have-you, and now we bring in bills that are going to allow us these fantastic powers and you are objecting to them, what do you suggest we do about it?"

Well I say, Mr. Speaker—and I think I am only paraphrasing some of the remarks the hon. Prime Minister made earlier this afternoon—I say that there is machinery available presently to govern, to allow for proper policing in this province; that there is the intelligence available in Ontario that can be put to the work of the government, that can advise Cabinet Ministers and civil servants as to what are infringements on civil liberties.

Commissioner Harvison said he does not need any more tools to get on with the job, he just needs proper use of the tools that are presently available. I would suggest, sir, that if the government is serious—and I hope they are and I would expect they are—if the government is serious about enforcing law and order and keeping control of crime in this province and making sure that the law enforcement authorities have the upper hand rather than the criminal element, that the government will constantly, 24 hours a day and 30 days a month and 365 days a year, make sure that every policeman in this province is working to the peak of his efficiency. Where small police forces—and this is one recommendation in this report that I agree with—where small police forces by reason of their lack of funds and inability to be properly trained exist, that these must go for the greater public good and we must produce larger units which can have more facilities and perhaps better pay. In all places in which we spend public money we cannot stint on paying our law enforcement officers, our policemen, sufficient money to get the best people available for those jobs. We must insist on high standards of education, high qualifications and impeccable character for those men whom we choose as policemen.

That is one phase. Where there are small forces they must give way to larger forces

for more efficient operation and better operation.

I was interested to hear, or to read, the former Attorney General's remarks—not the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests—when he dealt with this recommendation from the police commission and he said: "This is a good idea but it is premature, it is going to cost thousands of policemen their jobs."

I could not quite follow his logic in that one at all. By and large, as I understand it, the police forces in this province are undermanned and there should not be any wholesale cut down of jobs if there is a better form of administration worked out. I would think it would lie within the intelligence of government to work this out; this is what they are here for, after all. They certainly are not going to work out a system that is going to throw thousands of men out of jobs. I would like some further clarification from the government on this.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, another thing that is needed and most thoroughly needed, is the employment by government as civil servants of the best qualified people that are available, as civil servants who will become legal advisors and the law officers of the Crown. The government should not be afraid to bring into its service, at high rates of pay, the best legal brains it can find in Ontario. I mean no disrespect to anyone who is working in The Attorney General's Department at all, but I say to you, sir, that at the present salary rates there is little encouragement at all for any young lawyer to go into that department and to make working in The Attorney General's Department his lifetime career.

I say, too, that the government should pay great attention to the selection of Crown Attorneys and assistant Crown Attorneys. We all know how the system works now: An assistant Crown Attorney is usually some bright young lawyer, fresh out of law school, who enjoys court work and who wants to spend a few years at government expense at a minimum salary learning to find his way around. He stays here two years or three years until he knows his way around, until he has established the beginning of his public reputation and then, because the salaries are so meagre and the desire of The Attorney General's Department to keep those people there is so lacking, he moves on and goes into practice for himself.

I say, sir, that until the government sets its house in order it cannot expect that we are going to have proper law enforcement in this province. It can do it in these ways.

When this government has done these things, then let it come back to the House and say: "We have done them and this is the record." Then let them say: "If that is not enough, we need arbitrary powers," and then let us have a look at them. But let us prove that need. We are not going to stand idly by, Mr. Speaker, and allow any infringement on civil rights unless a thoroughgoing case has been made for it.

I find it difficult to imagine what that case could be. It is conceivable that possibly some extraordinary measures might be needed on a single occasion, directed to a single situation. But to enshrine these arbitrary ideas in statutes, as this commission suggests, and tuck them away so that you have an army of faceless civil servants coming around investigating, seizing documents, forcing people to answer questions, allowing them to ask a lawyer the secrets of his client, or a priest the confidences of his parishioner, or a doctor the knowledge that he has attained from his patients!

None of these things seems to disturb the government, and they bring in these statutes without even a word of apology. Mr. Speaker, we are as anxious as anyone, probably more anxious, to see that any abuses against the laws of the province of Ontario be stopped. But we say, and we say as emphatically as we can, that there are methods presently within the law to allow these things to be done.

The government has no cause to pat itself on the back and say, "Oh, what good boys are we. We solved the Brockville bank robbery. We solved the St. Catharines Trust robbery." These are things we expect of government. This is why we have Attorneys General, why we have policemen, why we have courts. These are the things we have, and there are reasons why we have them.

The government should be able to tell us, and we have not heard it this afternoon, why matters had got to such a horrible state in 1961, why matters had got to the deplorable condition that it was necessary for the leader of the Opposition at that time to make his speech, and to suffer all of the abuse he did because of it. That is what the government should be telling us.

The government should be telling us why Mr. Justice Roach had to disclose the record which he sets out in his report. Reference has been made to that and I am not going to elaborate on that at any length.

The government should be telling us why, when its police commission got into these matters, it elaborated and went much further than Mr. Justice Roach. The government

should tell us why its errors of omission and commission allowed these things to happen. It should not be telling us "what good boys are we."

They are ever-vigilant. I was making some notes as the hon. Prime Minister was speaking. He said he is deeply concerned; he is ever-vigilant; he will not shirk. "We are reasonably well equipped now," was the reference that Commissioner Harvison made. "An alert police force is important."

The hon. Prime Minister quoted from Mr. Robert Kennedy, but I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister noticed one of the quotes attributed to Mr. Kennedy on the day he was in Toronto. This is to be found on page one of the *Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, April 15:

He told the 30 reporters that Canadians should not be lulled into thinking crime does not exist in Canada because there is more of it in the United States.

"Your officials know organized crime exists and so do you newspapermen," he said.

Asked whether he felt existing laws were adequate to handle organized crime, Mr. Kennedy replied that anti-crime legislation must never be allowed to interfere with fundamental individual liberties. "Too much power should not be granted to a government," he said.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): What powers is he asking for?

Mr. Singer: I was interested in that aside from the hon. Provincial Secretary about New York State or what powers he is asking for. It was rather interesting to note these references made by the police commission to what is going on in New York State. On page 116 they point out under the heading:

CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

A code of fair procedure for investigating agencies is set forth in the civil rights law of the state of New York. It provides for fundamental rights of persons attending and testifying before the commission and should be of value in the formulation of similar rules for the proceedings of the Ontario Police Commission.

I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that such an eminent lawyer and someone so concerned with civil rights as the hon. Provincial Secretary, would have spotted this recommendation and would have been among the first to have stood up in his place in this House and said, "We must have a code of civil rights' protection for people who are

summoned before such agencies." We have not had that from him. We have just had his interesting remark this afternoon. I would hope that he thinks this is a good idea.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is unfortunate that the hon. member for Downsview is never in the House at the times when he should be. If he will refer to my remarks in this House on a previous occasion, I did make specific reference to that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member usually makes a speech and then he leaves.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: I am sorry that I have piqued the hon. Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: We all are. We have to listen to him.

Mr. Singer: I would have hoped that rather than make reference to it, the hon. Provincial Secretary would have been able as a Cabinet Minister to have had something done about bringing in this sort of code, to protect people who are summoned to appear before various administrative bodies. After all, the hon. Provincial Secretary, able man that he is, is not just an ordinary person. He is a man of substantial ability. He is a member of the Cabinet as well, and he really should not speak of his personal opinions when he speaks of matters of this great importance in this House. He speaks as a member of the Cabinet.

Is he prepared to say now, or is his hon. leader prepared to say now, this is what the provincial government stands for: that it will bring in a code to protect people who have to appear before administrative bodies? I would hope we would hear that and I would commend the hon. Provincial Secretary if he was able to say this with the authority of the government behind him. But we have not heard it, Mr. Speaker, and we are not going to hear it, I suspect, until a lot more water goes over the dam.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What powers does Robert Kennedy want?

Mr. Whicher: What powers do you want?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, indicative of the rather interesting attitude that the commission takes to various matters, is page 89. To be

quite fair to the commission, I am not sure whether these are the views of the commission, or these are the views of a group of Crown Attorneys, from whom it received ideas—it is very hard to tell from the way this is set up—but this is a paragraph that is included, in any event, at the bottom of page 89 of the report which, at least, if the commission is shocked about it, it does not say so. It says this:

It is suggested that fingerprints be taken on application to license a motor vehicle; that tapping telephones be permitted by police for purposes of investigation and also as evidence; that license be required to install more than one telephone; that the Criminal Code be amended to set out grounds where bail may be granted; that there be appeals on facts as well as law; that injunction and padlock proceedings be authorized as aid to law enforcement.

I do not know, as I say, to be entirely fair to the commission, whether it endorsed all of these ideas but at least it saw fit to repeat them and it repeated them without any comment, without any indication of shock or horror or anything else. If nothing else, it has given these ideas notice and probably much more than passing approval.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, if this is the sort of thinking that we have represented on that police commission, its members have no business to be in the positions which they hold in the province of Ontario today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal at a little greater length with some of the recommendations here. Before I get to the recommendations section I thought the paragraph at the bottom of page 100 of the report was worthy of comment. This is what the commission says and there is no doubt that this is its opinion:

We recognize that the proposals here made may arouse the opposition not only of interested persons, but it will also give concern to others who may fear the loss of a traditional if not legally guaranteed freedom of private communication. What is called for is a weighing of social values, to determine if what is here seriously advocated really involves any substantial loss of present rights as opposed to very worthwhile social advantages, which will serve to ensure the continued freedom of the individual from the physical and mental duress and tyranny which might result from the successful inroads of syndicated crime. Of what value, then, would any of our freedoms, legally guaranteed or otherwise, be to us?

I say, Mr. Speaker, that paragraph perhaps as well as anything that is in this report indicates the thinking of the police commission. This sort of thinking and this sort of phrase have been the cry of tyrants down through history. If these cries are allowed to take hold, if these ideas are allowed to become part of our government thinking, then democracy is gone. These are the matters that must concern us.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the role of government is concerned, I think a paragraph from the remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister on the fateful Monday when Bill No. 99 was discussed is most pertinent and should form a part of the record at this time. If the government says it can escape responsibility for this, the hon. Prime Minister squarely put it on the spot. This is what he said:

It is thus possible for hon. members to see that the report itself, with its exhaustive investigation into the existence and possible future development of crime in the province, together with this bill form a unit in which is contained the problem which must be met and a possible means of meeting that problem. In other words, the report and the bill must be considered together, and in themselves they form a unit.

The hon. Prime Minister has accepted the responsibility, as well he should, and now he must accept the criticism that goes along with it. Fortunately, those suggestions have not been enacted in law, but I hope this government has learned a lesson and will learn a lesson when it reads reports like this about suggestions of what should become a part of our law.

The commission on page 111 says that it is not satisfied with the investigatory procedures allowed under section 48 of The Police Act. It is not satisfied to have the powers that Mr. Justice Roach had, which were subject to review by the Court of Appeal, and which on at least one occasion saw fit to reverse his ruling. The commission is better. It knows more than Mr. Justice Roach. It should be allowed to be a law unto itself. It should be allowed to make its own decisions, to seize its own papers and on and on, to imprison people for contempt, to deny people the traditional privileges that have been built up in our history of law.

In case there is any doubt about what it was thinking—and there has been discussion about what the law officers really meant; there have been questions about which set of law officers we really believe—at the

bottom of page 112 the commission is worried about the contempt feature of these matters.

While under The Public Inquiries Act, which is made applicable to inquiries under section 48 of The Police Act, witnesses who fail to attend when duly subpoenaed or who refuse to answer questions asked of them, may be summarily punished by the commission for contempt, the New York commission must make application to the courts for such punishment, which is an unsatisfactory way of obtaining information and leads to delays—

Courts delay things! It is terrible. Courts in protecting civil rights often cause delay, and this commission says:

While our procedure is, therefore, better, it is not, in the opinion of the commission, clear that it may exercise the same legal powers in a private as in a public hearing and this should be clarified. Consideration should also be given to extending to the commission the powers given to courts at common law to punish for contempts committed in the face of the tribunal.

So the county court judge and the general and the policeman want to set themselves up as the be-all and the end-all; and the statute you remember, Mr. Speaker, allowed one or any of them, to determine these matters and to send people to jail. These are powers that we should never contemplate giving to a body of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, running through these recommendations that start at page 119, and the hon. Prime Minister has already listed some and he has indicated, as I understood him in any event, he has some grave reservations. There are many that give us real cause to wonder about the sort of thinking that is being asked to be reflected in the legislation e.g.: that in the interests of public security police be permitted to require the production of means of identification by persons suspected of criminal or illegal activity. I would like to know how that one would work. The policeman suddenly decides, Mr. Speaker, that you, sir, are a person suspected of criminal or illegal activity. I am only suggesting this as a hypothetical case. No policeman would ever put himself in that position with you, sir. But, the policeman if the commission is given its way, is entitled to force you, because you are a suspicious person, to produce some sort of identification.

Mr. Speaker, surely it must shock every hon. member of this House that the commission did not have sufficient respect for the liberties of the citizens of this province which

would instruct them to think out these suggestions before they committed them to paper.

Then there are the recommendations contained in item 11 of the report. The hon. Prime Minister said that it was as a result of these recommendations that the infamous section 14 of The Police Act was brought before this House. It is rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the explanatory note attached to The Police Act, one of the excuses for section 14 was that The Securities Act has the same sort of provisions.

Now I did a little research last night on how long those sections have been in The Securities Act. I know they have been in as far back as 1950. I would suggest they have been there for a much longer time. They are arbitrary too and they should not be there and I would have thought that the law officers of the Crown, having discovered they are there, should have recognized their arbitrary nature.

But even The Securities Act—as arbitrary as it is—recognizes that there are certain privileges to be respected and it sets those out, at least the one referring to the privilege of a lawyer not to be forced to discuss information that he may have received from a client.

The draftsman of this Act, and the people who introduced it, did not even think that precaution was worthy of inclusion in Bill 99 or these other four bills I talked about earlier.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate what I have said earlier this afternoon. We are proud of the role we have played in bringing to the attention of the people of Ontario, the tragic situation that existed insofar as the enforcement of our laws was concerned. We believe that our leader in 1961, Mr. Wintermeyer, did outstanding service for all of the people of Ontario in forcefully and dramatically bringing these matters to public attention and as a result forcing the inquiries that have taken place.

We have at no time advocated, nor do we advocate now and we suggest that no case has been made whatsoever for remedies of the type suggested by this commission or enunciated in Bill 99 and these other bills.

We abhor this type of arbitrary action, this sort of power that it is suggested be given to policemen, to the military or to nameless and faceless civil servants, and the abandonment of civil rights in line with British traditions of justice that have been built up over these hundreds of years. We believe that the government presently, in the words of Commissioner Harvison, "has the tools available

to do the job and the job can be done without asking for any arbitrary powers."

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Is that the policeman the hon. member is talking about?

Mr. Singer: Yes, but I would suggest that he is being reasonably sensible, because in his years of office as a policeman, and in his years of office as probably the most senior policeman in Canada and one of the most highly respected, he has never seen fit to go to his superiors and ask for these arbitrary powers. He has some respect for the civil rights.

We say that if the government is doing its job and if these law enforcement agencies are operating to the peak of their efficiency—and they can if there are proper advisors, well paid, within government and within the courts—that these matters will be controlled and they will be controlled in a manner that will protect all of these important legal traditions.

Statements like the one "It is better a thousand guilty men go free than one innocent man be convicted" have not become a part of our thinking as a result of our taking these matters lightly. The principle that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty has been a hard thought out principle that is an integral part of our system of law enforcement. The idea is that a person be not forced to incriminate himself, but if he has committed some wrong or some crime against the state it is the duty of those persons charged with the authority of law enforcement to go out and get the evidence to convict him. These are ideas which are important to preserve and they cannot be lightly cast aside.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I began with a quote from Edmund Burke, let me end with a quote from Edmund Burke. And in the same letters he wrote to the sheriffs of Bristol, he said this:

I therefore could never reconcile myself to the bill I send you, which is expressly provided to remove all inconveniences from establishment of a mode of trial which has ever appeared to me most unjust and most unconstitutional. Far from removing the difficulties which impede the execution of so mischievous a project, I would heap new difficulties upon it if it were in my power.

All the ancient, honest, juridical principles and institutions of England are so many clogs to check and retard the headlong course of violence and oppression.

They were invented for this one good purpose, that what was not just should not be convenient. Convinced of this, I would leave things as I found them. The old cool-headed general law is as good as any deviation dictated by the present heat.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate somewhat inhibited, because I must say that the hon. gentleman to my right has all the appearances of a wanted member of the Mafia, whose picture I saw in the paper about two weeks ago.

However, if I can recover my composure I will proceed to deal with the issues before us.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in any debate of this nature the question of the traditional rights of the individual should be given pre-eminent consideration—not only in any debate of this nature, but also in any of the activities, any of the legislation of this House, they should be given pre-eminent consideration. I am not going to take a great deal of time this afternoon in dwelling on them, as far as this Legislature is concerned; because quite frankly, insofar as enunciating these principles is concerned, insofar as abhorring any breach of them is concerned, I think that task has been done in about as dramatic a way within the past month, in the province of Ontario, as ever took place in our history.

The response of the people of this province to the implications contained in the so-called police state legislation was, to put it mildly, resounding. Indeed, it was so resounding that this government, which enjoys a majority and a power as a result of that majority from an election no more than six or eight months ago, for a period normally for the next four years, was virtually brought to the brink of defeat.

It was humbled in a fashion in which few governments, for quite some time, have been in the province of Ontario. And it was, Mr. Speaker, if my friends to the left at the moment—who really stand to the right—will not interject, because they at least, for a fleeting moment, recognized the importance of some of these principles. To their credit these principles were given prior consideration over party considerations. The result is that the government had to beat something of a disorderly retreat and we saw at least the end of that offensive section of Bill 99.

I do not think there is any necessity for prolonged discussion of this aspect of the question in the Legislature, even though it is important. There is only one aspect of it, Mr. Speaker, that I think is rather interest-

ing and rather important, and that is that we normally, in Canada, particularly those of us who are active in public life, deplore the lethargy of the electorate on many issues. That being the case, it is rather interesting to ponder why, on this particular issue, the people of Ontario, I think it could be said that spontaneously, six million or more of them, expressed their view in such a fashion that the government had to withdraw at least the offensive section of Bill 99.

Why do you have that contrast between what is usually deplored as a lethargy of the electorate and their almost spontaneous reaction in this instance? This is the point I want to dwell on for a moment, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important, as we consider these basic and traditional rights of the individual.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the reason why the people of the province of Ontario, and indeed the people of Canada, respond almost uncharacteristically on an issue, when it is this kind of an issue, is because governments in Canada in the 20th century have a very sorry record in this connection. To say that it is spotty is to put it mildly.

We have had repeated instances of governments in this country who have seized upon the threats — often an exaggerated threat which happened to suit their political purposes—and with the pretence of coping with this threat they have destroyed the basic rights of individuals.

Perhaps the most startling and far-reaching of those was after the first world war in 1919, when the workers in the city of Winnipeg engaged in a general strike and the Conservative-dominated coalition government at Ottawa, almost within a matter of hours, under the leadership of Arthur Meighen, rushed two amendments through the House of Commons. One was an amendment to The Immigration Act. But, Mr. Speaker, just stop and consider this: it meant that if a person was picked up because of the fact that, presumably, he was one of these subversive elements, there were people in Canada, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, who thought that what happened in the Winnipeg general strike was the Canadian equivalent to the Russian revolution.

This was Canadian Bolshevism! And anybody who might be accused or might be suspected of fomenting these ideas could be picked up without being charged, without being taken to the courts. There could be an arbitrary exercise of power and he could be deported from the country even, Mr. Speaker,

if he were a British subject. That happened in Canada.

You had, along with it, the infamous section 98 of The Criminal Code, which also permitted the arbitrary exercise of power against a person who was considered to be—and I will use the general term—a Bolshevik. And this in the fashion we have seen in more recent years in the McCarthy era in the United States, against anybody who was left of centre. And, Mr. Speaker, it took us one generation under the dogged battling of J. S. Woodsworth ultimately, with the co-operation of Lapointe, to get that legislation off the books.

In 1935—I have referred to this in the past but I did not happen to have a copy of it in the House—so I am going to refer to it now.

In 1935, when we fought an election in this country, out in British Columbia the six Liberal candidates running in the Vancouver constituency ran full-page ads in the papers entitled, “CCF and the Oriental Vote,” in which they quoted, in the centre part of the ad, from the federal *Hansard* in which J. S. Woodsworth said, “Sure, I am in favour of the vote for people who happen to be of Japanese descent. And I will come into any hon. member’s constituency and say so.”

These men, one of whom became a Cabinet Minister in the government which was elected, sponsored an ad which said: “You will decide on election day. A vote for any CCF candidate is a vote to give the Chinaman and the Japanese the same voting rights which you have!”

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: “A vote for the Liberal candidate in your riding is a vote against the Oriental enfranchisement.”

An hon. member: What about the Irish and English—

Mr. MacDonald: This is not the Irish and English years ago, Mr. Speaker. This is something of the spotty record in this country within the last generation, and it was not surprising therefore, Mr. Speaker, that a government which had Cabinet Ministers elected on that kind of an appeal seven years later trampled the rights of Canadian-born Japanese into the ground, uprooted them from their homes, looted their property and scattered them east of the Rockies.

An hon. member: It was John Diefenbaker who fought for them, not J. S. Woodsworth.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me remind hon. members of a final episode that has created in the minds of the Canadian people and in the minds of the people of Ontario a sensitivity so that they spontaneously react to a threat of the nature that was contained in Bill No. 99.

When I came out of the Navy in 1946 one of the first community activities in which I became involved in the city of Ottawa was in the Civil Liberties Association. The main concern of the Civil Liberties Association in 1946 was the acts of the government of the day in coping with the threat that was revealed by Gouzenko when he defected from the Russian embassy and provided some details as to the existence of spy rings in Canada. I knew people in Ottawa—some of them I knew personally and some I knew about—women whose husbands just disappeared. Nobody knew where they were; they were held incommunicado for weeks. They were not charged; they had no right to counsel but they were being grilled behind the scenes by the police because of the threat, a sort of a post-Second World War manifestation of Bolshevism in Canada. And this time the Liberal government took this kind of action.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting because there is a remarkable parallel with some of the talk we have heard in this House in the last while. During the course of the debate that took place in the House of Commons over the breaches of individual rights, you had this kind of a quote:

We are all attached to the proper administration of justice whether it be criminal or civil, as it is being practised under the British system which has become our own, but there has been nothing shown anywhere which constitutes any violation of any rights which any individual may have when he comes to answer for any charge brought against him.

This was with reference to these people who were being held incommunicado for a month without right to counsel. Their wives did not know where they were. Do you know who made that statement? St. Laurent, the Minister of Justice in the government of the day, who subsequently became Prime Minister.

Mr. Sopha: Is the security of the state a different proposition?

Mr. MacDonald: We will get around to whether the security of the state is a different proposition or not, because that is a very pertinent point that I want to dwell on later.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the same Mr. St. Laurent, on May 8, 1946, in the debates of the House of Commons had this to say:

Those principles resulting from Magna Carta, from the Petition of Rights, the Bill of Rights, from The Habeas Corpus Act are great and glorious privileges, but they are privileges which can be and unfortunately which have sometimes to be interfered with by action of Parliament, or action under the authority of Parliament.

In peacetime? This was not wartime.

Mr. Whicher: The security of the state was threatened.

Mr. MacDonald: This is 1946.

Mr. Sopha: The security of the state is a different matter.

Mr. MacDonald: Indeed there was another man who happened to be a supporter of the government at that time who rose and his explanation and justification for what the government did was: "I have a deep respect for Magna Carta!" You see the respect—it was like what we heard here in the House from some of the Conservative members, that they had great respect for these principles. Yet look what they did in their caucus and their Cabinet to these principles! The parallel is remarkable. This member of the House of Commons said this:

I have deep respect for Magna Carta. However, because I have a deep respect and sincere admiration for the Magna Carta and because I want it to continue to protect our rights and liberties, I contend that the government has acted wisely in taking these rights. The government acted the way it did in making the arrest precisely to prevent the sabotage of the Magna Carta.

Ponder and reflect on the rationalization there.

In my opinion the saying "desperate ills call for desperate remedies" remains true. I am quite sure that the Magna Carta would have contained clauses pertaining to sabotage and treason had the possibility of such actions been foreseen at the time. This was the quote of one Frederick Dorion the Liberal member for Charlevoix-Saguenay.

A week or so ago I was very interested in some of the comments that were made in the press with regard to the government's police state legislation. I was particularly interested, for example, in the comment of Jack Pickersgill, who was the adviser to Mr. King and

subsequently to Mr. St. Laurent before he went into active politics. Mr. Pickersgill's comment was that the Robarts government police state legislation made the padlock law look like a bill of rights.

Well maybe, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of personal judgment, I am not certain, but the interesting thing is that the Liberal government with Mr. Pickersgill as an adviser played politics with the padlock law and never, because it was not politically expedient, would they disallow the bill. Even though they exercised their power in disallowing equal threats to some of our basic rights when they were passed by the Alberta government. It was left, Mr. Speaker, to a man—distinguished in this country as a lawyer, and I might add because of a political association that I am proud of—Frank Scott, to fight the Roncarelli case through the courts for 15 years and finally achieve the unprecedented thing of pinning a conviction on the premier of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Sopha: He did no such thing, he got a judgment against him.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, okay then.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Is that more effective than getting rid of Premier Duplessis, which Lesage did?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I come back to the historical perspective in which we should place this issue of the challenge that has come to the basic rights of the people in this country, a record that is so spotty on the part of both Liberal and Conservative governments—and perhaps because they were in power often in the last generation, particularly on the record of the Liberal party—that the people of Canada are profoundly sensitive on this issue. They will almost spontaneously arise when the circumstances demand, and I am not surprised that they rose in the instance when this government brought in its particular police state legislation.

However, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with the pre-eminent position in which we should place these basic rights of the individual, I want now to get around to dealing with the basic problem with which, in an incredible fashion, this government got itself into difficulty, as it sought to shape more effective machinery, namely, the problem and the threat presented by organized crime.

We have been trying to come to grips with organized crime in the province of Ontario for years now. The inability of the police, for example, for a number of years to cope with the clubs such as the Centre

Road Veterans' Club out to the west of Toronto, when anybody who knew anything about this club—the dogs at the door, the barred windows and the three doors to get into it—knew that it was carrying on illegal activity. The police could not do anything about it. Indeed for three years after, when we in the province allegedly had moved to cope with it, by switching it from a federal to a provincial charter, the Attorney General of the day said that raids were not to be made on it unless there were complaints.

We had frustration of the police. I was very interested in the hon. Prime Minister saying that Feeley and McDermott languish in jail. They languish in jail now, but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, Feeley and McDermott in conjunction with the Mafia ran the Centre Road Club for years and it is passing strange that the police could not come to grips with the thing. Just let me put it that way and nothing else, it is passing strange that they were frustrated in their efforts to enforce the law.

Commissioner Harvison says, for example, that Canada is not rife for invasion, but he added:

—always provided the laws are strictly enforced and that heavy sentences are handed out.

But the problem in this province was that for years our laws were not enforced and they were not enforced because the greatest obstacle to enforcing the laws was the attitude of the government. The attitude—and the hon. member for Downsview is very right—the attitude of the then Attorney General of the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, was that there was no organized crime. One could not really blame him for taking that attitude because he was backed up by the Prime Minister of the day.

So for years we drifted instead of really coming to grips with this. Then we had the Roach commission following the revelations in this House by the then leader of the Opposition—a very able statement, because it was prepared by the leader of the crime-investigating group of one of the papers, Mr. Speaker, and the information that he had dug out for years in his capacity as a professional journalist. It was presented to the House and the public reaction was such that finally the government had to set up the Royal commission.

The Royal commission had three terms of reference, Mr. Speaker. Its first term of reference was to get at the problem of the chartered clubs. The second term of reference was to investigate the allegations with

regard to corruption in the Attorney General's department. On each of those terms of reference I would say that the report of the Royal commission was tolerably good and effective.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: I said it was tolerably good. Those are my words and I will stick by them. But the third term of reference, Mr. Speaker, that was given to the Roach commission was to look into the ramifications of organized crime in the province of Ontario and to make recommendations with regard to the effectiveness of the law enforcement agencies to deal with it.

After that, Mr. Speaker, the Roach commission did virtually nothing. Indeed, they picked up information along the way as they were dealing with the other two terms of reference and then Justice Roach and everybody involved became so weary of the task that there were one or two *in camera* sessions held with the commissioner of the RCMP and other people and we were presented with a report that merely scratched the surface in coming to grips with the ramifications of organized crime in the province of Ontario.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it became necessary for that job to be picked up and to be completed. It was just another instance of unfinished business. So we have now before us the report of the Ontario Police Commission, a pretty weighty tome. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should take note of this. That after all of these years the situation is not yet fully investigated. We have not yet got the full story, and this is the reason the hon. Prime Minister is very right when he said that we should not be lulled into any sense of false security.

We have not got the full story. The Ontario Police Commission report says quite frankly that this is a first and a preliminary report. It adds on page 11:

Many names were obtained of persons said to be engaged in organized crime, some of whom appeared before Mr. Justice Roach. We consulted the deputy Attorney General as to our legal powers while conducting our inquiry *in camera* and were advised that there was considerable doubt as to these, which should best be resolved by legislation to clarify. Accordingly, we decided to await a decision as to such legislation and its enactment, if favoured, before undertaking the private questioning of reluctant or hostile witnesses.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is the OPC in effect saying that a main aspect of

this investigation that we have been doing in bits and pieces for years still remains to be done, and therefore it is not surprising when you get to the concluding portion of the report, their conclusions and their recommendations, you will find on page 113, the following comment:

The commission has refrained, as stated elsewhere, from completing its inquiry as to criminal personalities until its legal powers can be settled by legislation or by the courts.

This is a point I want to pause and dwell on, Mr. Speaker, because this is important. We have had one Royal commission. We have had innumerable court cases related to it. We have had another investigation, and the point we must never forget is that we are not yet fully conversant with the picture of organized crime in the province of Ontario.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would say that just as the Valachi testimony in the United States in the investigation of the U.S. committee contributed in an extraordinary way to the knowledge of the operations of syndicated crime in the United States, and incidentally its link with Canada, so the testimony of the key leaders in Canada may represent a major lead to the organization and operation of organized crime in Canada and this we have not yet got. This is merely a first and a preliminary report.

It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, since we are trying to come to grips with how we can shape more effective machinery, to recall the whole origins of this report. Both the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. member for Downsview have spelled it out, that back last August—whether it was because they had nothing to do and because Commissioner Harvison made his statement, that the police commission then requested the Attorney General for permission to proceed and, in effect, pick up from the unfinished business of the Roach commission—whether that was the reason or not I do not know, but as a result of the public expressions of opinion with regard to organized crime in Ontario, they finally proceeded to complete the investigation. Indeed at that time, Mr. Speaker, we were treated to the rather unseemly spectacle of the Attorney General of Ontario and Commissioner Harvison in a public argument as to whether or not we had organized crime in this province and to what extent. It was not the kind of thing that would give one confidence as a citizen when the two leading people responsible for law enforcement, the Attorney General of Ontario and the Commissioner of the

RCMP, were squabbling over what the facts were within the province of Ontario.

Very early—so the newspapers reported all last fall—very early the commission went to the deputy Attorney General, as I intimated in the quote from page 11 of the report, and said: "What are our powers for *in camera* sessions? We know we have the power to call witnesses and all the powers related to that under The Public Inquiries Act, but what are our powers with *in camera* sessions?" Apparently it was the deputy Attorney General who said that he was not certain that the law was explicit in granting them these powers.

In other words, it is interesting—as I said in the famous debate on Bill 99 on Monday, March 23—it is very interesting to note that the origins for the amendments proclaimed in Bill 99 come directly from the deputy Attorney General. It was he who said that they were necessary. So they cannot be palmed off on Judge Macdonald in the kind of continuing vendetta which the former Attorney General tended to get into with Judge Macdonald.

Those origins were in the advice of the deputy Attorney General. In his view the law was not explicit in granting the necessary powers for the *in camera* sessions. So the OPC asked for it in their report. The irony of it, Mr. Speaker, is that in spite of their own recognition of the need for it, when they got around to bringing in a bill to grant these greater powers, they handled the matter in such a fashion as to create one of the major political crises in the history of the province of Ontario. They handled the content of the bill with a monumental insensitivity. As the hon. Prime Minister said in a comment during those trying days: "We underestimated the side effects of the bill."

Of course, they also handled it with a fumbling ineptitude on the political level that is almost beyond comprehension. I do not want to review all that here now, because it is all old straw, but the fact that the bill should come into this House and that we should have no explanation, and that the Attorney General should have immediately gone out and made such alarmist statements so that he created the atmosphere that finally blew him out of the Cabinet and forced the government into a rather humbling retreat is almost beyond comprehension.

Even more important, he was grilled—and quite rightly so by the press. "If you think the bill is as bad as you say," in effect the newspaper corps said to him "then why did you bring it in?" And his retort after the

question had been put to him many times was: "Do not ask me, ask Judge Macdonald."

An incredible statement, because it must have been that his better judgment and his recognition of the responsibility of Cabinets and Ministers was superseded for the moment from the underlying tendency in his thinking to continue his vendetta with the police commission and Judge Macdonald. So he blamed Judge Macdonald and got himself into real trouble. The result was, as I said, that this province was rocked with a major crisis which humbled a powerful government and, notwithstanding the comments of my hon. friends to the side, brought the government to the verge of defeat. It certainly resulted in the departure of the Attorney General—an honourable thing, incidentally, an honourable thing.

Indeed, if I may say this, and I say it without any undercurrent of criticism, I am glad that there was finally a Minister in the Cabinet who, under circumstances like that, had the integrity to resign. Because there are, sitting on the Cabinet benches, a number of them who have said—and let me go back to the former Attorney General and the debate on the NONG report in 1959—"I pledge my word that we have got the whole story and if it is ever proven that we have not got the full story on the NONG affair, then I will resign and go out of public life." Well, his resignation is long since past—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well now, on a point of order, I never said any such thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not got the quote here but perhaps we can get it for him.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I never said any such thing, or ever made any such suggestion. The hon. member may be getting mixed up about what I said in relation to something that the leader of the Opposition at the time said, later on in another context. But we are not discussing either at the present time. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to accept my statement at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: I shall quote the record before we begin the House tomorrow, before orders of the day. It is known by all—

Mr. Speaker: We are discussing the order before the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sopha: A good filing system this fellow has.

Mr. MacDonald: It is filed in *Hansard* for posterity to read.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am sorry. We are discussing the order before the House and I would ask the member to continue with the proper order of business at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: I was speaking of the honourable thing that the former Attorney General did under the circumstances, and I repeat: I think it was the honourable thing.

But the net result of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that the government, the Opposition, and the people of the province of Ontario, have been alerted to the need for a greater scrutiny of these threats to our basic liberties—not only in legislation, not only with regard to organized crime, but in the regulations and the procedures generally with which we have to deal in implementing the legislation which passes through this Legislature.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker—and I just say this in passing—that I have placed on the order paper a resolution—which I hope the hon. Prime Minister will give us an opportunity to debate—of the full range of these threats to the basic rights of the individual which may be in legislation or regulation; or the lack of appeal in some of our commissions arising from the fact that another committee which was set up by this House never completed a job, but just drifted off into limbo because of the preoccupation of the chairman in other matters.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me now come down to the real problem—the problem of organized crime. This is what provoked Bill 99. How great is that problem? I want to dwell on its seriousness for a moment, Mr. Speaker, because I think that the public consternation aroused by Bill 99, and the threat which it posed to individual rights, has tended to obscure the seriousness of the threat of organized crime. It has had a tendency to strengthen the feeling in the minds of some people that we are exaggerating the threat of organized crime.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, and I say this without any equivocation, organized crime is the greatest single threat from within society in the North American continent today. In contrast to it, the subversive forces such as Communism and Fascism are infinitely less. The forces of Fascism and Communism are supported by very few people but, in an unconscious and vague way, many people get drawn in in support of organized crime unwittingly—and this is a point to which I want to come in a moment.

In fact I think, Mr. Speaker, we have got

to see this in the whole broad perspective of what is happening in Canada, and the threat which has emerged in recent years. The existence of organized crime in the United States has been well known, so well known that time after time of studies have been made available for people to know the nature of it, its organization, and what is necessary to cope with it.

But because of the seriousness of the threat of organized crime in the United States, Attorney General Robert Kennedy has been conducting a very vigorous campaign against its leaders. Combined with those developments in the United States you had, for example, after the Castro revolution in Cuba, gamblers being driven out of the international casinos of Havana. They could not go back to the United States and operate with the ease they had been able to in previous years. So they began to look to Canada.

They looked to Canada, if I may borrow that phrase of Commissioner Harvison's that the hon. Prime Minister referred to, as "an increasingly attractive target." In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have in the North American continent, there is no doubt about it, a continental cartel controlling crime in various degrees. We say, for example, that crime does not pay but this continent is systematically looted of \$22 billion a year by the crime cartel.

The United States Senate committee has estimated that \$47 billion a year are made in illegal betting in the United States, that \$9 billion of that \$47 billion of illegal betting goes into the treasuries of the underworld. Attorney General Kennedy, in his speech to the U.S. committee, which is recorded in this Ontario Police Commission report on page 155, had this to say:

The private government of organized crime, a government with an annual income of billions, resting on a base of human suffering and moral corrosion.

This is his description of the nature of organized crime. It is a private government within our government.

One of my hon. friends over here was interjecting, when I was recalling the threat to civil liberties, when the security of the state was threatened because of the Gouzenko ring; but I want to submit to this House that the security of the state is constantly threatened by organized crime. It is the enemy from within. They are a private government unto themselves. They have their own laws, they have their own moral code, they have their own discipline, they have their own law enforcement agencies. They even have their

own pension system, so that when somebody has to be polished off in the squabbles and the internecine warfare and widows are left, there is at least some modicum of humanity; they will have a pension system for the widow who has to continue to live after her husband has been bumped off in their warfare.

You have this "moral corrosion" which Attorney General Kennedy spoke of, the \$9 billion income, half of which is used as protection money. Now just pause and consider this, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members should consider it when they are considering how serious is the threat of organized crime, this pattern of the United States of which we have the details. We have not got the details in Canada. We have not got the details in Ontario. This is the second or third report, and it is still only a preliminary report.

We can assume that the kind of thing that happened in the United States can happen in Canada, and what happened in the United States is that \$4.5 billion of the \$9 billion that went into the treasury of the underworld was used as protection money.

For example, in the *Maclean's* magazine article written by Allan Phillips on April 4, a couple of weeks ago, he refers to this and uses these figures—they are not new as far as he is concerned, they have been available from the records for quite some time—that the police and the politicians and the judiciary are subject to this kind of moral corrosion. Do not let us for one moment say, "This is American and has nothing to do with us." I was very interested, for example, to read in this Phillips article in *Maclean's* magazine, a quote he attributes to an embittered Toronto policeman who said, "Buy yourself a politician and you don't need to buy the police." Do not dismiss Allan Phillips' comments either, because if there is any man who has done a good job, apart from the Roach commission, to reveal the whole nature of organized crime, it is Allan Phillips, and this OPC report acknowledges this. It says the OPC is not in a position to agree, for the moment at least, with some of the conclusions he comes to, but this is in the context of the fact that it has not the full story.

In the United States, for example, there is more money being spent for protection than the police are being paid, far more money. Indeed, Mr. Phillips notes in this article, as I have seen in American articles studying the situation, that it is quite possible that police at the local level in the United States, whose total incomes are approximately \$1 billion a year, get more money from organized crime for protection than they get from their

own income. This is the conclusion of some of the studies in the U.S.A.

As for politicians, Mr. Speaker, just let me remind this House so that we do not get a bit of a holier-than-thou attitude with regard to what happens in the United States and cannot happen here, that there is no doubt in the wide world that there were politicians in this province, one of them right in the Cabinet, who was a very good friend of the—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am sorry, I think I will have to ask the member to desist from making references that do not come within the ambit of the report of the police commission which is now before us.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why at this point we draw the line between evidence which was contained in the Roach commission in its testimony and further evidence as made available in this. All I am saying is what was in the Roach commission testimony and report.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, I did not think it was relevant to the report which is now before the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, with very great respect, I want to suggest to you that if we are talking about the threat of organized crime and its corruption of police and politicians and the judiciary, this is very relevant to what we are discussing at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: Suppose we let the man rest in his grave.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Fine. But let us suppose that we take cognizance of the fact when we do accept your advice, that accomplices with organized crime were right at the Cabinet level.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member must feel very proud.

Mr. MacDonald: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if you think I exaggerate at all, let me quote another paragraph from Allan Phillips' article on April 4, when he said:

Politically the cartel puts up an estimated 15 per cent of all U.S. state and local campaign contributions, about ten times as much as organized labour. In Montreal's last election the Mafia backed its chosen candidates with sums totalling \$100,000. In Quebec's last provincial election, it

anted up nearly \$1 million. Bookies and runners doubled as poll workers. Strongarm men stuffed ballot boxes. At the core of many big city machines is the manpower of organized crime—an alliance of two governments, one directing the law, the other the lawbreakers.

Here is a man who knows about as much about organized crime, outside of those who are investigating it, as anyone, and this is his comment. So what is the point we have reached? I just sum up my comments by agreeing with the hon. Prime Minister 100 per cent, that we must not for one moment underestimate the threat of organized crime and be lulled into a sense of false security.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What is the title of that article?

Mr. MacDonald: This article?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: "For the Sake of Argument." Allan Phillips says, "Let us give the police more power."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute now. Never mind this "would you" stuff. Let us get down and deal with the substance of the issue instead of continuing to play politics with it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: The final and the most important aspect of this, Mr. Speaker, is that if you are going to cope with the threat of organized crime you have to recognize that organized crime becomes established through legitimate businesses. When it gets built in with legitimate businesses and gets established in a community such as we have in Metropolitan Toronto, you can never uproot it—that is the considered opinion of the students of organized crime. You will find, for example, on page 119 in the conclusions of the Ontario Police Commission report, conclusion (j):

—that once syndicated crime has obtained a foothold in any large community, it is almost impossible to eliminate it.

Just let that sink in, Mr. Speaker: "—it is almost impossible to eliminate it."

—but that it cannot gain such foothold without police laxity, inefficiency or corruption.

The conclusion of both this report and of the Roach report is that we have organized crime

in the province of Ontario, that as yet we have not syndicated crime.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that with the record of Attorneys General not coming to grips with it and with the difficulties that the police have had in trying to track down and close up clubs, we are luckier than we deserve that we have not got syndicated crime established in the province of Ontario. But let us not take too much for granted, because according to other evidence in this Ontario Police Commission report, the line between organized crime and syndicated crime is a very thin one. It is almost a matter of judgment as to which is organized and which is syndicated. One can develop into the other very easily.

One recalls, for example, the Bluestein beating here in the city of Toronto. Once again the law enforcement agencies did not seem to be able to come to grips with it until Pierre Berton began to expose it in his column and force some action. But let us face the fact that the Bluestein beating was a manifestation of the battle to establish syndicated crime. The Aguecci murder, when a resident of the township of Scarborough was found, his body mutilated and burned over in New York State, was another proof of the fact that syndicated crime controlled from the United States involved a Canadian citizen. He was bumped-off because for some reason or other he was not playing the game. Or you have the instance of "Scrip" Mitchell, up until the time he disappeared, a well-known gambler down in the Niagara frontier area, who walked out of a club one night at twelve o'clock and nobody has heard of him since, because he apparently was not playing the game according to the rules the leaders had established.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, you have a very serious threat, and I repeat, in my view organized crime is the greatest single threat within the North American society from within.

It is a threat that is just as great as the threat of subversive elements that led the government at Ottawa, for example in 1946, to try to crack spy rings. Indeed it is a threat for precisely the same reasons. It is a threat against the security of the state, and the integrity, not only of the state, but of the judiciary and of the police and politicians. Let it go on uncontrolled and you will destroy society as we know it.

So I think it is very important, as somebody quipped over here, asking "do you want to give the police more powers," it is very important that we examine whether or not

we have given every bit of power that we can to the police to deal with this kind of threat—short of a threat to the basic rights of the individual. This is the acid test.

If you look at the recommendations, Mr. Speaker, you will find that underlying these recommendations is the confusion of the government's position at the present time. Underlying the recommendations that are made not only in this report but in the annual report of the police commission—the first annual report made a year or so ago, a copy of which was tabled in this House, and which I have had for reading purposes the last few days—you will find that there is a plea for more effective co-ordination of the police forces in the province of Ontario; co-ordination between the provincial and the national, so that you would not have the Attorney General and Commissioner Harvison arguing as to what exactly was the situation in Ontario; co-ordination between the provincial and the municipal; co-ordination between the provincial and the international forces on the other side of the border.

It suggests that you should have intelligence officers and intelligence committees, with the officers reporting only to the chiefs of the various police forces so that they will be able to keep their pooling of information within a limited group, in order that it cannot leak out into the hands of those who might be able to use it.

You have the basic recommendation that they make in this instance. It is to be found on pages 119 and 120 and I think it would be useful to have it put into the record:

For the purpose of improving police efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement generally, this commission respectfully submits and recommends:

1. That all police forces should be under the immediate government of an independent and non-political authority subject to removal for cause by the government on the recommendation of the Attorney General; that in pursuance with that policy, police commissions be appointed for all municipal departments now governed by municipal councils; and that provision be retained in the organization of such commissions for political representation;

2. That smaller police departments, where geographically feasible, be amalgamated and/or placed under a single police commission or provincial authority, to ensure the maximum availability and mutually effective use of manpower and of specialized services; that consideration be given to the enactment of amendments

to The Police Act, to empower this commission to make reports and propound schemes for such amalgamations, conduct hearings thereon, and subject to the approval of the Attorney General, put such schemes into effect.

In other words, what we were seeking to establish was this co-ordinated police force through the province of Ontario. This, as the hon. Prime Minister has indicated, is the reason why the government has established the police commission.

But what has happened since then, Mr. Speaker? The government created the police commission and in less than 12 months it started to destroy it by withdrawing its power. When it was established in 1961, or at least the debates dealing with it were in 1961, the hon. Prime Minister concluded his comments in the first reading of the bill with this comment:

In short, the commission, in addition to supervising the affairs of the Ontario Provincial Police, will play a general watchdog role over law observance and enforcement in Ontario, to the end that our province will always be an unhealthy place for crime and criminals.

The Attorney General added the following; as was recalled in the first annual report of the police commission:

It is the intention to make this commission as strong, as impartial and as qualified for its work as possible. In particular it will have the directing and control of the Ontario Provincial Police force. It will have the powers of directing, overseeing and leading the Ontario Provincial Police force, which will come directly under the commissioner.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it was this government which established the Ontario Police Commission and said that it was to co-ordinate all of the police forces and would have direct control over the Ontario Provincial Police. Yet within less than one year, this same government acted and subsequently confirmed its action with amendments in which it took the OPP away from the Ontario Police Commission.

The pleas of the Ontario Police Commission in its annual report a year ago, and the pleas of the Ontario Police Commission in this crime report included one that there should be something to co-ordinate all of these small police forces across the province of Ontario. This would cope with the kind of situation where you have a municipality in which there is one policeman, and while the bank is being robbed he is impounding a dog

or looking after some bylaw about burning grass or something of that nature. Surely, this is a pathetically inadequate kind of situation to deal with any threat of organized crime. Yet this government up until now has categorically dismissed this proposal.

I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the hon. Prime Minister's comments, whether in a quiet way he was not letting us know that perhaps now that the former Attorney General was gone, maybe they are going to give a somewhat more sympathetic hearing to this particular recommendation. The hon. Prime Minister, in referring to the need for amalgamation of these various forces, and conceivably the other part of the recommendation that the OPP should take over in the small municipalities that do not have the wherewithal to build an effective modern police force, commented that it was a "long-term task."

Does this mean that the hon. Prime Minister is saying that he has reversed the policy of dismissal of these recommendations, because it was reported in the press many times by the former Attorney General, who categorically dismissed this recommendation. He certainly did nothing when it was reported in the annual report a year ago. Judge Macdonald repeated it many times throughout the fall and many times the former Attorney General is on record as saying that he was not going to entertain this proposal. Perhaps some time before the debate is over, the hon. Prime Minister will enlighten us as to whether or not this is an indication of a more sympathetic reaction to this request.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is another quotation that I would like to put into the record. There is no doubt about it that Judge Macdonald's recommendation in trying to bring all the police forces together was born of his reactions from a study of the situation in Great Britain. There, they had had an investigation of the whole of the law enforcement agencies through a Royal commission. Once again, in that Royal commission report, you will find that the argument against a national police was studied in Great Britain. It was rejected in 1962 in a Royal commission report. In other words, they were in favour of a national police force that was a co-ordinated body and their reason was this—I quote:

British liberty does not depend and never has depended upon the dispersal of police power. The proper criterion is whether the police are answerable to the law and ultimately to a democratically elected Parliament.

Their recommendation was for a national police force that would co-ordinate the local forces in a fashion that our OPC has been seeking for a year or so.

What is the government going to do? Here is an area of utter confusion at the moment. The government set up the Ontario Police Commission. The government within a year starts to dismantle the Ontario Police Commission until the hon. member for Downsview is not too far wrong when he says that the police commission today happened to be—he is he a county court judge, the new one; the former chairman was a county court judge—a Crown Attorney, a policeman and a general who are really looking for something to do. Most of their original powers and most of their original status and most of their original functions have been destroyed by the government that set them up.

Let me emphasize this—I am not wedded to the Ontario Police Commission as it stands. What I am looking for is the most effective kind of organization to cope with the situation about which this government now has the obligation to “level” with the hon. members of this Legislature and the people of the province of Ontario. The government set up the police commission; it has reversed its policy. It is in the process of destroying it now. It has refused to accept the commission’s recommendations for establishing a co-ordinated effective law enforcement agency in the province of Ontario. What is the government going to do? It has a real mess which is its own creation.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is what you think.

Mr. MacDonald: At least I am thinking and I wish I was convinced that the hon. Minister who just spoke was doing the same thing.

I will make this further comment. Perhaps when we get back to The Attorney General’s Department it will be more appropriate to deal with the police commission since it is responsible to him. But I must say that I am more and more inclined to the need for a separate administrative and co-ordinating agency—which was one of the functions which was given to the police commission and now has been dismantled to a degree—apart from the investigating functions which have also been given to the police commission, to conduct what in effect is a continuing Royal Commission into crime, or the threat of organized crime, in this province.

I think it is going to be increasingly difficult to get one body of people to be the

administrator of the police, the co-ordinator of whatever group of police you have in the province of Ontario, and at the same time conduct the kind of continuing investigation in which the New York crime commission has been engaged in since 1958.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is possible that there is an error in the basic concept here. The public in a democracy are very suspect of the excessive power of police. Therefore if we find that we have got to give whatever body is charged with the responsibility of a continuing investigation into the threat of organized crime powers which are dangerous powers, I think they should be in the hands of not the police but a separate agency. I would suggest, in general terms, something along the lines of the New York crime commission, three out of four of whose personnel, incidentally, must be attorneys.

I move on to one of the aspects of the report of the Ontario Police Commission with reference to gambling. This is the one area which the Roach commission, and now the police commission, says is the most serious. Here, beyond any shadow of doubt, we have had organized crime.

I sometimes wonder how it can be argued we have not got, to some degree, syndicated crime; because if anybody notices the continuity—between gambling on horse races during the off season when Woodbine, New Woodbine, and other racetracks in Canada are not operating, because of the obvious connections with horse racing in the United States—I do not know how you can come to the conclusion that there are no international links which denote a degree of the syndication of that aspect of crime here in Canada.

Within this OPC report you have a comment which, I think, is very accurate—that “gambling is the root of all evil” as far as organized crime is concerned, that gambling provides the treasury of the underworld—the \$9 billion which goes into the underworld of the \$47 billion of illegal betting in the United States—according to the U.S. committee report. It provides the funds for other activities, from narcotic rings to prostitution rings, to all manner of frauds.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I think we run smack into what is basically a problem in public attitudes. On page 194, for example, of the police commission appendices, you will find a paragraph attributed to William Schneider, the Commissioner of Police for Buffalo, New York. It says this:

2. A small crime committed on the local level is magnified many times when its evil fruits are funnelled with those of similar

crimes to the top of the pyramid. It is in this latter area that public awareness can supplant public apathy. In the area of gambling, for instance, the average citizen is generally unaware that the \$2 so-called "innocent" bet placed with a casual acquaintance is his contribution to a multi-billion dollar syndicate which depends on brutal assault and murder as its means of cold, dispassionate discipline.

In other words, the individual citizen, with his little \$2 bet which can be collected down in the front lobby of Queen's Park, or in an office or cigar store downtown, or in any factory, is the contribution of this individual citizen to this multi-billion dollar structure, which, beyond any shadow of doubt, is the syndicated portion of organized crime.

What are we going to do about this issue? Once again the government has not been facing up to the situation. We have had, for example, the Morden report, suggesting that we cannot ignore the great proportion of illegal betting which takes place off the tracks. In fact there is testimony in the OPC report which says—not attributed to any specific person but in one of the chapters—that for every \$1 bet legally you have from \$3 to \$5 in Ontario which is bet illegally. I think it was given by one of the Crown Attorneys, or one of the chiefs of police, who were on a panel.

You had Magistrate Bigelow's statement to the legislative committee a few weeks ago that in fact the law permits track betting now as long as the money is channelled through the pari mutuels at the race track. He says this is an interpretation of the law which he has had from lawyers. He also said that he told Jimmy Gardiner one time—this is back in the days, which I think still exist, when pari-mutuels came under the Minister of Agriculture—that he was going to exercise this power as interpreted to him by some lawyers. And Jimmy Gardiner told him that if he did the law would be changed pretty quickly.

You have the OPC evidence on page 175, from Attorney General Kennedy, which I would like to read briefly into the record. This gives the opposite view because Professor Morden's proposal was that we should legalize off-track betting. Here you have part of the testimony before the Senate committee, as found on page 175:

Senator McIntyre [saying to Attorney General Kennedy]: I am sure that you are aware and, surprisingly, that there is this tremendous desire on behalf of the people to gamble.

I think perhaps you are aware that up in

New Hampshire this past year we have passed a sweepstake or general lottery?

Attorney General Kennedy: Yes, I am.

Senator McIntyre: I have often wondered whether or not the legalization of this whole field would at least tend to drive these hoodlums out of it and go along with what seems to be the public's desires.

Attorney General Kennedy: I would be opposed to it. I can understand the feeling for it. I happen to be opposed to it.

First, I don't think it drives the hoodlums out. Where we have seen legal gambling operate, it has not been a very happy picture, so far.

Senator McIntyre: Have you found, then, that legalized gambling actually attracts this element of society into its midst?

Attorney General Kennedy: It does, Senator.

So here we have an opposing point of view. Indeed, hon. members will find on page 21 in the testimony of Commissioner McClellan, the successor to Commissioner Harvison, this comment:

They doubted—

"They" meaning Commissioner McClellan and some of his senior police officers, who were with him before the Ontario Police Commission inquiry:

They doubted whether legalized off-track and other betting would get rid of the bookmaker taking illegal bets. It has not done so where it has been tried. The gangsters move in on anything like that that is legalized. The same applies to legalized supply of narcotics. The experiment in England is not successful. As a result of constant police pressure in Canada, the number of criminal addicts has not increased very much in the last 20 years; 3,300 then, 4,000 today despite the substantial increase in population.

So here we have contradictory views.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that since gambling is the root of organized crime, since this is where the money comes from, since this is where you get the billions of dollars in the United States and at least hundreds of millions of dollars channelled out in Canada—or even in Ontario. Last year approximately \$90 million was bet in Ontario tracks; and if the ratio is correct that there is anywhere from \$3 to \$5 illegally bet for every \$1 bet at the track, that means anywhere from \$270 million to \$450 million is illegally bet in the province of Ontario alone.

Now, you get about a fifth of that being creamed off into the treasury of the underworld and there you have something like \$50 million, anywhere from \$50 million to \$90 million. This is the kind of fund that is available there.

What is the government doing about it? Well, the report has some interesting recommendations as to where the government is not doing very much about it. For example, it reports that radio and TV stations should be prosecuted for regular broadcasts of race results. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have the authorities—the government, the law enforcement agencies, who profess to be opposed to the activities of bookmakers—and yet this is sheer hypocrisy, because every day of the week, every hour of the afternoon, on every newscast, you have open collaboration with the bookmakers through broadcast of the results of races, and they give them on every TV and radio station.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Newspapers, too!

Mr. MacDonald: Right; I agree with my hon. friend. I am very intrigued by their omission. I missed the distinction as to why newspapers are not listed in the report of the Ontario Police Commission. In fact, I remember years ago when I was working on the *Montreal Gazette* one day, either by design or in error, they left out the racing material in the "bulldog" edition in the evening and there were more telephone calls in the hour or so after that edition hit the street and the unsatisfied clients were not getting their information that they had ever had on anything that ever came into the *Gazette*. So there is no doubt in the wide world that the papers as well as the TV and radio stations are active collaborators with the bookmakers.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I spend my summers down in that great God's country of Lanark constituency—the hon. member (Mr. Gomme) is here—in the Rideau Lake area and I have always been fascinated in the summertime by one thing.

It is a quiet, tranquil, pastoral atmosphere and the only radio station you can get on my little transistor—others are over the

rocks to Kingston or through to Ottawa—the only good local station you can get is a little radio station, CJET, in Smith's Falls. It plays western music and caters to all the needs of the people in this pastoral atmosphere of eastern Ontario. Yet every half hour regularly in the afternoon, the news results from New Woodbine are pouring in. Now, this must create a little bit of disturbance in the minds of the responsible citizens, because where are the bookmakers hidden in this serene, pastoral atmosphere down there?

Mr. G. E. Gomme (Lanark): They are only there in the summertime.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know whether there is any broadcast of the results in the wintertime when I am not there, so I will just have to try to assess one of the suggestions that has come from over here.

But the point, and having made it I leave it, Mr. Speaker, is that there is hypocrisy in the government and the law enforcement agencies. They have been tolerating, openly, gambling in this province. They have been tolerating collaboration with bookmakers.

Well, are they serious in doing something about organized crime and, if so, when are they going to go into action on this issue?

Surely that recommendation is one that is about as overdue as anything could possibly be—the recommendation that the Criminal Code should be enforced with regard to provision of all this working material for the organized crime leaders and all the little minions who work with them.

Mr. Speaker, I come finally to the last section of my comments with regard to strengthening the investigating powers. This is what we sought to do in Bill 99; it has relationship to that and also to one or two other phases of the subject. I am wondering, in view of the fact that it is three minutes of six, since this is a unit in itself, might I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: It being six of the clock, I do now leave the chair and will resume at eight.

It being six o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 16, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 16, 1964

Consideration of report of the Ontario Police Commission on organized crime, continued	2163
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. McNeil, agreed to	2190
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2190

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1964

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

ONTARIO POLICE COMMISSION REPORT ON ORGANIZED CRIME (continued)

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the latter portion of my remarks in connection with this crime report, I promised the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) this afternoon that I would give him the quote instead of paraphrasing him, so I shall read excerpts from *Hansard* at page 1347 and 1348 for March 18, 1959.

Mr. Speaker: I would just ask the member, is this relevant to the debate that is before the House?

Mr. MacDonald: No, except that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests intervened this afternoon and said if I were going to use any quotes that I should give direct quotes. I will do it tomorrow—

Mr. Speaker: I would be of the opinion that the member should do it on another occasion as it is not relevant to the order that is before the House.

Mr. MacDonald: It has kept for five years, it will keep for another 12 hours.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Would the hon. member mind if I ask him a question? I did not want to interfere before, I did not want to break into his train of thought and as he is beginning a new— Would he mind?

Mr. MacDonald: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On page 194 of the report which he quoted at some length earlier, the hon. member quoted from the statement of William Schneider, Commissioner of Police of Buffalo, New York, and I took it that he pretty well agreed with the third paragraph on the page, but I noted that he stopped right there. Page 194.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a paragraph after that which he did not make any mention of and in all seriousness I would like to know if he agrees with what obviously Commissioner Schneider agrees with, that is, "there is no public outcry against suspended sentences or nominal fines in our courts for gambling or prostitution." Obviously the commissioner feels that there should not be suspended sentences for these offences. I wonder if the hon. member—

Mr. MacDonald: I agree with it emphatically. I think Commissioner Harvison's suggestion that we should enforce the law and that there should be stiff sentences is one of the great requirements. Once again, in Allan Phillips' article he quotes the fact that on the Canadian prairies there has not been a single conviction for bookmaking in years, so apparently out in that pastoral scene it is even more—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are not speaking of "no convictions"; he says "no suspended sentences." Does the hon. member agree with that?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that is a double negative. I am in favour of no suspended sentences and more effective sentences.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Chairman, the final portion of my remarks have to do with two phases of strengthening the investigation powers, and obviously this is the area which raises the dangers with regard to the rights of the individual. I think perhaps it would be useful, to begin with, to quote the report and what it recommends, as found on page 124. This may have been quoted earlier in the afternoon, I am not certain. The 11th recommendation or the 11th conclusion, I have forgotten which it is:

That section 48 of The Police Act be amended to clarify the powers of the Ontario Police Commission so as to permit hearings *in camera* as well as in public

and to make it an offence, without permission of the commission, to communicate the name of a witness or information given to the commission by any witness in private session; and to confer on the commission, whether in private or public session, the powers of a superior court to punish for contempt; and that following such clarification, this commission interrogate persons believed to be in possession of information respecting criminal operations, which information could be of assistance in determining the state of law and order in the province, and the need for special legislative, government or police action.

Now, there are some aspects of this that I personally think are unnecessary. On the other hand, I do not agree with the conclusion of the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) that we need no greater power. It seems to me that it is clear from the legal interpretation of the questionable powers regarding *in camera* sessions that we have to have some clarification of it. The clarification is needed to strengthen the hands of the investigating body to get information with regard to what is going on in the underworld. I emphasize, of course, and so there can be no misunderstanding, I will continue to emphasize this, that any consideration of an extension of powers beyond what is there now must be done only in a fashion that is not going to encroach on the rights of the individual.

This, of course, is the meat of the legislative committee's job, which we are going to have to get to within, I presume, the next week. We are under a directive from this House to strike out section 14, but as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) insisted—and I certainly not only had no objection, I was enthusiastic on the proposition—we should study it to find what alternative to section 14 would be tolerable without being offensive to the basic rights of the individual. I personally await with a great deal of anticipation the attendance before the legislative committee of the law officers of the Crown to hear from them why they think, as both the hon. Prime Minister and particularly the Attorney General have intimated to the House, that section 14 as it stood did not constitute any reflection on the rights of the individual.

Without anticipating the work of the committee and the investigations that it is going to conduct, Mr. Speaker, in my view I think the working model that we should examine very closely—personally I can see nothing seriously wrong with it—is the situation with

regard to the New York crime commission. As hon. members of the House are likely aware, this was set up as a temporary body—in fact its official name includes the word “temporary”—back in 1958 for a five-year period. Its term has been extended for another two years and according to what I have read it is likely to continue to be extended. As the hon. Prime Minister indicated this afternoon, they recognize that they have a continuing job to do.

What, in effect, this does is to invest an investigating body with the power to hold *in camera* sessions, to exercise most of the powers usually under The Public Inquiries Act. But the people involved can have counsel and here, of course, is the key point—that if witnesses are held in contempt and any of the penalties are going to be imposed, the New York crime commission itself cannot impose the penalties. It must go to the courts and seek a court order. In other words, here you have an opportunity for a review of the situation before the court and thereby an opportunity to protect the rights of the individual. It seems to me that this is granting the kind of power with all of the necessary safeguards. It is more power than we will have at the present time if the deputy Attorney General was correct in his legal interpretation that we do not have these powers now. But I think it is the kind of power that is necessary to strengthen the hands of any investigating body we have in Ontario to interrogate these leaders of organized crime and to try to get the kind of detailed information that they got in the Valachi hearings in Washington. I acknowledge the Valachi hearings were on a voluntary basis; they were not at this stage dealing with a hostile witness.

The second phase of strengthening the investigating powers that I want to touch on is this question of wire tapping and I do so for two reasons: one, I think once again here is a topic that illustrates the complexities and the difficulties involved in the problem with which we are faced here. I also raise it because I had something to say over the weekend on this topic and I was quoted accurately in one paper that I was almost convinced that this was necessary and inaccurately in another paper that I was unqualifiedly in support of the proposition of wire tapping. I hope in the course of my remarks I can indicate my thinking at least at the moment.

It seems to me the basic situation we have to take solid cognizance of is the fact that the leaders of organized crime and syndicated crime, beyond any shadow of doubt, are using

these instruments all of the time. They are fully aware of all of the modern electronic devices and they are using them so that any suggestion that the police be denied the right to use them in coping with organized crime—as I shall point to a little later in reference to the committee in the U.K.—simply means that you are going to deny the police the use of modern electronic weapons that the leaders of the underworld have access to and are using all the while.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of this, and I make this comment as a layman with no comprehension at all of all the incredible developments in the electronic world, but it is the case now, beyond any doubt, that there are new electronic devices with which you can in effect tune in on a discussion, or presumably on a telephone discussion too, and record it, even though you may be some considerable distance from it at the time. In other words, if you can in effect achieve the same result as has been achieved in the past by actual physical wire tapping, then the question that arises in my layman's mind is, are some of the problems involved in wire tapping as we have known it in the past really problems any longer? Do we need to physically attach anything to a wire when we have now moved into an electronic age where you can just in effect tune in and record anything that you want to record?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should have experts in this field come before the legislative committee when we are considering this. Indeed I read one newspaper story which stated that the Metropolitan police are now using this kind of equipment and that the police forces in some of these suburban communities have been in touch with the Metropolitan police to find out how effective it is before they get equipment of this nature.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): The Toronto chief denied it.

Mr. MacDonald: He denied it? Well, I think there is a tendency to make denials with regard to these things. It is like denying there is going to be an election next week when the Cabinet has already decided there is going to be one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Chief Mackey would not deny it if it were true.

Mr. MacDonald: Would not, eh? Well, I accept that; I have high regard for Chief Mackey. As a matter of fact I would not dispute that, except some times he is in a

rather tenuous position vis-à-vis the law and public reaction to this kind of thing.

However, leaving aside for a moment the need for some expert advice to answer the question that I have just raised, I think it is interesting to go back and take a look at the legal position and the view of authorities—beyond any doubt they are real authorities in the various fields—with regard to wire tapping and its use. I want first, for example, to comment on the position in the United States. I am quoting from page 169 of the OPC report in the lengthy statement that was given by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to the committee in the United States. Starting in the middle of the page:

Finally, if we are to make maximum progress in our drive on organized crime, I am convinced that we need legislation to permit the use of wire tapping by law enforcement officials.

The urgency for revision of the present and ineffective provision of the wire-tapping statute is emphasized by the fact that the latest electronic improvements are easily available to the criminal. The advantages these can give him over law enforcement officers are plain.

Leading racketeers make almost unrestricted use of interstate facilities, particularly communications, to direct their illegal activities.

Meanwhile, the present statute fails to protect the right of privacy over the telephone, because anyone can listen in without violating that statute. At present, to convict someone of illegal wire tapping, we must not only prove both that a tap was made but also that there was unlawful disclosure of the conversation.

Thus the present law neither prevents indiscriminate wire tapping nor recognizes the legitimate needs of law enforcement for authority, closely circumscribed, to use this means of gathering evidence.

Last January, The Department of Justice resubmitted to the Congress a carefully worded bill, S.1308, with strong procedural safeguards, which would afford a clear-cut basis for the legitimate and controlled use of wire tapping by law enforcement officials. At the same time the bill would expressly forbid all other types of wire tapping.

Now there is the American position. Elsewhere in the report—I will not bother quoting it directly—it is intimated that Attorney General Kennedy is going to move to have the necessary constitutional amendment so that this enactment can be made.

Let us turn now to the Canadian position as reported on page 95 of the report:

A third and more drastic means of procuring information and possibly evidence of a bookmaking or narcotics operation by so-called wire tapping being given legal authorization is controversial and is opposed by many as an interference with the privacy of communication and an introduction of methods found in police states. The problems presented should be examined to see if the objections taken are not more emotionally than rationally based.

And I look directly at the hon. member for St. George, Mr. Speaker, when I say that because I think he went into orbit spontaneously when the report was put out. I continue:

To begin with, except for section 25 of The Bell Telephone Company Act, there is in Canadian law at present no prohibition against wire tapping as such. It can be and no doubt is done at present, for good and bad reasons, without fear of penalty. The only thing prohibited by Ontario law is the unauthorized disclosure of conversations overheard by a third party. The Bell Telephone Company special Act which makes it a "misdemeanor" to attach unauthorized equipment to its telephone lines or to intercept conversations on those lines would, in our respectful opinion, prove legally unenforceable, and with modern electronic equipment telephone messages can be intercepted anyway without the necessity of making any attachment physically to any telephone line or equipment.

A court, however, could and does permit, subject to the general rules of evidence, disclosures of such conversation to be made. Would it not be better, as is done in many of the American states, to prohibit wire tapping entirely, except as authorized by a court where justification and need are strictly proved and exacting restrictions are at the same time imposed?

So there you have the very confused Canadian position where there is really no law against it. Admittedly there is considerable use of it. The courts will accept the evidence and in face of that it is rather interesting that there should be such a widespread public antipathy to the idea—although I understand the reasons for the antipathy because it appears to be a serious invasion of privacy.

However, let me turn now to the British position as found on pages 96, 97 and thereafter. This is from a committee that was established in Great Britain comprised of two

leading judges, Lord Birkett and Lord Monckton together with Mr. P. C. Gordon Walker. The report continues:

After making a careful historical review of the legal power to intercept communications of various kinds, they came to the conclusion that: (a) a right to detain and open letters and put them in evidence in court has long been recognized.

I must say, if I may interject here, that this makes very interesting reading for a layman. I was not aware that this was the case. But here are two distinguished British jurists plus another. I continue:

(b) this power of interception also extends to telegrams, and (c) if there is such a lawful power, then it is wide enough to cover telephone communications as well.

The authority to intercept communications is given by warrant of the Secretary of State and for the purpose only of detecting serious crime or of safeguarding the security of the state. We are here, of course, concerned with the first purpose only.

Then on the next page, page 97, the following extracts from the report are of particular relevance and interest:

We cannot think it to be wise or prudent or necessary to take away from the police any weapon, or to weaken any power they now possess, in their fight against organized crime of this character. The police ought not to be handicapped in their efforts to prevent, or to detect crime, whilst the criminal is allowed to use every modern method to achieve his purpose. If it be said that the number of cases where methods of interception are used is small, and that an objectionable method could therefore well be abolished, we feel that though the number of cases may be small this is not a reason why criminals in this particular class of crime should be encouraged by the knowledge that they have nothing to fear from methods of interception.

We therefore think that no useful purpose would be served by recommending that the power of interception be no longer exercised in the detection and prevention of crime, for it would remove from the hands of the police a weapon which they have found to be effective when all other methods have been unavailing, and would announce to potential wrongdoers that they have nothing to fear from the police in this particular respect. This, in our opinion, so far from strengthening the liberty of the ordinary citizens, might very well have the opposite effect.

And:

We feel that to announce the abandonment of this power now would be a concession to those who are desirous of breaking the law in one form or another, with no advantage to the ordinary citizen or to the community in general.

And a little later on in the page:

The committee accordingly concluded and recommended:

(1) The origin of the power to intercept communications can only be surmised, but the power has been exercised from very early times, and has been recognized as a lawful power by a succession of statutes covering the last 200 years or more.

(2) There is some difference of view on the authority to intercept telephone messages. On one view the power is identical with the power to open letters and rests on the ancient power to intercept communications. Another view is that the power rests on a comparatively modern statute.

(3) The power to intercept communications is exercised for the prevention and detection of serious crime and for the preservation of the safety of the state.

(4) The power is now almost exclusively exercised by the Metropolitan police, the Board of Customs and Excise and the Security Service. It is used with the greatest care and circumspection, under the strictest rules and safeguards, and never without the personal considered approval of the Secretary of State.

(5) The use of the power has been effective in detecting major criminals and preventing injury to national security.

(6) The exercise of the power in these limited spheres should be allowed to continue under the same strict rules and supervision and in the special circumstances we have set out. The criminal and wrongdoer should not be allowed to use services provided by the state for wrongful purposes quite unimpeded, and the police, the Customs, and the Security Service ought not to be deprived of an effective weapon in their efforts to preserve and maintain order for the benefit of the community.

(7) The interference with the privacy of the ordinary law-abiding citizen or with his individual liberty is infinitesimal, and only arises as an inevitable incident of intercepting the communications of some wrongdoer. It has produced no harmful consequences.

And then it goes on to point out that:

Mr. Walker, in a reservation, emphasized the importance of public support for the methods used by the police, and that telephone tapping should be limited as much as possible because of public repugnance to the interception of communications.

In other words, sir, if I may just sum up here. The body of advice and information from experts such as Attorney General Kennedy in the United States, and the committee in Great Britain, clearly indicates that we are going to tie the hands of our law enforcement agencies behind their backs in this important respect, if they are not given this right. Therefore the use of it should be considered under carefully considered and safeguarded conditions, so that any time they are going to use it they have to get a specific warrant for its use in the knowledge that it is required to detect some particularly important underground figure and his activities.

The second point in my summary that I want to go back to is that as a layman I am curious to have some information as to whether or not the modern electronic development does in fact make this all outmoded and it is really the Model T Ford approach to things because we really do not need any physical tapping in it at all.

This brings me to my final conclusion as we approach this difficult task of reconciling the shaping of more effective machinery and yet, at the same time, make dead certain that we are safeguarding the rights of the individual. It is a quote that I would like to draw to the attention of the House on pages 100 and 101. I think the hon. member for Downview used this quote this afternoon, sir, and used it in the framework of his general criticism of the police commission. Let me read it to the House again:

What is called for is a weighing of social value, to determine if what is here seriously advocated really involves any substantial loss of present rights as opposed to very worthwhile social advantages, which will serve to ensure the continued freedom of the individual from the physical and mental duress and tyranny which might result from the successful inroads of syndicated crime. Of what value, then, would any of our freedoms legally guaranteed or otherwise, be to us?

I must say that my initial reaction to this is somewhat different from that of the hon. member for Downview. I personally do not minimize the seriousness of the threat to our society from organized crime. I repeat, I

think it is the greatest single enemy within society today. It is just as great a threat as the threat of subversive elements. The security of the state, and integrity of the state, its legislators, its judiciary, law enforcement agencies, all can be corrupted. Surely nothing could be more serious than this. Therefore I think there is a weighing of social values—as to whether or not the use of more power to investigate, or the safeguarded use of wire tapping, are not necessary to get the information that will protect the state.

Indeed, I think that Allan Phillips, in the concluding paragraph or so of his article, put the point very well. He said: "We need to define the enemy." I suspect this is what we are trying to do this afternoon. It is what I suspect the government should have done before it brought its legislation in, or it would not have got into so much trouble.

We need to define the enemy.

It is not our institutions; these are the very basis of our freedom. It is not the police; they are only a cross-section of the public, no less and possibly more honest in self-control. The enemy is the underworld, without and within—the undisciplined pursuit of our right to riches, the perversion of our society's principal dynamic.

It is this we are trying to protect; and it is the responsibility and the obligation of this Legislature now to go back and re-examine what the government has presented to us and withdrawn. I for one look forward to playing my part in it because I think it is a major contribution that we, as legislators, have to make to the people of Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Your Honour, we now have in this dignified House three charter members of the Attorney General's club, one active and two past members. One would have thought in the discussion of an important subject such as this that we might have heard from the two previous Attorneys General. Mr. Speaker, within the reign of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, who first assumed the Attorney General's portfolio on August 17, 1955, this problem confronted the people of Ontario. Then, of course, the establishment of the important body took place during the tenure of office of the previous occupant of that high and historical office (Mr. Cass).

I would have thought, sir, if they were not moved *proprio motu*—as we say in the law—to rise in their places and give their views on this important matter, then the head of the government might have abjured them to

do so. But apparently we are going to be denied the valuable contribution of the two past Attorneys General, though it is hoped, and I make no judgment, nor do I make any prediction, that we will hear from the present incumbent of the office (Mr. Wishart) before the debate concludes.

I have this qualification, in all fairness to him, that he has occupied that office, I think, for less than a fortnight. It is less than a fortnight since he was called by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the province to assume the mantle of responsibility. If he is to make a contribution to the debate, your Honour—and I use that form of address to you again—if he is called upon to make a contribution, then it puts a very heavy burden upon him indeed, new as he must be to the department, although I do not suggest that in any way he is inhibited from hard work or is in any way denied a keen interest in the important matters that now have fallen to his shoulders. I will leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker, in the Judaeo-Christian civilization, so as not to leave out the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions who is sensitive about such things—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And a couple of the hon. member's colleagues.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and a couple of my hon. colleagues. In the Judaeo-Christian civilization the doctrine and the phenomenon of conversion is an important aspect of it. I draw attention to it. The one that has occurred in this House—I especially draw attention to that conversion. I did not really intend to, Mr. Speaker, but I was moved to do so because of the remarks of my hon. friend from York South on the subject of wire tapping. He struck in my heart a grave disappointment. When I was nurtured in youth and began to pay attention to the public affairs of this province and this great country, I had come to believe that the one group in the country in the political spectrum—at all times, morning, noon and night and in the wee hours of the morning, the great defenders of civil liberties—were the socialists or those who professed to be socialists.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member was right then and he is wrong now.

Mr. Sopha: I am wrong now, because I have become disillusioned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. members are both wrong.

Mr. Sopha: I say categorically, above the din, that it is no place of Her Majesty's

loyal Opposition, Mr. Speaker, to advocate any measure in this House or anywhere else, that detracts from the civil liberties and the fundamental freedoms and the rights of the citizens. That is the responsibility of those that have the privilege of advising the monarch and her representatives. When they make such a recommendation then it becomes the duty of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition to scrutinize those measures with the greatest possible care and the strongest intelligence that they can bring to bear. And it grieves me that my hon. friend from York South gives himself leave to stand in the House as a professed socialist in the tradition of people like Frank Scott and others in this country—yes, Eugene Forsey, to name another—and to say, "I think perhaps wire tapping has become such an efficacious device that we must have it as speedily as possible."

Mr. MacDonald: I said study it.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, yes. But let me return to the hon. member's conversion. I want to read into the record. He talked at great length this afternoon, in a seemingly unrelated way. He looked into every closet in the country and he pulled out every dead cat that he could find, every smelly and odorous cat—

Mr. MacDonald: Most of them were Liberals.

Mr. Sopha:—and he said—oh, yes, most of them were Liberals; if they are not Liberals they are Tories, but they are never CCF—and he held it up for all to view. And he said, "The Police Act is in a long line of succession to such things as the enforced deportation of the Japanese and the jailing of the people in the Gouzenko spy trial," and so on, and he related everyone from just about the turn of the century. How they were related, the one to the other, escapes my comprehension.

Mr. MacDonald: I was closer than Burke.

Mr. Singer: If the hon. member had listened to Burke he could get some education.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right?

Mr. Sopha: How the one was related to the other is beyond my understanding.

Mr. Singer: You listen to the NDP council and give no respect to Burke.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What riding does he represent?

Mr. Singer: Bristol.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): He left Bristol for—

Mr. Speaker: I would remind the members that the member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You were always one of my greatest friends and supporters.

An hon. member: One of the few.

Mr. Sopha: Well, if hon. members do not like the analogy of the dead cat—he rattled the skeletons in the closet. And democracy—I say to you, sir, because I know it is something you understand even if he does not—democracy never held itself up to be the epitome of perfection. Certainly it has its failings and its dislocations and its moments of forgetfulness. We are not a perfect people. But that does not mean to say for a moment, or in the wildest stretch of anyone's imagination that there is not in this country a deep-seated belief in the democratic tradition.

I venture to say in retrospect that if that Bill No. 99 debate had lasted over a period of three weeks, let us say, instead of the few short days that it did, if it had lasted for two or three weeks, then any group that was alert in this country could have packed Maple Leaf Gardens with people who came there to protest. You could not get Canadians or residents of Ontario or Toronto to come to a meeting about public housing and protest. You could not get them out to listen to speakers on pensions, but let some government in arbitrary fashion interfere with the democratic rights of Canadians and Maple Leaf Gardens would not hold the crowd that would come there.

Now I return, and I am going to leave it at this, but I feel obliged to read it into the record—my hon. friend's early attitude. I do not intend to speak about Bill No. 99, but I am going to relate his early attitude to it. On March 20 this year, the day after that bill was introduced in the House, he had this to say:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not abuse the privilege you have given me—

that was a change for him:

I just want to say two or three things.

that is a change, too:

One, the spectacle we have seen on the government side in the last day or so is a pretty unseemly one and it is obvious that the government itself, at least at this hour, recognizes it. The second, and equally important point, is that I hope we are not going to play politics with this

issue. While I agree that it is desperately serious that the basic rights of individuals should be threatened in the fashion that they were, there is another threat that is almost as great.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear, exactly; and I repeat it now.

Mr. Sopha: Continuing:

As the Royal commission says, there is another government in operation in the province and it is the government of organized crime. I hope that the government will pursue with continued vigour an alternative, and an acceptable proposition as, obviously, what they have presented is not acceptable.

Mr. MacDonald: Wonderful statement!

Mr. Sopha: And further:

So the initial onus is on them to come up with an acceptable proposition as to how we can cope with the frustrations that we have experienced in the last year or so, in both court and Royal commission, in trying to get all the facts.

Now hearken to this! I arrive at the ultimate of his remarks which demonstrate his conclusion. I ask every hon. member to listen to these remarks:

Let us not lose sight of this almost equally important problem, because in the long run it is a threat to the welfare of the community. I am just a little saddened by the willingness to play politics on the part of some people who a year ago were desperately disturbed with organized crime and now have forgotten about it completely.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a very good statement, I would not change a word of it.

Mr. Sopha: Anyone can see that on Friday, March 20, Mr. Speaker, he did not know just where he stood, and he was ready to get up and point the finger of accusation at the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and accuse him of playing politics. But then over the weekend, of course, as happens so frequently when he makes an utterance in this House, the council meets and they decide the position he has taken is not tenable. On Monday, the man who can make the right hand turn on the road to Damascus, like Saul of Tarsus, quicker than any other man in public office, on Monday he was changed; he and the lion from St. George by that time were soulmates; they wrapped themselves in the Union Jack, and he got up in the House and he

pilloried and he bludgeoned and he blustered, and then he was out into the public and was willing to take credit for the withdrawal of the bill. Thursday he was a different fellow though.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a small point of information. The hon. member would like to be informed that there was no meeting of the council of the New Democratic Party that weekend at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): They did not have to meet to tell the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: They communicate by phone. Now I want to say, and I will get this business of wire tapping out of the way. The principle, Mr. Speaker, is this: we are not concerned really, no one in this House and no one in the province of Ontario who thinks about it at all is concerned really, about the rights of criminals. Other than the right to a fair trial, the right to be treated in accordance with human dignity when they are apprehended and incarcerated, criminals have no rights, they have no rights at all. It is the law-abiding people who have rights. Neither I nor any other member of this House has any sympathy for the criminal which would inhibit us from tapping the telephone lines of a person who is carrying on anti-social or lawless behaviour. What we are concerned about is the innocent, the good citizen, the law-abiding citizen, against whom one of these devices might be turned. He is the subject of our worry.

Mr. MacDonald: For a lawyer, that is a specious argument.

Mr. Sopha: Not at all.

Mr. Singer: The speciousness is in the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: It is a problem when one starts to infringe upon the right to privacy. The problem always is, can you trust the people who exercise these powers to exercise them in accordance with just principles? That is the problem.

Now I say this, that the responsibility is not for the hon. member for York South to advocate in this House or anywhere else that we engage upon a programme of wire tapping.

Mr. MacDonald: I said there should be a study of it.

Mr. Sopha: Let the hon. Attorney General or the hon. leader of the government of Ontario lay before us a measure which conveys the deep thinking of the government, and we will scrutinize it. And if it is responsible, if that measure contains safeguards to the rights, liberties and freedoms of people, then they will find in a responsible way that it will get support from all sides of the House. Now I leave it at that.

Now then, I want to make some reference to the remarks addressed to the House this afternoon by the hon. Prime Minister, who launched this discussion. One got the impression—and I hope he would not think it unkind of me, because I would not want to be unkind to him or seem to be unkind—but one got the impression that he so protracted his remarks that he was almost beating a deadline, somebody else's deadline. But it can be said—and I listened carefully to what he said—that his remarks were couched to the utmost in the sanguine characteristic, sanguinity, if you like. He is a confident man and he is an optimistic man, and he wanted to give that impression that notwithstanding what is in this awesome document here in all its 120 or 130 pages of report—not counting the appendices—that in the tradition of the man whom he succeeded, the great man from Lindsay, hon. Leslie Frost, he wanted to convey to every hon. member of the House the thought that "things are bad in Ontario from the point of view of the influx of criminal activities, but they are not really so bad. And we are alert, and we are vigilant, and we are going to take the proper steps to put these lawbreakers behind bars and we are able to thank our lucky stars or someone—providence or someone else—that though organized crime has come into the province, we have no syndicated problem."

A great emphasis on semantics, great emphasis. That was started by the hon. Mr. Justice Roach, who drew a distinction between the two types of the organizational aspect of criminal activity. Well, I do not know that we need to be so thankful, and if we are going to give thanks and move a vote of appreciation, we on our side of the House are going to move that vote to that great citizen of this province, the former leader of our party, who had the courage to stand in the place where I now stand and to draw the attention of the public of Ontario to the threat that was posed against the very life's blood of our existence by the evil people that would drain it dry.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I just ask the hon. member a

question? I have various comments on what the then leader of the Opposition in those days did, but I have not heard any comment upon what happened to his allegations of dishonesty and all sorts of things against various people in this government. That part of the result of his comments does not seem to be mentioned very frequently.

Mr. Singer: How about the rest of the comment that the Attorney General and the hon. Prime Minister denied, all the way down the line until he was forced to call a Royal commission?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What about all the allegations of dishonesty?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Why did they resign?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would like to tell the members once again that when a member is speaking, the others are to listen in silence unless they have a point of order. Now please keep the debate in order.

Mr. Singer: That is a good thing even for the hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member for Sudbury should answer the question, why did they resign?

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps I will say this to the hon. Prime Minister, that if he wishes to address some questions to Mr. Wintermeyer about allegations that he made or may not have made, I do not take the responsibility to answer for him; perhaps the hon. Prime Minister would write him a letter.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member takes the part he likes and leaves the part he does not like.

Mr. Sopha: It is all I need do because this problem transcends, and has always transcended, individuals; this is the problem of the infiltration into our society of a large group of people who are a threat to our very existence.

The origin of the Roach commission as well as this report can be found if it needs to find a place for its genesis, Mr. Speaker, in this paragraph of the vote of confidence moved against this government:

This House regrets that this government has failed deplorably to recognize the peril of the inroads of organized crime into the life of Ontario and has failed to protect

the citizens of this province from the activities of the criminal and the anti-social.

That was the beginning because, during that summer of 1961 an Attorney General (Mr. Roberts) who came to that office, as I said, in the height of summer of 1955, when he had come to the office—I well recall it although I was not in active political life at that time—I recall that Attorney General showed an absolute fetish, an obsession, about deaths on our highways. When he came to the office he was going to stamp out the problems that had been created by the motor vehicle and for months the papers were full of what he was going to do to correct this, to allay this slaughter on our highways. During the succeeding half-decade, of course, that evil people with their tentacles of threat to our society were coming into our province, the Attorney General and, I suppose, as well, his officials in the department, had their heads buried in the sand.

Then we come to the summer of 1961 when I myself had a few things to say, and I do not take back any of them. Everything that I said was borne out. During that summer, the same Attorney General paraded about this province saying that there was no threat of organized crime; that the police with their alertness would keep all this under check. He denied the need for a Royal commission and I recall with some sardonic humour, the delight of the MacPherson cartoons which depicted that man during that summer. Then the chips came down, Mr. Speaker, in the session of 1961, the fall session, when Mr. Wintermeyer detailed his findings, his investigations on the floor of this House.

Then, of course, I do not need to repeat what other hon. members have said during the course of the afternoon, that there is a dichotomy, there is a contradiction between this report that was signed January 31 of this year and the report that was delivered to the Lieutenant-Governor less than a year ago by the honourable Mr. Justice Roach. At page 117 of this report, where it lists the areas of criminal activity into which inroads have been made by organized crime, in categories one to eight running through narcotics and gambling and counterfeiting and high-grading and armed robberies and prostitution and extortion, intimidation and protection and frauds of the so-called white collar variety; I say, with truth, that ever since mankind became stained with original sin, that is just about a complete list of everything criminal and illegal that mankind has ever invented.

That is just about it. You could not devise another category of crime which has not been found by this police commission in some degree of organization.

So that is our mess of pottage. That is our inheritance at this time as we try to discuss this matter with some degree of intelligence and reason in this House tonight.

I say to hon. members, to sum up this part of my argument, Mr. Speaker, that this report gave no cause to the hon. leader of this government to stand in the House as he did this afternoon and appear to be sanguine and confident about the outlook.

Now, sir, having said that, I want to go on. I want to go on and say this: I too am going to make some suggestions, according to my training as a lawyer and according to what I feel I may have learned and the little experience I have had. But before doing that I want to say that I shall take upon myself the responsibility to try to get this discussion back to what I believe to be its proper plane of reason and out of the realm of inflammation where it has gone. I well recognize, and I so state, that on all sides of the House there is a concern about the problem. Every hon. member feels very deeply—

Mr. Bryden: We could not conclude from listening to the hon. member up to now that he is interested in reason.

Mr. Sopha: Unfortunately, I am sad to say, that before I take my train tonight, in duty I will stay here and I will probably have to listen to you. That will keep me awake most of the night. Most of the night, on the train. I find it difficult to sleep anyway, on trains.

Mr. Bryden: I attend all sessions of this House; perhaps I will speak tomorrow rather than tonight.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the hon. member is a full-time politician.

Mr. MacDonald: Where was the hon. member when we were dealing with important issues, in his law office?

Mr. Sopha: A full-time politician! We in this House are not subsidized or assisted on this side by anyone else to be a full-time politician.

Mr. Bryden: And neither am I.

Mr. Sopha: If I might add a word to what my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Downsview, so well said about the role—

rather of the office—of the Attorney General in this province. I, sir, stipulate it as fundamental in dealing with organized crime and criminals and bringing them to justice that the office of the Attorney General must immediately become staffed with competent lawyers, a whole staff of them. Senior counsel, people trained as counsel; people under the direction, within that department, of a senior counsel, a man of ability and learning and experience.

Now I am not saying, as the hon. member for Downsview said, that the people in the department now are not competent, but I do hasten to add that there are not enough of them. They are a sturdy and small band and as he pointed out—we have for four years, I think, pointed out—that the salary schedule in that department could not possibly attract anyone that wanted to make a career in the government service as a counsel. It is a place to hang your hat for the time being and they go on to greener fields after having gotten a bit of training.

I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, and I will measure my words when I say it and I am a bit ashamed to say it, that under the present constitution of our society, when the criminal is brought to indictment that he, sir, can avail himself of the finest legal minds in the province. The finest lawyers in the province appear for the criminal. The Crown, the Queen, the government, The Attorney General's Department ought to be represented in the role of prosecutor for the Crown by the finest lawyer in the province on the staff of the Attorney General.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: When an indictment is brought, such as was brought against Feeley, McDermott and Wright, or an indictment against Harry and Ben Smith, then it ought to be a counsel of The Attorney General's Department who appears in the place of and in the stead of the Attorney General to prosecute him and not a member of some law firm down on Bay Street.

I could go on and become more specific about the prosecution of the first trial of Wright, Feeley and McDermott, but I will inhibit myself. But in truth, for those who judge such things in terms of money, this government had no business in the world in paying for the prosecution of Feeley, Wright and McDermott the sum of \$21,615 as they did.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): To the cent!

Mr. Sopha: To the cent! And in paying for the prosecution of the malefactors, Harry and Ben Smith, \$82,830.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Where is he now?

Mr. Sopha: Jail is right! They could hire the best. Perhaps eight or nine lawyers and put them to work in criminal prosecutions full time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Eight or nine months.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, a year for that. It would serve two immediate and useful purposes that come to my mind. If The Department of the Attorney General came to be staffed by a group of competent counsel, then it would strike fear and respect into the hearts of the criminal element. They would know that no matter whom they were employing, they would be met with vigorous resistance and strong prosecution when they got to court.

Second, such a calibre of counsel within The Department of the Attorney General would mean that department in its contact with the police forces and those in charge of the investigation of these crimes, such a staff of astute and intelligent lawyers could keep and exercise a supervisory role, over those charged with the investigation.

Now I do not have to spell out what I mean by that and the prophylactic effect that would have upon the activities of those charged with investigations. I do not think a moment should be lost in the inauguration of such a system within the office of the Attorney General. I have said so before in this House over the years. I hope to say again and I hope to be in this House when a common-sense principle such as that is adopted, and indeed the practice of the United Kingdom in that regard for more than two centuries is followed.

The institution of Treasury counsel is of great antiquity, a position of great honour, indeed a position of great prestige for the lawyers who go to court to represent the government. I say of The Attorney General's Department, in prosecuting the lawless, goes down to Bay Street and hires a member of a big prestigious firm there, then the government really is not in court. It is not the government that is in court at all, directly. The government, the Crown, the people, society, can only be in court defending our laws and upholding and maintaining prestige and respect for them, if the Attorney General is in court. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General is not there, then one of his counsel, in his stead working for him,

employed by him, must be there in his place and not some other.

To borrow the words of my hon. friend from Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby)—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Could I ask the hon. member a question? If the criminals he has just mentioned can hire the highest-priced counsel and the most capable and are well taken care of in court by such counsel, then why can he say on the other hand, that if the Attorney General gets the best counsel available, he and the government he represents are not well represented in court?

Mr. Sopha: I want the best counsel to be on the staff of the Attorney General, to report to him regularly and daily. Perhaps in the prosecution of these people, in The Department of the Attorney General there would be a meeting every morning at a quarter to nine, in that magnificent library at the end of the hall, around the big table. The Attorney General and his staff would meet there in the morning, and they would discuss the prosecutions that are presently at bar in the courts.

Mr. Singer: And not next week be defending the criminal—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, as my hon. friend from Downsview says, the man hired by the Attorney General to prosecute, the next week is working for the criminals. He is hired by them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Could I ask the hon. member again? As a member of the legal profession has he not one day or one week perhaps defended a criminal and the next day or the next week defended someone on the opposite side of the case?

Mr. Sopha: No, I have never prosecuted anyone in my life. I am a defence lawyer.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: And he is a QC.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member is always a defence lawyer?

Mr. Sopha: That does not detract from my point, which is a valid one. I have to repeat it for the benefit of some.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I will not bother to repeat it. I have made the point.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: One of the things that bothered me in the recent action of the Law Society of Upper Canada, of which I am a member, was their calling into question the activities of certain members of the legal profession, because I like to try to see things analytically—I like to try to see the whole picture, not just part of it—they called into question the activities of certain lawyers and found them to be guilty of unethical conduct in that they associated with criminals beyond what the responsibilities of being their solicitors or their counsel required.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And rightly so!

Mr. Sopha: Yes. They found them to be guilty of unethical conduct in that regard. Well, when the hon. Attorney General says rightly so, perhaps he will agree with me that there is an all-pervading question there about where do you draw the line? Where do you draw the line?

Mr. MacDonald: There is no doubt where they drew the line.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. True. Perhaps these people did associate too much with their clients, but really, here is one the hon. Attorney General might take home to go to sleep on.

If a person is defending a criminal who engaged in the sale of narcotics, or gambling, or bookmaking, or prostitution and so on, I suppose one might say that is pretty bad. But what if the lawyer is engaged in the defence of someone charged under the anti-combines Act and that client takes the lawyer to dinner at the National Club, or the Granite Club, or the York Club—

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Or the Albany Club!

Mr. Sopha: Or the Albany, yes. Then on the one hand I suppose the conduct of the association with the bookmaker is proscribed, but it is all right for the person who runs the combine to take the lawyer to one of these clubs or invite him for a fishing weekend at his farm and let him view his herd of Black Angus cattle. That would be all right. I wonder myself, because not only am I a lawyer, but I am a member of this Legislature, sir. I wonder if the Law Society of Upper Canada thought about this problem through to its ultimate and necessitous conclusion before it gave the ruling on that subject. Well, that is enough about lawyers.

Another problem that I want to draw attention to, which has been lightly touched

upon in this House this afternoon, is the problem of the amalgamation of police forces and the increasing of the efficiency of the police forces which we have. As a result of my reflection, your Honour, I come to this conclusion. I have held this conclusion for more months than some people might believe. It is that I think that with the Ontario Provincial Police we have to come to a state of affairs where that police force acquires the sole responsibility for the investigation of serious crime in the province. I qualify that by saying quickly that one might leave out Metro, the Metropolitan Toronto area, which has a large and efficient police force and indeed a police force which is larger in number and better paid, I must say, than the Ontario Provincial Police force itself.

But on the other hand, throughout the province and in the smaller centres and in those centres where we know that organized crime flourishes as well as it does in Metro, because this report says so, I do not see that there is any efficacy in leaving investigation and law enforcement in the hands of municipal police forces. For one thing, municipal police forces, and this ought to clinch it, have not got the scientific facilities that the Ontario Provincial Police have to detect crime in its modern form.

I have always thought it rather silly that if a homicide, for example, occurred in an unorganized township, the next day there would appear on the scene an inspector from the CIB. But if, on the other hand, the homicide was within an organized municipality, no matter how large or how small, no matter whether it was the town of Capreol or the city of Sudbury, as long as there was a municipal police force, the Ontario Provincial Police apparently are without jurisdiction to handle it. It was left in the hands of the municipal force, with its limited facilities for investigation, detection and prosecution.

I say this, I can put it in a nutshell. We can leave to municipal forces, if we have to have them, the matter of the regulation of highway traffic and such things as arresting drunks—arresting drunks which, sad to say, they do with tremendous facility, only they pick the places where they arrest drunks. They arrest all the drunks in the part of town where the lower economic orders live, where the people without much money live. That is where they arrest the drunks; they do not arrest them outside golf clubs and curling clubs and other places; none from there. A very selective law.

But we can leave those things with the municipal forces and put the responsibility

for the enforcement of the Criminal Code in the hands of the Ontario Provincial Police, which would then become a greatly expanded force, a much more effective force in the administration of justice in this province.

There may be some who do not know that the government of this province tomorrow, tomorrow as far as I am concerned, could say to the federal government at Ottawa, "Come and enforce your own statute; bring your mounted police in here, we are getting out of the field." We might have to pay for the mounted police to come here, but constitutionally the Criminal Code is a federal statute and the provincial government could say to the federal government, "You come and enforce your own statute, do not ask us," because section 92 of The British North America Act does not say anything about the enforcement of the criminal law. It gives to the province the responsibility for the administration of justice which is an entirely different concept from strict enforcement of the law. But there must, I feel—and this is the second branch of my argument—there must soon come a time when we dispose of and dispense with the small police forces in this province.

Recently, the reeve of North Grimsby wrote us a letter and he pointed out to us that within a radius of ten miles, ten miles of his home, there were no fewer than seven different police forces. No fewer than seven. We must, I say, do away with those smaller and inefficient forces and replace them with Ontario Provincial Police so as to reduce greatly the number of departments working in this province and increase the efficiency that the smaller administrative unit would thus entail.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is so plain a proposition that the government ought not to hesitate to embark upon it, because truth to tell, the only way in which we are going to combat these crafty and clever and evil people that are the subject-matter of this report, is to meet them with intelligence and efficiency, with unity, with forces that are of manageable proportions and able to combat them.

I do not want to leave it without saying that I agree wholeheartedly with what I believe to be the philosophy of this government in regard to control of police forces. I believe it to be their philosophy from the printed utterances, and I say this: I will never support any proposition while I am in public life, I will never support any proposition in a democracy that removes the control of the police forces of this province from the political heads. It is fundamental to democracy.

I vehemently and entirely disagree with that recommendation of the police commission found in this report which is put in a very high place. Let me read it to show you that with which I disagree. I quote:

That all police forces should be under the immediate government of an independent and non-political authority subject to removal for cause by the government on the recommendation of the Attorney General.

I will never support that proposition. The police force, the police arm, in a democracy is much too fearsome a weapon that the day should ever come that the Attorney General or the head of the government might stand in his place in this House and say with impunity, when the abuse of police power is called to his attention, that, "the member knows that the police are under the control of an independent commission, I will get the answer tomorrow for him. I will ask the head of that independent commission."

No, sir. The police are too powerful a weapon to be used at the behest of the unscrupulous, that our democratic tradition could not tolerate such an answer from the Attorney General. Sir, the Attorney General must, at all times, be responsible for police action and if there is an abuse of police power then the reply the Attorney General makes is that "I have looked into that matter and I have found that (a), (b), (c) and (d) have been guilty of a gross abuse of their powers and I have suspended them." That is the proper democratic answer. That is the answer that is consistent with the philosophy of parliamentary government as the tradition to be found in the United Kingdom over these 200, 300 or 400 years, which I hope will continue to be the tradition in this province and in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with all of those remarks made by my friend, the hon. member for York South and those of the hon. member for Downsview about civil liberties and the threat to them that comes on the one hand from evil and the lawless and on the other from the misuse of arbitrary power that was granted by a government. I agree with Thomas Jefferson when he said: "I have a right to nothing that another has a right to take away."

So our problem as we discuss this—and I have advocated two areas in which I think that we might join the fight with great alacrity and greater vigour against the lawbreakers—our problem is a dichotomy. I recognize it and in conclusion I want to pitch my tent on higher ground. I want to look over at

the hon. leader of the government and say to him as man to man and gentleman to gentleman, that in dealing with this problem, in attempting to combat it, I say to him in a spirit of friendliness, let us get away from the realm of frenzy, let us get away from the atmosphere of panic, let us keep it on the plane of reason. Most of all, I say to the hon. leader of the government, the government has the responsibility first to advocate in this Legislature and this Parliament the measures that must and can and should be taken in order to combat this evil and to destroy this cancer, to turn the searing rays of radium upon it. As I said before, let us keep it out of the realm of inflammation, out of the realm of emotion. I say to the hon. member for York South, let us not liken it to everything bad that has happened in our history before because we have a great society here.

And finally, I say to them through you, Mr. Speaker, that if they exercise their strong intelligences that I know them to have, if they approach it in a spirit of moderation and devise some type of legislation that can combat this—and most of all, when they introduce it in the House, do not introduce it, I say to them, the way the former Attorney General introduced that Bill No. 99, but come to us and make an explanation and say: "Here is what we propose and here are the reasons and here is why we think we need the exercise of these powers."

Take it out of the realm of emotion and frenzy and lack of reason. Come that way and we will examine it, we will examine what is needed in this province and we will examine it as gentlemen would. We will turn our analytical powers upon it and our experiences and try to do the right thing. We will all join battle; all of us, on every side of the House, will join battle and we will say to these people that make the creation of that report a necessary thing, we will say in a unified voice as if we were a veritable coalition, we will say: "Look, you people, you are not coming into this province and exercising your lawless activity, you are not going to beat Bluestein in the centre of our city downtown here, you are not going into the house of the Clergyman Hord."

Is that forgotten? That the hoodlums went into Hord's house and beat him and his wife because they had mistaken the identity of the people they wanted?

We will say to those people with a strong and united voice that this is a decent society in Ontario and people as individuals have a right to keep the law and enforce obedience

to it. We will not tolerate the activities of any that either were born and grew up here or any who come from outside as aliens into our society and seek to warp it and torture it and bend it and pervert it. We will keep this society in Ontario strong and free, governed by lawful people of dignity and reason.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately am not a lawyer. In some ways unfortunately, because I wish I could speak with the abilities of my two hon. colleagues here who practise in the law, and could have the sense that they have with respect to both defending and prosecuting criminals, the experience that they have had. But I am just an ordinary citizen from the riding of Dovercourt and as I have looked at this situation, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the dilemma that the government has had to face—and I think the hon. Prime Minister has expressed it—on the one hand he has had to face the serious threat of organized crime, as a government he has had to face this, and on the other hand he has had to face the necessity of protecting the ancient rights of the people of any British Commonwealth country, the people of this country.

I would like to briefly deal with both sides of this and I am going to take the first aspect, that of facing the threats of organized crime, because I feel, sir, this is where the government has given priority in connection with this balance. I feel they certainly gave complete, almost hysterical, priority to the threat of organized crime when they brought forward the bill which they did.

Now what I would like to say is that we have heard the hon. Prime Minister, when he was talking about the threat of organized crime, emphasize a number of times that he was going to be, and that he always was, with respect to protecting the individuals from crime, ever vigilant, I think was the term he used; ever vigilant and ever alert to the protection of the people in respect to having a strenuous and vigorous police action.

I would ask: if you are a hunter can you really shoot a bird if you do not see it? I say this because as we look back on the situation of a government ever alert and ever vigilant, can they really be ever alert and ever vigilant to organized crime when we have a situation of a man who is the official guardian of the protection of the people against crime, telling us not so long ago that there was no organized crime? In saying this, if I am using the quoted remarks that he might have made to the press, I apologize, but I just suggest that there seem to be a great number

of misquoted remarks in connection with his emphasis on the fact that there was no organized crime in Ontario.

So my first point is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister of this government suggesting that they have been ever vigilant in the protection of the people rings somewhat hollow when on the other side of the fence you hear the official guardian of the protection of the people suggesting that there was no organized crime, or being misquoted on a number of occasions as saying there was no organized crime.

So what do we see with respect to this ever-vigilant approach? We see, for example, as we look through previous *Hansards*, that there has been the suggestion that the soul of crime is organized gambling. Yet we see that the charter of one club which was obviously a centre of organized gambling for 19 years was permitted to continue. For 19 years, when the police of this province wanted the club to be closed down, when the deputy Minister of the hon. Provincial Secretary's (Mr. Yaremko's) department made requests that the charter should be rescinded. I am talking about the Atlas Club and referring to the report that was made both in the Roach commission and the reports in *Hansard* in connection with it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Is it operating now?

Mr. Thompson: I am talking about the 19 years in which it did operate.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Is it operating now?

Mr. Thompson: I have never attended it, but I would certainly hope that by now it is not operating. But I would say that if this is the ever-vigilant approach, then I think again it would ring hollow. We look again at the approach that has taken place with respect to becoming aware of the dangers of crime, and I think again to a man who is no longer in this House. I think that in the light of the contribution that he has made, and the contribution that he could make, I think perhaps the people of Ontario will be having second thoughts in connection with the way that they did vote, in that there was a man who suffered gibes and jeers for a courageous stand; a man who is the cause, the cause of this whole situation being brought before the floor of this House; a man who is the cause of getting a lethargic and apathetic, a government with ineptitude, to suddenly size up that there is organized crime and they have to do something about it. That man, as I know everyone in this House recognizes, is John Wintermeyer.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: After the government was forced into having a report—and I say that with great sincerity and I think that a previous Attorney General sitting across from me on the government benches will recognize that the commission was one into which he had to be pushed—into accepting the fact that it should take place.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Tell us how they operate in Ireland. That would be really helpful here. Tell us how they operate over there.

Mr. Singer: That is as relevant as the speeches the hon. Minister made during the crisis.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, all right, he is an Irishman.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that in many other areas we may have a warmth of sympathy, but at the moment I am not talking as an Irishman talking to the representative of St. Patrick, I am talking of a situation that applied in Ontario.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: That is the problem. Is there—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: May I ask the hon. member a question? The hon. member has spoken before about the position of Mr. Wintermeyer and the Royal commission and the Roach commission. Is it not true that in making his speech he made accusations against individuals which were found in the report to be inaccurate? Is this not correct? Was this not part of his reason in asking for a Royal commission?

I read the terms of reference of that commission this afternoon and in the findings of Mr. Justice Roach, I refer to page 10, Mr. Wintermeyer in his speech said that he accused no one. I do not so read his speech. I am only asking if Mr. Wintermeyer was not motivated by something other than the tremendous lofty ideals that are given to him by the hon. member in his remarks to this House. After all, there was more in the Royal—

Mr. Singer: This is a speech.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am asking the question—

Mr. Bryden: I would be glad to answer the—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I listen to quite a few long questions—occasionally I like to ask one.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but Mr. Speaker, alas, comes to the hon. Prime Minister's aid.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I would be quite happy to answer that and I wish I could pull this from it, Mr. Speaker. I am quoting from Mr. Wintermeyer himself in *Hansard* of 1961. He says:

Mr. Speaker, the essence of the speech I made was that there was organized crime in Ontario.

The essence, Mr. Speaker, of the misquoted remarks by the then Attorney General who was representing the whole approach of the government was, and as I say it may be misquoted, that there was not organized crime in Ontario. Because of this, sir, I say again that the people of Ontario thanked the leader of the Liberal Party during that period for the courageous fight he had made in waking the conscience of this government to finally take some action.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have already had one question which I think turned into a statement. Knowing that my hon. friend also suffers from the same tendencies as I do I think I will wait until later for his question.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I wish only to say to the hon. member that I owe him one long question.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, let me continue, if I may. As I say, the question that the leader of my party at that time raised was to find out if the government recognized that there was organized crime in Ontario. Let me quote what Mr. Wintermeyer said after the Roach commission came before the House:

Now that we have the report, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to wait for another 20 years and simply have a repetition of this sort of thing—

By that I mean lethargy and ineptitude and blindness on the part of people to recognize organized crime—that is my quote, incidentally. I continue with Mr. Wintermeyer's words:

—or has the report served its purpose and has it put into the hearts and minds the conviction that this demands action and immediate action?

That, sir, was said by Mr. Wintermeyer in 1963, on March 27, in this House.

"Ever vigilant," says the hon. Prime Minister after he sees that organized crime is in the province. Then what does he do? He listens to a police commission, to study and to look into the report that was made. And so we wait again with respect to getting immediate action. We are still waiting for immediate action.

Sir, I say this, that the police commission in this report, it seems to me, has shown that there has not been an approach of "ever vigilant". I say this because the police commission—and it has been enunciated much more ably by my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury—as I have read the suggestions it makes, sir, is obviously suggesting that we need to have many efforts. It enunciates a number of them and I will not go through them. I hope that people have read the commission report. It has also been explained and elaborated by others. But it is quite clear that if we are to be ever vigilant, we need to take some action to get a more effective and a more able police force.

We need to have other approaches made. Therefore I say, why have we not had that before? If the hon. Prime Minister of the province is telling us that he is ever vigilant of the protection of the rights of the citizens against crime, why are we waiting, sir, until this date when we have a report to debate remedial action in order that we can have proper protection against crime? Why were not some of these measures done before?

I think if you read the report, for example, and I will do that if you like, I will go through it myself—but I think my hon. friend has enunciated and I will not go into it in detail. As a simple fellow from Dovercourt, as I read this report—I am not a lawyer, sir, so that I cannot dwell on the innuendoes in connection with it—one thing that struck me was, why do we have a report that goes in for such definitions of semantics? I could not help thinking, sir, of what would have happened to Mr. Blustein as he lay there beaten up at the Town Tavern, if the Attorney General had happened to approach him at the time. I could see the Attorney General leaning over his battered body and saying to him, "Remember, it is not organized crime, it is syndicated crime. It is syndicated crime."

Is that a comfort to the people who are the victims of crime to know the semantic approach? Let us get on with the job. That is what we have been asking.

An hon. member: Tell us how to do it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: I think the police commission has made some suggestions and I want now to talk about this other area. This is the situation that has taken place. I would say this, that in connection with the better protection of the individual from crime, it has been a hollow call from the hon. Prime Minister, standing up here and bleating ever vigilance. But we hope it will have a stronger sound to it in connection with action after this debate.

Sir, as we come to the other area, let us see the kind of approach taken by those people who felt there was no organized crime, even though they were misquoted, those men who felt there was no organized crime. Calm, capable men, feeling the sense of the responsibility of government—what did they do? They had the dilemma that the hon. Prime Minister said he was faced with. He said on the one hand, "There is the threat of crime and I must protect the people." On the other hand he said, and he had emotion in his voice, as though it went right through his sinews, "The thing that I will never stand for, will be that the rights of any citizen in Ontario will be in any way trampled on." And yet, sir, he hugged to his bosom for as long as he could, a bill that was repugnant to every civilized, democratic country in this hemisphere.

I, sir, felt there might be some reason for this. I have thought, why have men such as the hon. Prime Minister, who personally is a very decent person, in public office given me the opportunity to question whether they understand the true meaning of democratic rights? And I said, why, sir, would he hang on to this abhorrent bill? I say this, because I find this situation—

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the member now that we are really not talking about the bill. I realize that the bill arose out of this report and it has some relevancy, but I would ask the member to try to confine his remarks to the order that is before the House, and that is the consideration of this report. So, if he would leave the bill until it goes to the committee, it will be discussed in its entirety and also when it comes back to the House. I would rather he would leave that part of his remarks until that time.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I always respect your advice to me. I also would like to follow the remarks that were made by the hon. Prime Minister, whom I noticed you did not ask to sit down when he mentioned

that he had this dilemma. These were his opening remarks. On one hand, he said, we had the dilemma of trying to protect individuals against the present crime. I have dealt with that. And now, if I could deal with the other statement of the hon. Prime Minister, that he said that we will always—"I personally will see that the rights of individuals will never be trampled on". In view of the hon. Prime Minister's having introduced this important area of discussion of the bill and recognizing your advice to me, I will continue with respect to this latter point to be discussed.

Sir, I wonder if, in respect to the abandonment of these great principles that have been in our democracy, I wonder, sir, if we could not have an analogy with a situation of the great general who recently died. I am speaking of General MacArthur, a great general. And yet General MacArthur, when he was fighting in Korea and needing the troops there, there was also a small man in a sense—but a great man, because he understood democratic principles. I am speaking of President Truman. No matter the expertise of a general. The President knew that the general had to answer to the political powers. President Truman told General MacArthur: "You do not advance further." Somehow, sir, I feel that this has been the problem in connection with this bill. It has been that these men and other generals and other magistrates, or the magistrate and a policeman, somehow, sir, they, like General MacArthur in their eagerness and enthusiasm, wanted to advance into China in connection with battling crime. But the test of a government of representative people was to stand up to the enthusiasm of these men and tell them: "You are going too far." I, sir, suggest that the administrators took over from the representatives of the people. That is the only explanation I can make.

I, sir, say this, that we have seen, and the hon. Prime Minister has said, that this government will always respect the rights of the individual. I presume, sir, he feels that having brushed an Attorney General aside and had an Attorney General resign and a new Attorney General come in, that all will be forgiven and we will assume a new faith on the part of the government. But I would like to emphasize, sir, because all this is part of this discussion, that the men on those Cabinet benches, on those Treasury benches, collectively, are responsible for the philosophy and the attitude that took place in connection with this overdrastic approach in presenting the police bill—all of them.

And if I could suggest this, sir, there seems to be irony in it.

It is irony in this way: I was looking through some of *Hansard* before. It is rather like a history of the wives of Henry the Eighth—Catharine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. Some beheaded, some divorced, and so on. But let me go back to Catharine of Aragon. The Attorney General from St. Patrick, no longer the Attorney General, but the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker. I disagreed with him in many things in connection with his period as Attorney General but I suspect it may be because of the Irish tradition that he inherited. I suspect that he, sir, was one who quickened to the need for the rights of the individual. I suspect this from having watched him as that bill was presented, and from remarks that he had made himself in connection with a book by Mr. Keaton, I think it was. He was talking then about tribunals and the rights of the individual and having a proper procedure.

But he was no longer the Attorney General. They had removed him and put another man in there. I think, sir, that the irony is that this later man is probably—among that Cabinet group there—one who strongly opposed the abhorrent parts of that bill. He came out and told the press, "This is terrible; this is new." And he told them the kind of thing that would be approached and I suspect there had been an argument in Cabinet and he was told, "You put that bill through," and he came out and said, "These are the things that are wrong with the bill." Because how could a man who is as intelligent as the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass) and as politically astute as he is, tell all this to the press and then present it? To me, that is political suicide. I think he was forced by other Cabinet members to present that bill.

So, sir, the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas has gone. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is no longer there and I think that he, sir, as Attorney General would have stood against this. What is the situation in connection with what the hon. Prime Minister said about the balance between the threat and the aspect of preserving the rights of the individual? The men who are least guilty in connection with it have been dismissed or have been moved to another position and the men in the Cabinet who are really responsible, still sit there.

May I say, sir—and I am not going to go into this at length—once again, as the hon. member for Sudbury has said, Mr. Speaker, we have strongly emphasized that there

should be efficient and aggressive action in connection with tackling crime, but I would also suggest that in connection with the rights of individuals, we believe, as has been said on a number of occasions before, the rights of the individual are paramount to the threat of crime.

Let me put it as a British Prime Minister did—and I have used this quote before, because it struck me that a British Prime Minister, William Pitt, in the 18th century, could give you advice on this. William Pitt said: "Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants. It is the creed of slaves." I am going to repeat that, because I had hoped that this might sink into those people who are suffering the dilemma of the threat of crime and preserving the rights of the individual. Let me repeat what William Pitt, one of the youngest Prime Ministers of Great Britain, said in the early 18th century: "Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants. It is the creed of slaves."

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, three of the five speakers who have participated in this debate are lawyers. I think it appropriate, sir, that lawyers should give us the benefit of their knowledge and advice in matters of this kind. I would say that two of the three lawyers who have spoken in this debate have made useful and constructive contributions. As for the hon. member for Sudbury, who I presume, is now sleeping peacefully on the train to Sudbury—

Mr. Oliver: He must have gone to sleep in a hurry if he is.

Mr. Bryden: Well, at any rate, he is not here. I can only say that his apparently irresistible tendency to add irrelevancy to irrelevancy and multiply the whole by irresponsibility, greatly limits the usefulness of the contributions which I think his ability would otherwise lead him to make.

Mr. Oliver: That is about as clear as mud.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to say to all of the lawyers who have spoken, and to any others who may be interested, that whereas we welcome their contributions in discussing matters of this kind and benefit from them, I think that it might be in order if they looked to their own profession. I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to pages 38 and 39 of the report of the police commission, as follows:

A lawyer in Ontario whose name he did not know is a member also of Cosa Nostra, Valachi said. We obtained from him—

"We", that is the commission:

—obtained from him further information which enabled us to be reasonably sure of the identity of the lawyer to whom he referred.

We have not attempted an interrogation of the lawyer mentioned because of the doubt as to our powers of doing so in private session, and as Valachi's statement is based upon hearsay evidence, such an inquiry should be conducted *in camera*, lest serious and unjustified harm be done to a professional man's reputation. We feel obliged, however, to refer to this allegation, because Valachi did not know the lawyer personally and there was no particular reason apparently why he should volunteer such a statement.

This fact had also apparently made a deep impression on him, because he said: "I was amazed, I was shocked." And he added that he knew of no New York lawyer who was a member. The source from which he obtained the information undoubtedly convinced him as to its truth. This is one of two Ontario lawyers' names that have come to our attention as having more than a professional relationship with members of the Cosa Nostra.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness I think I should also state without quoting in detail that at another place the commission commended the profession and the Law Society of Ontario for taking prompt action with regard to certain conduct reported to them on the part of certain counsel appearing before the Roach commission.

However, to elaborate on the picture I would like now to quote briefly from an article by Allan Phillips which appeared recently in *Maclean's Magazine*. My hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald) quoted some extracts from this article this afternoon. I wish to quote one or two other extracts.

Some of the strongest opponents of the police on such civil rights issues appear as lawyers time and again on behalf of syndicated mobsters. They distort continuance, delaying and winning adjournments till they get the judge they want. They devise gambling club charters, set up dummy corporations and often act as fronts through whom the racketeers hold control, hiding the racket behind the lawyer-client privilege of secrecy.

In Toronto and Montreal lawyer-politicians draw large fees that buy not only their talent but their influence. These lawyers are the most important cog in the Mafia machine, the godfathers of every

North American syndicate. In Quebec City, Montreal, Hamilton, Windsor, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, there are lawyers who hang out and holiday with the racketeers. They advise in the planning of rackets. They dictate statements in case of arrest.

The Montreal ring that pulled off the 1961 bank robbery at Havelock, Ontario, had been advised by their lawyer to dress so that no skin was showing. In a robbery in Montreal's St. Laurent suburb in 1961 the robbers drove to the bank in their lawyer's car.

A Montreal lawyer, pleading with police director Adrian Robert to reduce a gambling charge against his client, burst out, "You don't understand the rackets in this city. I am afraid, if I don't get him out I don't know what they will do to me."

Says Robert: It is not a case of a lawyer advising a client any more, it is the mob telling the lawyer what to do. He is an employee.

A Winnipeg lawyer is one of the heads of a gambling combine. A Hamilton lawyer masterminds a robbery ring. Another Hamilton lawyer is the son of a Mafia Don, well off, influential, clever, experienced.

The prosecutors in many cases are seldom as skilful as syndicate lawyers. In federal cases the prosecutors are picked by the justice department usually from the list of party acceptables. They seldom have experience in syndicated crime. The department has even put corporation lawyers on criminal cases.

Mr. Speaker, the former Attorney General, once removed, now hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has frequently expressed the view, in my memory, that we can place absolute confidence in the integrity of professionally trained men. I believe that is true in the overwhelming majority of cases; I believe that most of these professional men are men of integrity, but I can also say, Mr. Speaker, that too many people have been rooked by too many lawyers in recent years for the public to believe that it is universally the case.

I think that it is time the law society and the members thereof gave much more active consideration than they have apparently given today to ways and means of cleaning up the profession and getting some of the bad apples out of the barrel. It would certainly appear, on the basis of information provided by people who have studied this subject, that corrupt lawyers and lawyers with criminal

associations are an essential part of the web of crime that exists in this province at the present time, and even worse perhaps, is threatening it in even more virulent forms in the future.

We have often heard of the mouthpiece—I think is the term that is used, in the United States. I was one of those who assumed that the mouthpiece was an institution that existed only in the United States. There is some indication that it is an institution that already exists and may be on the increase in Canada and Ontario as well as in the United States. I think there is a clear responsibility on the profession to make sure that it does not extend any further.

One of the unfortunate consequences of the government's entire handling of the problem that is now before us is that by its ineptitude—and I will use that word because I do not think anything more sinister is involved—by its ineptitude it created public apprehension on the question of civil liberties which has detracted attention from some of the very serious problems involved in the development of organized crime, and I may say in the development of petty racketeering in many fields some of which may not yet be within the ambit of organized crime, although if one can believe the reports of the police commission and others some of these other fields such as the used-car racket and the moneylending racket are frequently areas to which criminals look in expanding their activities.

There is, in my opinion, a serious inadequacy in law enforcement in these fields. The government, for reasons that are difficult to understand, has blundered in with measures that perhaps might be less effective in cleaning up the problems that we face than they would be in threatening the liberties of citizens. This has created a state of public apprehension that makes an intelligent discussion of the whole problem difficult. It has left the field wide open for demagoguery which, unfortunately, attempts to play on quite well justified public apprehensions for political purposes. In fact, as I listened to some Liberal speeches during this whole unfortunate incident, I began to wonder if some of their supporters really wanted to return to the laissez-faire philosophy of the 19th century.

That produced liberty all right—it produced liberty for the rich to ride on the backs of the poor and liberty for aggressive, predatory and unprincipled centres of economic power to prey on the rest of society. I think we have to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the positive state is here to stay. The state has

a positive role to play in improving the conditions of individuals and in protecting individuals from interference and destruction of their liberties by irresponsible elements within society.

The hon. Prime Minister has stated this afternoon that he would never be a party to anything that destroyed civil liberties—or words to that effect; I am not purporting to quote him. I believe him. I believe that he is most sincere. He believes as sincerely in the defence of public liberties as any person in this province or this Legislature. I believe that everybody on the beaches opposite believes sincerely in liberty and in the protection of civil liberties. Yet we had legislation brought in not very long ago which I think that in their hearts of hearts they must now realize posed a genuine threat to liberty.

The hon. Prime Minister stated this afternoon that he is now in consultation with the Dean of the Law School—I believe it was, he said—to consider some of the implications of these problems. They are difficult problems and it is proper that he should discuss them with men with special knowledge in the field. I would like to suggest to him and to the government that he might also give some consideration to a resolution of which the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party has given notice, and the text of which appeared in the votes and proceedings of yesterday. I would suggest that if this House would consider that resolution and act upon the suggestions contained therein, we might develop guide lines which would be an indication to those who are drafting legislation for the House as to the lines of demarcation over which they should not extend. I think that the ideas contained in that resolution would also provide guarantees that even if legislation did inadvertently slip through this House, which threatened civil liberties, there would be remedies for the citizens.

For example, it is proposed that there should be in this province an adequate bill of rights. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a bill of rights which specifically set forth the basic political and civil rights which form part of our common law tradition, and which also declared that no statute of this Legislature unless it specifically states otherwise can be construed as contravening those basic rights, there would be a guarantee of protection so that even if the Legislature slumbered, no legislation would pass that would infringe upon our basic rights. I think it is necessary, especially as the role of the state continues to expand, and it is bound to do in areas such as are indicated in this report and in other areas. It is necessary that we consider and

devise means of guaranteeing that in the development of its more positive role, the state will not infringe on basic liberties.

I will not at this late hour attempt to outline in detail some of the proposals that this group thinks should be accepted in combating the problem of organized crime and of racketeering generally, sir, without at the same time infringing on civil liberties. I think our hon. leader earlier today gave a reasoned, and I think intelligent, proposal for at least a line of approach to this problem. I think he made suggestions that are worthy of consideration by the government.

For example, there was the suggestion that we should have a continuing investigation into organized crime, but that that investigation should not be in the hands of a police commission that is also responsible for the administration of the police force. I think there is a legitimate separation of functions here. I think we should have a commission investigating these matters at all times and in studying the adequacy of our police protection. I think that that commission should have the same sort of powers as a commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act and I do not think that it needs to have the powers to commit for contempt. But I think it should have powers to require the production of evidence and compel witnesses to give evidence under oath. I think that it should have the power in certain circumstances to take evidence in private. But if it wants action taken against recalcitrant witnesses, then I think we should be prepared to go to a superior court and let the court take such action as in its wisdom appears appropriate on the basis of the facts placed before it.

I think it is advisable and desirable to have a commission of that kind and I think it is also desirable that it should not be the police commission. There is perhaps a natural reluctance on the part of the people of the province to see the police or an agency of the police given this kind of power to compel witnesses to give evidence under oath. They regard that as more properly, and I think rightly, power that belongs to a court of law or a similar agency.

I think there should be a police commission that has solely the function of administering and consolidating and developing the police forces of this province. I think the two functions should be separated. I think that might be a way of allaying some of the public apprehension that has been created and which will otherwise make a constructive approach to the problem of organized crime more difficult in the future.

I think, above all, it is incumbent upon the government at this stage to come forward with an overall statement of policy, certainly something much more comprehensive and meaningful than the statement the hon. Prime Minister gave us this afternoon. He gave us a very interesting historical review—not an entirely unbiased or accurate one—but he stated very little in the way of government policy. Yet a statement of government policy is absolutely vital. What have we had so far, Mr. Speaker? We have had a bill that created the greatest public uproar produced, I imagine, by any bill ever introduced into this Legislature, and what happened? The government abdicated its responsibilities entirely, its responsibility of making policy and of presenting policy to this House for consideration. It instead transferred the whole matter to a committee and placed upon a committee of the Legislature the responsibility of making policy.

I think that if we are going to return to responsible government in the British constitutional sense, the government should re-assume the policymaking role. It got off on the wrong foot entirely in this matter through haste, ineptitude, what-have-you. It brought in a report from the police commission, a special report, an important report, and on the same day it brought in a bill which was to implement important parts of that report.

Surely the government would have been much more sensible if it had brought in the report, had a debate on the report, considered the views of the Legislature in regard to the report, and then brought in its legislation. Now it is in a hopeless mess and I can see real difficulty at this juncture of getting any sort of rational approach to the problem. I view with the greatest apprehension the committee hearings on Bill No. 99. I can see them turn into a real donnybrook which will produce friction and heat and practically no light at all.

I would suggest to the government that it should now, since it has had a few weeks for sober reflection, reassert itself in its rightful role. I am not saying it should bring in a bill or any bills tomorrow or the next day, but this House is going to be sitting here, I think, for at least a month. I think the government should sit down and consider its basic policies, should put those policies frankly before this House and then should bring in its own bills to implement those policies. And, having learned by experience, it will know enough to avoid the kind of provisions that it had in section 14 of Bill No. 99. I am not saying that section 14 was totally wrong but there was so much wrong with it

and what was wrong was so totally wrong that this section became totally unacceptable.

I think the government now should be prepared to come forward with sensible and intelligent policies. As far as I am concerned, and I think I can speak for my group, we would not hurl any taunt of any kind at them if they forgot their ridiculous proposition of trying to shift responsibility to a committee. If they just forgot the whole thing and stated frankly that they had got off on the wrong track, we could all admit that everyone can make a mistake. Mind you, it takes quite an effort to make the sort of mistake, and the series of mistakes, that were made on this legislation. But so what? Let us forget about the past. Let us wipe the sheet clean. Let the government come in now and state its policy. Let it bring legislation in that is its own legislation and not a committee's legislation, for the consideration of this House. I think this is the only way in which we will get rationality restored to this situation. I would urge the new hon. Attorney General who does not carry with him all the difficulties of the past and can start with a clean sheet, to consider a return to responsible government in this province by adopting that procedure.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps not quite the first word I have spoken from this seat in the short time since the Legislature resumed its sittings. I believe I did have the pleasure of answering a question put by the hon. member for York South yesterday, but I believe it is almost the first and I have a suspicion it may rather be the last word in this debate. It is not often, some of my friends tell me, that they get a chance to offer the last word. I appreciate the opportunity.

I thought as I sat here and listened to my hon. friends opposite that I might wish for a moment to be in their position where, for some time past, although I was not here to hear them, some years back and over some two or three years, they have shouted allegations and made charges that crime was rampant, that organized crime was in this province in the ranks of the government and the police and in our society.

Having clamoured in this matter, and having shouted it to the roof tops and having repeated it and repeated it and having had two reports now to pretty much dispose of those shouted charges, they now stand up, particularly the hon. member for Downsview in the beautiful position of being able to quote the wonderful speeches of Burke in the defence of liberty and to stand forward in

the guise of the champions of liberty. What a wonderful position to be in. I wished for a moment I could have changed places. I could have quoted those beautiful passages almost as well as the hon. member for Downsview.

But it is a much different thing and a much more difficult task to face a situation, a job which has to be done and to do it. Something that may not be altogether understood and may not be—as some words in the commission report said—may not be “popular” with some persons and may cause apprehension, and be blamed for perhaps overzealousness in trying to do with the best of intentions a good thing. At least trying to achieve a good result in the protection of the public, which the government has a duty to do and to be blamed for overzealousness because it would appear that the rights of the individual were being taken away or being trampled upon.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to make one or two general remarks, before dealing with the report. Reading the report of Mr. Justice Roach and reading the report of the commission and the recommendations and the conclusions, and having the benefit of the debate which has gone before me today and the debate on Bill No. 99, I have arrived at this conclusion as a general statement—that in the province of Ontario, or in any society, where you have an independent and a capable and respected judiciary on the benches of all the courts from magistrate up to the Supreme Court of Canada, as I submit we have, and where you have a competent and capable and trained police force, as I submit we have in this province, and where you have those two things based upon a society, upon a people, who have themselves a high sense of moral values, who are intelligent and aware of their rights and privileges, as they have shown themselves to be and who demand of public persons and of civil servants, persons in public office, who demand a high standard of conduct—when you have that type of society, then I submit that crime, organized or syndicated, is not likely to be able to invade very far into the body politic or to affix itself on that body politic and to fester and grow there. This is the kind of Ontario and the kind of society which we have.

I further suggest, and I say this without any political connotation or interests. I ask you to believe me in this. But I think, this is my conclusion, that the people of this province, among other things, on September 25 last, indicated at least to me, that they were not too much alarmed, that they did not take

too seriously, that they did not believe too much, the charges that were hurled about and publicized that this province was in danger of being taken over or invaded and destroyed by organized or syndicated crime.

That was one of the things among others that was answered by the people of this province on September 25 last.

But having said that, I would say this: Both these reports, the Roach report and the Macdonald report, as I shall call it, indicate and establish the existence of syndicated and organized crime upon our borders, amounting in some respects to a government of crime, a criminal government, within a government, in certain of the states which lie upon our borders. This is an ever-present threat, ready to invade, to come into this province and to take over the government, as it has done, and as the report indicates as it is doing, in states that lie very close upon our borders.

I would refer, if I might for a moment, to page 118 of the commission report. This may have been quoted before. Let me read it to the House. This is page 118 and it is marked (h).

It is admitted that the law enforcement agencies in the United States have extreme difficulty in coping effectively with organized and syndicated crime in that country, that conditions in the years since the Kefauver report of 1951 are worse rather than better than they were at that time and that criminals have gained control of many aspects of legitimate as well as criminal operations in the fields of business and labour and influence in politics and law enforcement.

The report goes on:

That Mafia-like syndicated crime controlled by American gangsters manifested itself in the province of Quebec especially in 1953 to 1955 and its activities there have been noted in the same fields as in the United States. Reorganized police forces, supported by an aroused public, are progressing in their efforts to eliminate it. While the situation has improved, organized crime still presents a challenge to constituted authority in some parts of the province.

This I know one of my hon. friends has quoted, but I would repeat it.

That once syndicated crime has obtained a foothold in any large community, it is almost impossible to eliminate it, but that it cannot gain such foothold without police laxity, inefficiency or corruption.

Then the report goes on to say:

That law enforcement agencies in Ontario are for the most part not lax or corrupt, but frequently, for reasons beyond their control, vary in their efficiency.

Now if hon. members doubt that there is a threat of organized and syndicated crime on our borders and that it is poised and ready to pounce and to invade, read, I suggest to them, the book written by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Robert Kennedy, "The Enemy Within". It is a good book.

He reports, as hon. members read in the newspaper a day or so ago, that the threat exists and continues to exist and continues to grow and that they have not been successful in dealing with it. I have had the opportunity of having him say that to me a day or so ago. Curiously, someone quoted Jefferson this evening. Here is the man, the Attorney General of the United States, who has been fighting this type of crime and it is a fascinating story of his efforts to fight it.

We are accused of destroying in our proposed legislation, the liberty of the subject. The quote on the fly-leaf of this book is from Thomas Jefferson. The Attorney General uses it and this is how it reads:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

This is Thomas Jefferson. This is in the fight against crime.

May I then concern myself with the recommendations which this report contains, bearing in mind that this problem exists; and as has been said by my hon. leader, this is the problem we face, to prevent this invasion, to defeat it before it comes in or to destroy it and drive it out should it gain access to our province.

Here are the recommendations of the commission and I can give you some comment upon them and then indicate to you what the policy should be, in my opinion, in approaching this problem and dealing with it.

The report, at the foot of page 119, recommends that provincial and municipal police should be under the immediate government of an independent and non-political authority.

I would like to say this: perhaps the suggestion is good. I welcome the thought that functions of commissions might be divided, that the investigative side and the administrative side might be in two separate bodies, but I would say this, that I think a real effort and a real result has been achieved in

removing from the political arm, and I am sorry my hon. friend from Sudbury is not here, that there has been a real effort and a real result, I think, achieved, in removing from the influence of the political arm the operation and the administration of the police forces; the Ontario Provincial Police and the municipal bodies of this province, by placing them under a commission which is charged with the administration and with the control and with the education and with the direction of the police force. In the case of the Ontario Provincial Police, there is a further separation by placing it under a commissioner of provincial police who reports through the commission to the Attorney General.

The hon. members of this House will appreciate and be aware of the fact that there must be—separate the force as far as you can from the political influence—but there must be a responsibility to government through some officer.

Mr. Singer: Indeed so!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Indeed so! But the separation, the control, the administration by the commission formed, or by a commissioner, I submit to the House, is a good thing and as long as the line of control is retained these two somewhat opposed ideas, must work together.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Singer: In view of what Judge Macdonald said in the annual report of the police commission tabled in this Legislature two weeks ago, does the hon. Attorney General believe that the police commission has any control, any longer, over the OPP?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could refer my hon. friend to the present Police Act and the answer I think is there. I think my hon. friend is aware of it. I could find it for him.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but the judge said that since August, as I recall his words, after two requests to the hon. Attorney General's predecessor, who apparently paid little attention to them, he had come to the conclusion it had no role to play insofar as the OPP is concerned. I quoted that this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am saying that the law, The Police Act, provides for and sets out the power of the commission over all

police forces of Ontario and that the Ontario Provincial Police commissioner is reporting through and with the commission to the Attorney General. This is the status.

The next recommendation is that smaller police departments, where geographically feasible, be amalgamated. The hon. Prime Minister has said this is being done, insofar as being feasible it is being considered. But I would add this, that such a policy, such a recommendation, is one that cannot be quickly or lightly brought about. Many problems present themselves. There are many difficulties, but I think the recommendation is one that is worthy, and in many ways and to a large extent perhaps feasible, but it is one that will have to be pursued with care and with regard to the difficulties that present themselves in attempting to amalgamate the police forces of small communities and large and small municipalities.

The third recommendation, item (c), is that police recruits be trained. This is being done and assistance is being given at the Ontario Police College. I am able to inform the House that the staff is being augmented with the best type of police instructors being obtained, and that assistance is given to the members of municipal police forces. Just as an instance, the course is a three-month course. The registration fee is \$10 per applicant. Through The Attorney General's Department, and the funds made available there, that is the entire charge. The travelling expenses, the board, the lodging of the entrant are paid throughout the course for the charge of \$3. The staff, as I have told you, is being augmented with the best persons who can be found. These things are being done.

Telex system of intercommunication is item (d) and I am glad to be able to say that the tenders for that system are already called, so that it may be installed in the provincial police force.

The next one is that the Ontario Provincial Police highgrading squad be renamed gold thefts squad, or some other more appropriate name. That was done, even before the recommendation was made. It is known as the precious metals theft squad.

The next one is the appointment of a criminal intelligence officer. This has been done by the Ontario Provincial Police and an intelligence department has been set up. The information is being obtained and it is being made available to the municipal police forces, as is recommended in this report.

At the foot of page 121 is the recommendation that the Ontario Police Commission, the

Ontario Provincial Police force and the Metro Toronto police department co-operate in the formation of an intelligence clearing committee. I can tell you that the Ontario Provincial Police force and the Metro Toronto police force have this arrangement in effect and consideration is being given, in accordance with the recommendation, to its expansion.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, sir. I wondered if you had gone from six to eight. Is that by omission?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sorry I did not—

Mr. Thompson: I noticed you were going through these various recommendations. I wondered if you had gone from six to eight. Seven, in a way, is a part of six I guess, or have I got the wrong—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have no number seven. I am reading from an excerpt.

Mr. Singer: The page is 121.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Page 121, yes. The numbers on that page of my copy are two and three.

Mr. Singer: Six, seven and eight in the copy we have.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Excuse me then. Yes, I had different numbers on that, sorry. I think number seven is what I had in number two: that the Ontario Provincial Police establish and maintain for the benefit of its own forces a central criminal office. This is being done. This is well under way. I had thought that was included when I described the intelligence office and the records which are being obtained. Now, my numbers are different.

I am not able to comment on items 9(a), (b) and (c). Although I believe that action has been taken under (b), I am not in a position to confirm it.

On item (e) I would have some reservations as to what might be done there, but I think it is well worthy of consideration, and the same with (f) and (g). I have some reservations as to how far the police should be entitled to go in identification. These are things which are being considered and more than that I am unable to say at this time.

Mr. Bryden: What about items (a) and (c)? They seem to be perfectly reasonable.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think perhaps I can answer the hon. member by saying that they may be all right. I am not, at this moment,

prepared to make a statement as to what my policy and the policy of the government would be. I know they are noted and they are being considered. That is as much as I can say at this time.

Likewise with most of those recommendations which follow down under the number nine.

Now we come to the one item (j), of which much has been said. I must say that I have some reservations, I think, on the matter of wire tapping. I know it is employed in certain jurisdictions, as the hon. member for York South has pointed out, but I am certain, as I stand here, that if that had been included in Bill No. 99, the outcry that we heard—I will not say that the hon. member for York South would have joined in it—I am sure would have been ten times the volume that we did hear with the other provisions about which so much objection was offered.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the necessity of it in view of the new electronic devices?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say that my own thinking is this: It is not a question of whether you have to tap a wire physically, and tap on to it. That is not in my mind the question at all. I do not think I can distinguish in my thinking between tapping the wire or having some electronic device that you can listen to by getting close to it. I think the principle is that you do not invade the private freedom of an individual to that extent. At least I have not reached that stage in my thinking.

Mr. MacDonald: Even with the safeguards of specific uses and occasions and so on?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: How can the hon. member throw safeguards around it?

An hon. member: Good for the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps one can. Perhaps one can.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Are the police not using it now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, the Ontario Provincial Police are not using it.

Mr. MacDonald: Are the Metropolitan Toronto police using it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know; the chief says not. But how can one distinguish between tying this wire to my telephone line or

putting some device against it that will listen? To me the principle is, at the moment, repulsive. Maybe I will change my thinking but I cannot overlook the suggestion that I feel that if it had been in that bill, we would have heard a tremendous uproar not only from hon. members opposite, but from all over this province.

Mr. Singer: Is that a statement of government policy?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have just said to the House that in my present state of thinking I cannot quite bring myself to insert that in the bill. I think I am entitled to say that I am open-minded enough if I could be convinced that it is necessary and that it does not violate a principle of the individual's right to some privacy, if I could reach that stage in my thinking, then I might go forward. But I cannot see that.

Item (k). This is a federal matter. I think it is plain to all hon. members. It comes within the section as noted there, 169 of the Criminal Code.

Now, item number 10. This is a respectful request to the courts as to how they impose sentences and as to the nature of the sentences they impose. This is something that is not within the field of legislation and perhaps if the commission feels that our courts need some encouragement, perhaps they may be allowed to do that.

Now we come to item number 11. This is the section, the recommendation for legislation which brought about the preparation of Bill No. 99. I do not propose here to discuss the bill. We will have ample opportunity, I am sure, to discuss it in the standing committee on legal bills and again in the House in the committee of the whole. All I would say is this, that I feel it is the duty of every hon. member of this House to approach that committee and the discussion of that bill with the feeling that he has a duty and an honest duty, apart from any political considerations to try to arrive at an effective piece of legislation which will achieve two things, the two objectives we have before us. One, to control, to prevent the invasion of organized or syndicated crime or the single criminal into our society and at the same time, in striving for that objective and achieving it, to make certain that the rights of the individual are not destroyed or taken away. I think these things are quite compatible and can well be done.

If I were permitted to discuss Bill No. 99, I think I would say that those two objectives were not too badly attained in that bill. I

have some matters to put before that committee and I am saying this simply that we should approach it simply with the idea of achieving those two objectives, to control and prevent any invasion of crime, and to make certain that the rights of the individual are preserved in the doing of that. These, I think, can be done and these, I think, we shall do.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the hon. Attorney General I should like to ask him another question arising out of his last remarks. Is he of the opinion that there are not sufficient procedures available to carry on investigations within the present legislation; or to phrase it another way, does he not agree with the remark of Commissioner Harvison that there are sufficient tools available to allow proper enforcement at present?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think this is verging on a discussion of the legislation which should come out of this report. I am aware, as I know the hon. member is, that the present rights the commission has are under The Public Inquiries Act. I think my hon. friend will perhaps agree with me that there are some dubious areas there with respect to the recommendation number 11 of the commission as to why the hearings are necessary. These things, I think, deserve our full consideration and I think, in considering what powers we should give to carry out the recommendation we have, as I have said also, to make certain that there are all the safeguards put in that any individual as a witness should have if he approached such a hearing under the control of the commission.

Mr. Singer: I will wait for the hon. Attorney General to come forward and discuss it after.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be permitted to ask a question, sir. I have been interested in reading the report by the Ontario Police Commission. I have been interested in the way in which it was presented to the House. My question is that, in the way it was presented to the House by the former Attorney General, I wonder, sir, whether you would—and I am not saying this to put you on the spot in any way, my question is whether the hon. Attorney General would have considered—I am sorry, I would like to ask the question, Mr. Speaker, but there are interruptions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let me have the question.

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Attorney General have considered this report in bringing it before the House in this manner? If I could clarify why I am asking this question—I wondered with respect to names that are placed in this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the hon. Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Would the member just ask the direct question?

Mr. Thompson: I ask if the hon. Attorney General would have followed the procedure of bringing forward the report in this manner, which includes names of private individuals and others about which there does not appear to be substantial evidence concerning activities which they are alleged to have done.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thought the commissioner was very careful in saying that there were individuals whom he did not name who, it was suggested in the evidence before him, had been perhaps involved or associated with criminals. It was one of the reasons that he asked for the very legislation in section 11 of the report. But I think this also, if there are individuals named in this report—and the hon. member seems to think that would be wrong—certainly there are some criminals named there, a good many of them. I think that if we withheld this report from the House, however it read, that I would have heard a great deal from the hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask a supplementary question? Could I ask, when the hon. Attorney General mentioned the names of two lawyers—in this report it suggests there are two lawyers in Toronto who are connected with the Cosa Nostra—does he feel that this might reflect not only on his profession but on certain hon. members?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They are not named.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Of course, Mr. Wintermeyer did that in his crime speech.

Mr. Thompson: No; I say the very fact that they are not named, could this not be an embarrassment to people as a result of what might be inferred?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would answer a question whether he—

Mr. Speaker: No, I am sorry, I am not going to let the discussion get into a question-and-answer period across the floor. The member had a supplementary question and if the Minister cares to answer it, he may.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would just like to say this: I know there are some lawyers who are not worthy of the name and do our profession no good. I think that is true of persons in every walk of life. We should not condemn the whole profession because some go bad.

Mr. MacDonald: And the sooner we dig out the full facts—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would like that, too.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning there are a few speakers on the Budget debate and we will then return to the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, April 17, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Friday, April 17, 1964

Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bryden, first reading	2193
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	2193
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	2193
Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading	2193
Establishment of local roads boards in territories without municipal organization, bill to provide for, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading	2194
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	2194
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Troy	2197
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Olde, agreed to	2214
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2214

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 1964

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Birch Cliff Heights Public School, Scarborough, and members of the Espanola High School Honour Society; in the west gallery, students from Bendale Vocational School, Scarborough.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there are four amendments to this Act contained in this bill: 1. It will provide for the payment by a school board of maintenance assistance payments in respect of children in hospital or under the care of a charitable institution; 2. We are extending the powers of the Metropolitan Toronto planning area to undertake special studies in conjunction with other governmental authorities, particularly CMHC; 3. There has been a problem in that it has been difficult for the Metropolitan corporation to obtain the information from the individual municipalities as to the assessment in relation

to grants in lieu of taxes. We are providing that the clerks of the municipalities must provide the statement to the clerk of the Metro corporation within 60 days after the grants have been paid; 4. This section is to authorize certain payments to a number of charitable institutions, including the Canadian Red Cross Society, for the Italian Flood Relief Fund.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this bill be referred to the legislative committee on municipal law. The amendments suggested are minor in most cases and I will go into all the various amendments during second reading and subsequent hearings of the committee.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, may I crave your indulgence? I thought the hon. member for Woodbine would explain the purpose of his bill. Would it be too late now to ask him if he would?

Mr. Speaker: We have passed that.

Mr. Troy: I know, sir.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide a means of equalizing the basis of the contributions of counties on the one hand and of cities or separated towns on the other, toward the cost of work on roads under the jurisdiction of suburban roads commissions. I might say in amplifying this,

that it is now proposed that the levy against the cities or separated towns by a suburban road commission shall be on the basis of the provincially equalized assessment.

LOCAL ROADS BOARDS

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the establishment of local roads boards in territories without municipal organization.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to encourage the development of the local roads in territories without municipal organization by methods that are more efficient and equitable than those provided in The Statute Labour Act. Local roads boards, elected by owners of land in local roads areas established under this Act, are given the power to collect taxes and determine what work will be done on their local roads. The Department of Highways will subsidize these local roads boards and perform the work on the local roads.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. Report of the Provincial Secretary of Ontario with respect to the administration of Part IX of The Corporations Act for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963.

2. Report of the Statistics Branch of The Department of Agriculture of Ontario for the year 1962.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order that I would like to raise. One, since this is the appropriate time, I would like to put on record without any other comment, the exact quote from *Hansard* rather than a paraphrase, in the hope that I may satisfy the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Just a moment, if the hon. member will—

Mr. MacDonald: Have I the floor, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am asking for it at the moment before the hon. member reads this.

Mr. Speaker: I presume the member is raising a point of order with regard to the remarks he made yesterday. Did the Minister wish to ask him a question about the point of order which he is raising or what was the point he wished to raise?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, my point is just this, if my hon. friend is endeavouring to put something on the record from *Hansard* at this time in relation to the NONG investigation, I do not want to be in a position of having to answer it, for this reason, that at the present time, there is a trial going on in this very city relating to many of the matters that are brought up inferentially as a result of this question. I think if my hon. friend will ponder, it would be better to let that stand until the trial is out of the way.

Mr. Speaker: Had the remarks which the member wished to make have anything to do about the Northern Ontario Natural Gas trial which is taking place at the present time?

Mr. MacDonald: No, they have nothing to do with the trial. The trial has to do with Mr. Farris and this has to do with the comment of the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Does the substance of the remarks which the member wishes to make, have anything to do with the trial that is on at the present time, insofar as the material is concerned?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, it is with reference, you are right, to the erroneous comments of the hon. Minister on the question of the issue of promotional stock. But the hon. Minister yesterday rose and said that I was wrong, that I was paraphrasing him and that he had never said anything like that. I said at that time, "I shall put on the record precisely what he said, nothing more."

Mr. Speaker: The only thing I want to point out to the member is that this trial is now on, and we do not want any further remarks in the House about a matter that is *sub judice* at this time before the courts.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to argue with you, but we are now in a very peculiar position once again, that if we cannot quote back into the record what is already part of the record of this House because allegedly it is before a court, we are really crippling the operations of this Legislature, particularly after the hon. Minister has made a charge yesterday when I was paraphrasing. This is sheer obstructionism, what we have got this morning, under the guise of being an affront to what is going on in the courts.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I do not want to let this matter go any further. The only thing the chair is concerned about is if these remarks, which the member is about

to make, are relevant to the trial that is now taking place. Therefore I think perhaps it would come under our *sub judice* rule and I would ask that he desist from making them at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall put it out in a release so that the press will have it, because Mr. Speaker, I feel that some time soon we have got to make a protest in this House that we are denied the right even to quote the record and deal with facts, allegedly because they are before the courts downtown. This has nothing to do with the perjury charge that is now before the downtown courts, nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It has to do with an allegation that the hon. Minister made yesterday which was quite wrong.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Just by way of getting this clear. As I understood the statement yesterday, it has very much to do with the end result and the reopening of this investigation. I have quite a number of items that I would quote in reply to anything that my hon. friend could bring. I would not want to do that while this trial is on. I would appeal against any attempt to do that while this trial is on.

Afterwards, I will deal with it just as free and just as easy and just as hard as my hon. friend wants it dealt with. But right now, this thing should not be brought up. I would be immediately put in the position of having to answer in this House, which of course is open to reporting, while this trial is on, and I ask my hon. friend, not with any idea of any reason why at a later date, if he wants to get anything on the record, he should not get it. But right at this moment, I think it would be very unfair and if anything of that sort was released in the press at the present time I would ask the presiding judge to call the hon. member before his court to explain it.

Mr. MacDonald: I will draw to attention the absurdities of the position we are in. I am now going to be placed in the position where it is quite conceivable I cannot read from *Hansard* to this House what has already been in *Hansard* for a period of two or three years. Because what is downtown before the courts is surely going to be appealed, so that for two or three years, I cannot read into *Hansard* what the hon. Minister said and—when I paraphrased it yesterday—he denied it. I am not going to argue the point any further, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to draw your attention once again to the absurdity of a

rule which denies this House—a place which has special privileges in dealing with matters of public concern—the right to deal with matters that are being discussed on the streets and being discussed in the papers.

Mr. Speaker: I just want to point out that the reason I am making this ruling is because we have this rule of the House. It is not as if I am making the rule at this time. We just want to follow the rules of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a second point of order, that I want to raise. I asked a question in the House on April 14, last Tuesday, of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). I inquired as to the report concerning the health conditions faced by workers in the Allied Chemical Plant near Sarnia, and the fact that some of them have been hospitalized. The hon. Minister of Health replied as follows, as found on 2011 of *Hansard*:

The Department of Labour and The Department of Health have had the new Allied Chemical of Canada plant near Sarnia under close supervision during construction and since it commenced operation. There have been no incidents of health problems relating to phosgene used in the process.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the *Windsor Star*. Nothing appeared in the Sarnia paper on this matter at all, rather significantly. The *Windsor Star* of April 15, under the heading,

SEVEN HOSPITALIZED BY GAS LEAK

There is one paragraph in the story, and I am quoting directly:

Today, plant manager S. G. Anderson confirmed that six or seven plant workers were at different times taken to hospital and treated for exposure to gas.

Mr. Speaker, this is either the second or the third time this year, that a question has been put to the hon. Minister and in reply to it, or in another statement, the hon. Minister has misinformed this House. I think the time has come when it is not too much to ask the hon. Minister of Health, that he examine the information that is given to him by his advisers a little bit more carefully, so that he will not perhaps unwittingly become the purveyor of misinformation to this House.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a dastardly charge for any hon. member of this House to make against any Minister. The information, sir, which I placed before you and before the

hon. members of this House is a statement, directly prepared by my staff, who are charged with the responsibility of looking after this.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the hon. Minister's staff were in error.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the hon. member to wait, please? The statement which I read to him, and to this House, I did not alter in any single word or detail. Because a highly scientific matter was under discussion, I took the words as given to me by my staff, without any alteration whatsoever. If they have been misinformed, or if the cases have not been reported to the division of industrial hygiene of The Department of Health, then I cannot give any reason why that should have happened, other than to undertake to you, sir, and this House, that I will order the division of industrial hygiene to investigate this more fully and find out why one report is given to the newspapers and another report is given to The Department of Health.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I may just add one bit on the point of order. This is not a technical matter. This is a simple fact of workers being hospitalized. The hon. Minister was given a report which he now says, presumably, was in error because the plant manager denies it. All I am asking is that the hon. Minister not accept *carte blanche* what is given from his advisers because this is the second or third time he has given the House misinformation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very, very reasonable that any Minister would accept what is given to him, as my hon. friend blandly calls *carte blanche*, by his staff who are experts in the field, rather than take a report from a newspaper, with all due respect to newspapers.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I wish before the orders of the day, to make a report to you that might bring a little lavender and old lace into the debates this morning. The Department of Mines is pleased to report that as of this date there has not occurred a fatality in Ontario in mines, metallurgical plants, pits and quarries, over a two-month period, since February 6, 1964.

This involves in heavy industry a working force of over 46,000 men and is a new record of safety in this group over many years and shows the safety work being done. I wish to compliment the industry and my men for that announcement.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree).

Would the hon. Minister please inform the House when he will be making a full statement on minimum wages for the province of Ontario? We have sent notice to the hon. Minister.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on an earlier occasion in this House, and certainly in other places, I have stated that I would make a statement with respect to minimum wage orders during the present session of this current Legislature. Nothing has happened since I made the statement which would alter the commitment which I have made.

Mr. Bukator: A supplementary question, if you will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: You wish to ask the Minister a supplementary question?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, I would like to, if he would answer it. I do not know how to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, without a bit of a—

Mr. Speaker: Sir, you will have to make—

Mr. Bukator: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this House is stifled. How can you ask an intelligent question without a word of explanation before it? They have two lines in *Hansard* that I would like to quote, if you would permit me to. I think this would make an intelligent sort of a discussion.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, you cannot dictate to me.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, may I anticipate what is in the mind of the hon. member and elucidate on the answer which I gave? I thought it was quite clear. I shall deal with the minimum wage question during the next day or so, within the period of this present session, but I am not able nor do I propose today to state the exact day on which I will make that statement. I think it is the exact day that the hon. member would like me to name at this time.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to thank the hon. Minister for that comment, that we will have it in the session.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 2nd order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, when I was ending my speech before, I think I was talking at the time about the hospital bed situation. Sir, at that time I think everyone appreciated that there was a really quite serious bed emergency situation, particularly with active treatment beds in the Metropolitan Toronto area. As I recall, this situation was being put before the public by aroused newspapers, by ministers of the gospel, and even by, I would say, members of Parliament from every side. But the only person who did not seem to be putting forward anything was the man who after all is most responsible for it, and that was the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Sir, since that time once again an inactive government has been moved to some action in that with this pressure it became aware that a crisis had developed. We find that the hon. Minister did come through with what I would call a partial answer to one of the problems of the hospital situation.

I would say that it struck me as somewhat ironical that the person who was providing an answer, a considerable time before we got an answer from the hon. Minister, was the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop). The hon. member for Forest Hill has suggested to us what I would have felt was a long-term approach to this. I think, sir, the hon. member for Forest Hill recognized that private philanthropy cannot answer the problem of raising funds for a modern technological hospital, and he suggested that a system should be set up by the provincial government which would provide funds that could be guaranteed to be paid either by the raising of hospital premiums or by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission guaranteeing the cost of interest rates and principal.

I would say, sir, that this is surely fundamental. I appreciate there should be a role for private philanthropy and I would think this should be, if I could say it, on the frills of a hospital, but the basic necessity of hospitals surely should be carried by the level of government responsible for health and that is the provincial government.

I had suggested myself that there should be a fund set up for needed hospital construction. I suggested a revolving fund of \$25 million. I think, sir, that such a fund would provide low interest loans for hospital construction approved by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. I think that the low interest rates would remain stable, and I should add that I notice where the hon. Min-

ister, in connection with the loans that are going to be provided, has given a low interest rate, I think of three per cent. I would feel, sir, that the loans could be up to \$10,000 a bed with a payment over 20 years. I would hope that the hon. Minister, also in connection with these loans, would be working steadily for negotiation with the federal government, that it again might be asked to play a role with hospital grants.

I think that the repayment would be possible by provincial hospital grants being increased to include debt charges. The advantage, I feel, in connection with the proposal I make over that of the hon. member for Forest Hill, is that a revolving fund can replenish itself continually and it meets not only the present construction needs but also the forecast need of 3,800 beds which we understand has to be available by 1970. Sir, the heat in a sense, has been off the hon. Minister of Health because he has given a partial solution to one area of the problem, but I would hope that having had a sense now of the urgency for providing adequate health facilities for the people of Ontario that this government now has realized that this is its responsibility.

I notice the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) is kind enough to be listening to me. He, I think, realizes that when you take money from people through premiums and tell them they will get a service, they expect that the government will be honourable enough to provide adequate service. I would suggest that there are many other areas that have to be looked at in order to provide adequate service. I am thinking of staffs. I do not think we can tolerate glib replies in connection with the shortage of nurses. I think we want a deeper approach to that situation—a deeper approach to look at the working conditions of nurses; a deeper approach to look at the situation of the married nurses who obviously, it would appear, are not taking part in hospital work.

Sir, I am so sensitive to the rulings of the hon. Minister or the rulings of Mr. Speaker after the situation this morning, that I almost have a Pavlov reaction of sitting down quickly if I even see him twitch a muscle.

My hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) perhaps might have mentioned this area to us, and that was in connection with the co-ordinated approach which I am sure he is going to take with respect to war on poverty. This is perhaps a too-clichéd term now but it is still a very vital term. One of the things he might, I think, have thought about was the need to

get married nurses to continue nursing. They have taken a great deal of training. That is why the question about the placing of day nurseries. I, sir, have always had a great deal of faith because this image I see is of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, as they say, on the white horse. I was so pleased to see that he is prepared to push for a medical insurance plan for the people of Ontario, as he says, based on an approach similar to the hospital insurance plan.

That, sir, shows a remarkable vitality in connection with welfare, compared to what it has been before. I thought that when he had thought of this, of the medical insurance programme, he might have also considered the point that a way to attract the married nurses to work again in the hospitals would have been to consider placing day nurseries in hospitals so that married nurses who have children would have been able to have their children at the hospital in the day nursery while they worked.

Sir, I would never suggest that the hon. Minister did not have the imagination to see this solution. In fact I notice him looking into a brief now. I am sure he is probably figuring how this can be arranged and I will be the first to congratulate him when he will announce it.

One of the things that I think we should all appreciate is that there has been an extraordinary situation in the House. For the sake of the hon. members of the back benches, who I think possibly feel and wonder about the way that they are, on the whole, ignored by the government, I would like to say that I find a most refreshing contribution from a number of them. I wanted to call to the attention of the Treasury benches the remarks of the private hon. member for Forest Hill because I think his remarks and suggestions may go unnoticed by the government. I am sorry that he is not here because I wanted to tell him that at least the members of the Opposition recognize this brightness that suddenly takes place in the government circles when you have a private hon. member making a suggestion with respect to a crisis.

He was not the only Daniel who—there were others—I think there is a song and I think you will probably recall it, Mr. Speaker.

Dared to be a Daniel,

Dared to stand alone,

Dared to have a purpose firm,

And dared to make it known.

The hon. member for Forest Hill, I think we should call him the Daniel of Forest Hill—but

if you will recall the Bible, sir, when Daniel went into the fiery furnace there were three others who went in later. There were Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego and there are also Shadrachs, Meshachs and Abednegos here. The hon. member who sits next to the lady hon. member (Mrs. Pritchard), I am sorry I cannot—

An hon. member: Armourdale!

Mr. Thompson: Armourdale, the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton); there is the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). Now these men, sir, have dared to be Daniels. I do not know how far this will advance them, whether they will just have to take the loneliness of the fiery furnace or whether they will be recognized for their courage and abilities. We, sir, at least recognize them.

The other thing I would like to say—because when we see a contribution being made on the part of the government, and I may say that for my own part it is rare that I see it, but when I do see it, I want to give credit when it is due. Now, sir, for many, many years, one of the things that I felt has been bleak and forlorn has been The Department of Reform Institutions. It was something like the situation with the hospital beds—it had to be an outraged, persistent war by the community and by the newspapers and by the Opposition, Mr. Speaker; and by people who work in the hospitals; in connection with nurses; by doctors, until we got action out of the inactivity.

And, sir, with the prison reforms, I can recall when I first stepped into this Legislature as a member—that was not so long ago either—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It seems long!

Mr. Thompson: But I recall that at that time, reading just before I came in, that the then Minister of Reform Institutions admitted that there would no longer be whipping in the institutions of Ontario. As I recall, I read that it was because the press had pushed him to see that there needed to be some reform here. I think the way the press did it was by a column describing the horrifying situation of a young man who was going to face the scientific torture of the whippings administered by certain kinds of instruments to make the most acute pain without breaking the bones of the people. This young man, unable to face it, had hanged himself.

Well, that was the slow advance that was taking place in reform institutions. This particular Minister had admitted in Parliament the outraged outcry of the newspapers forced this reform.

So, sir, it was with considerable delight that I read—and unfortunately I have not got some of the notes that I had wanted—of some of the reforms that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) is starting to instigate. I would say that if he can keep on in that approach that we really will have a reform taking place in Ontario institutions. I congratulate him on doing this. We will be watching because we have seen this moment of brightness and, of course, you cannot prevent us being cynical, considering that we sat and watched the way things went for years. So we will watch this to see, sir, whether you will still progress and eventually this will really be a reform institutions department. But in having made a first step, I would like to say that I congratulate the hon. Minister on what he has done.

Now I would like to turn to a problem which concerns us in this Legislature because not only are we representatives of the people of our various ridings but we are also citizens of Canada. I would feel, particularly in these times, as citizens of Canada and realizing that some people are suggesting there is a crisis in Confederation, it behooves every one of us to look toward measures that are measures of unity for Canada, and that we should try to mould those measures across Canada in a similar fashion to the early Canadians who made Canada a nation by building a railway across this country.

And I would suggest that one of these plans which can build the fabric of unity, one of the approaches surely, is a social measure providing equality of benefits, providing for a mobility across this country for people, in fact, indeed encouraging it. And I am pleased that the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Roberts) agrees with me, agrees with our party. We must stress the great principles to develop a unity across this country. He agrees on the principle of a Canada pension plan rather than separate plans.

I am sure that we all agree that if we could get a Canada pension plan it would provide a mobility far better and encourage mobility between the provinces, far better than having the portability of pensions where there will be inequality with areas of lower standards of pension between the various provinces. I would say that we should think about mobility. We should think of the fact that in this nation—I think one of the

tests of a nation is that people are permitted to live in one area and spend their old age in another and so on; I think one of the tests of nationhood is that young men, if they see a better opportunity in one part of a nation, can go there freely to work. If they get a chance of promotion, they can return to another province, and so on. And I think therefore that the idea of a Canada pension plan is vital in connection with the unity of our nation.

And I would say that as I have looked at the proposals about a pension plan—and I notice that the hon. member for Forest Hill is now with us, and I would like to say that amongst the other contributions which he has made to this House, he said one of them was that there was too much fuzz, and misunderstanding and ambiguity about the proposals of pension plans. I agree with him, but I would like to come to why I think such ambiguity and confusion exists.

I noticed, sir, an article—I think it was the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, in which it reported a resolution passed by the Ontario Teachers' Federation. They were calling on the Ontario government to withdraw from the proposed Canada pension plan. And, sir, I phoned someone at the Ontario Teachers' Federation to discuss the reasons why they were considering withdrawing. Now I do not know if I spoke to the author of the resolution or not.

The person to whom I talked certainly seemed to be able to speak with some authority about it. I noticed that the first point raised in this article is that "you feel you should not be in the Canada pension plan because teachers would be forced to pay what is called a disguised tax on salary under the Canada pension plan, and could not qualify for full benefits under it". And I said, "Does that mean that you are concerned about the one per cent?"—which at the present anyway is proposed under the Canada pension plan to be taken from salaries. And I said, "Well now, if you are concerned about the 1 per cent, does it mean that you are really for private pension plans rather than a public plan?" I was told that they were for a public plan. And I said, "Well, I fail to see how you can have a public plan unless you are going to have to make some contribution." And I suggested to them that with the Quebec plan they would have to have 2 per cent taken off. So we had our discussion about this and then we moved on to the next problem which they had raised.

The next problem was that they said that the board said that most teachers retire before 65, but could not draw a pension until 65.

This is one of the reasons that they wanted to opt out of the Canada pension plan. And I said, "If you are for a public plan, and you are annoyed about the fact that you cannot opt out before 65, do you want the age of a public plan to be 60 or lower than 65?" And again they said, no, they did not want that, they felt it should be at 65. As I say, I do not know if I was talking to an authority but we moved on to the next point.

The next point they had apparently raised was that they were concerned that the depletion of the unemployment insurance fund demonstrated the federal government's inability to administer properly any Canada-wide social security scheme. It seems to me that—and I certainly do not want to get overly partisan in this—but it would seem to me that the unemployment insurance fund was not set up for periods of widespread unemployment.

And I think that if we look at the recent period in Canada, we can understand there were periods of widespread unemployment and the unemployment insurance fund did go broke. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Canada pension plan or with any pension plan, surely it is more predictable to assess than the contributions in a situation of unemployment—I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will forgive me this little remark—a situation in connection with unemployment when you might have a federal Conservative government in power. It is not always predictable that you will have full employment at that period.

But I would say that we can surely predict the numbers of people generally, people who are going to move into a pension plan, far better than we can the number of people who may be unemployed due to world situations and many other things.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): It is the amounts that are paid out of the funds we have to be careful of—it is not only the prediction or the number of people who may be unemployed, but it is the extension of benefits which is always politically popular with any party, it is no partisan approach I am taking on this. It is the extension of benefits without a corresponding increase in the fund which I think is at least partially responsible for the fate of the unemployment insurance fund.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I appreciate the contribution—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The unemployment insurance fund got into the mess because of national unemployment.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, there are several elements involved in it.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate the point made by the hon. Prime Minister. I still think that the basic problem was the widespread unemployment that caused this strain. And I would suggest that the point the hon. Prime Minister makes is certainly valid in connection with any plan. If he is going to increase the benefits over contributions, that also would be a cause of a fund being depleted. But I think it comes to us again that when we asked the teachers about their concern over the unemployment insurance fund and tried to show there was a different aspect with a pension plan, they then said that they do not have much faith in a federal government investing money, but they do in a provincial government. Well, this seems rather odd to me that you cannot have faith in your nation and in your federal government but you prefer to have faith in the provincial government.

So what I am really coming to is the point that was raised, I think, by the hon. member for Forest Hill that objections and pros and cons to pension plans are often based on inaccuracies and on confusion. Now, I would like to suggest that perhaps one of the reasons for confusion in connection with this and one of the reasons certainly in the minds of these people—because I asked them. I said, "Well, now, you are for a Robarts pension plan?" and they answered me; they said, "What plan? What does Mr. Robarts stand for? What does he want?" And I, sir, as always, forgetting partisan politics or anything, I said, "Well, there is one thing we know he stands for; he is for the principle of a Canada pension plan"; but apart from that I am afraid—and I hope in this House we will get clarification—because I am afraid I am like many others. I do not really know what he does stand for in connection with a Canada pension plan.

I would say, sir, that if you look at the past approach that has been taken by the hon. Prime Minister, in connection with whether he will be within a Canada pension plan or whether he will have his own plan, we saw first of all, his own plan, which he was suggesting. His own plan, sir, was going to provide — and I am quoting from the *Toronto Star*, which has done a comparison between the two plans—his own plan, sir, the provincial plan, will build up over 40 years, since it will only apply to work done on or after January 1, 1965 and after attaining the age of 30. Anyone retiring at 70 in the year after it comes into effect will receive \$2 plus the \$75 flat rate pension. And after 40 years

of payment into the plan, which will build up by \$2 a year, a man receiving the maximum will get \$80 plus the \$75, for a total of \$155. That was the hon. Prime Minister's original plan.

It was a plan which was based on private insurance companies. I am not saying "with influences" by private insurance companies. I would say I do not adhere to that. But what I did notice, sir, with respect to the hon. Prime Minister's remarks were that he apparently had gone to the federal government and he was concerned about a public plan. He was concerned about a public plan because of the government taking over large investments and how this would affect the private sector.

I may say that it appeared to me that the hon. Prime Minister agrees in one sense with the federal plan, which would have had a fund of \$300 million with the amendment which the hon. Prime Minister appears to encourage, the federal plan would have a fund of \$2.5 billion in ten years. Then sir, it seems to me that with the hon. Prime Minister's concern about the public plan interfering with the private sector with respect to investments, if he has an interest, a keen interest in the Quebec plan—I understand he wants 100 per cent of the funds now to be in the provincial government's hands—surely it seems that he is abandoning the concern he had with respect to the influence of governments taking such large investments into their own hands and what kind of effect it would have with respect to the private sector.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I think the question then was a very basic question of what effect a public plan would have. I can assure the hon. member that my concern was not expressed in order to block it. I was interested to know whether any investigation of this had ever been made, whether this question had been studied. I can assure my hon. friend that my interest was shared by a great many people, a great many economists. Now the answer may be that it is perfectly all right, but in those early days when this plan was thrust upon me in the middle of an election campaign and I was issued an ultimatum to either accept it or reject it, and an attempt was made to force me into a position where I was to say I am either for or against this before there was even a bill in the House of Commons, there was nothing there but a resolution. I mean, you understand this.

These points were raised so far as I was concerned, not with any idea that we were going to block the Canada pension plan. But

I was very interested to find out whether these things had been considered when the legislation was in the formative stage. That is why it was raised. The hon. member knows himself that there have been so many shifts in the meantime. For instance, originally the federal plan as I understood it, was a pay-as-you-go plan and part of the pay-as-you-go was going to be an additional \$10 on old age security, which was going to be paid out of the money collected under the Canada pension plan. When Quebec indicated it was not going to come into the Canada pension plan, the federal government then could not funnel an additional \$10 on old age security into the province of Quebec, if the people in Quebec were not going to pay under the Canada pension plan. So we had a reversal right there.

In the overall picture, what has happened in this whole question of pensions is that there have been public debates and positions taken. It is a very fluid situation. Even in this past week there has been change, because Mr. Pearson is negotiating with Quebec and has telephoned me and told me this. Eventually there will be results from that. I can assure my hon. friend the chances are we will come up with something in the final analysis that we have not even seen yet.

This is not an unhealthy way to develop the best piece of legislation that we can find in this area for all of Canada. In the affairs of men, this has happened to develop in this way. I personally am convinced that as men of goodwill and co-operation, we can work these things out, but it is impossible to know from day to day what developments are going to be.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I would like to suggest while I am discussing it that I am not by any means suggesting you are blocking the plan. I am simply suggesting that it seems to me that you yourself have moved from various positions. Now, I am not criticizing that. I am just tabling it.

I am constantly emphasizing the point you have made that you are interested in a Canada pension plan and I am just going through some of the approaches that you have taken because—

Hon Mr. Robarts: Well I am just trying to help you.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that, I really do appreciate your contribution. If I could, just to clarify, to show that I have watched your approach on this, say I know you wrote,

for example, to Mr. Pearson last February in connection with this area of private investment, that you were concerned and you had written. If I can quote this:

That one of our main concerns throughout has been the impact of the Canada pension plan on existing private pension plans in this province and the adverse effect on the formation of investment capital upon which the growth of our economy greatly depends.

I think you said that at a meeting, rather than wrote that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, in any event, I have expressed the viewpoint.

Mr. Thompson: But I would suggest that it seems to me that one problem in this—perhaps I will not go on in this area much more—but one problem to me has been to know where you really stand. Perhaps you frankly have no stand, you are watching to see what is developing and your interest is both for the people of Ontario and for a broad pension plan. But it seems to me, sir, if I could say this, that you have a wealth of technical brains, both yourself personally as well as your civil service. The hon. Provincial Treasurer told us that there had been negotiations between your people—I speak of our people, rather, the Ontario civil servants—and the federal government technical people, and I had asked him about it—it is recorded in *Hansard*; I have not got it here but it is recorded in *Hansard*. This was several months ago when his estimates came out, and you had worked out the problem of existing plans. Well, sir, the hon. Provincial Treasurer had given me that impression.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, if I can correct the impression, there were meetings held at the technical level. They were, I would say, completely unproductive. In other words, we did not get the answers we wanted in those meetings. There were meetings held after the meetings held in September, I believe, and some at a later date than that, these by technical commissions. From our point of view those meetings were not particularly satisfactory.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask this, sir, and I appreciate the hon. Prime Minister giving us answers on it: I understand the federal government constitutionally cannot legislate for existing private pension plans to fit into an overall plan. Now, the provincial government could do this; it could set certain standards for the private pension plans.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the adjustment comes one place or the other. You have two things that you want to put together. Constitutionally I cannot answer the question. I do not really know whether the federal government has power to legislate for a private pension plan, but it certainly has power to tailor its plan to fit the existing plans in this question of integration, which is a technical matter. If they cannot legislate and change the existing private plans, certainly they can arrange their own legislation so that it will fit at least with existing plans. This is what I think they are attempting to do, for instance, with their own public service pension plan in Ottawa which is a large, complicated pension plan.

Now, somehow or other it has to be. At one conference one man spoke for half an hour without taking a breath on some of the things that they were doing to co-ordinate that. I am afraid his speech ended in a general round of laughter because there was not a single person there who understood what he was saying other than himself. It was a very complicated matter indeed. That was the result of the work the federal government was doing to integrate its own public service pension plan with its own universal pension plan.

Mr. Thompson: Thanks, sir. As I say, if the hon. Prime Minister looks at the situation in the States where they have a contributory pension plan, it does seem that this can be worked out for—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, the point about the United States really is that if we had introduced a universal contributory pension plan 20 years ago, of course our problems would not be as great. On the other hand, the problems are put before us to be solved; there is an answer to it, and certainly that would not be a sufficient reason to block a universal plan if in the thinking of all of us a universal plan is a proper social need in our country and I think there is great room for it. We simply have to find an answer to these problems. We cannot say, "Well, there is a problem, therefore we will not proceed." The problem is there and it has to be dealt with, but what we have been seeking along the way is how, because a lot of people ask me, for instance, "What is going to happen to my pension?" just as the teachers made this statement. I think they are concerned basically as to what is going to happen to them and the pension arrangements they presently have, and this is a proper concern for them to have and we have a responsibility

to see where we are going and how they will be integrated.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, this would happen whether you had a provincial public plan or a federal plan, and it would seem to me also, sir—I appreciate this because the hon. Prime Minister is much closer—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It becomes a problem for Ontario if we have an Ontario-operated plan, but when it is to be a Canada-operated plan then it is their responsibility and that was why I asked the question.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I can appreciate this, sir. If I could ask this, it seems to me that the situation still would be that the Canada pension plan would set a certain standard with respect to contribution and to benefits. The individual plans surely vary a great deal, and I am talking about the private pension plans. So it would be a matter of the private pension plans with all their individual characteristics working to adapt themselves to the federal plan or to the provincial plan rather than the federal government saying to each one, "Well, we will work out how you adapt." I think of looking, for example, at Professor Clark's brief. I am not in any way a person who is familiar with these figures or statistics, but I was interested in the statement he had made, saying that the problem of integrating existing plans to a public plan is not a deep problem, it is one that can be worked out by technicians. I find it hard to understand when the hon. Prime Minister is suggesting the federal government should say how these existing plans are going to fit in. Is he asking that they call all these together—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, no, no, but if this is the approach they are going to take they have never said so. This is a problem which will have to rest with the private pension plans; those who participate in them; those who sell them and those who administer them. If this is to be the basic approach to integration, why, that is it, and we would then know.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, the next question is for the hon. Prime Minister. It seems to me that there has been confusion that the representatives of the provincial government, I think including the hon. Prime Minister, have suggested that his provincial plan and the Quebec plan would have the great advantage that it would include widows and survivors. Yet as I understand, that with a change in The BNA Act, which would have to come at the initiation of the provinces, and I would say, sir, particularly the hon. Prime

Minister's province, as he is the leader of the wealthiest province, that the federal plan will offer this coverage if he would agree to it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We are apparently going to have a debate here. We agreed some time ago; I wrote to the federal government and signified that we would agree to an amendment to The British North America Act to provide for this. As a matter of fact, I think that point came up originally in the Diefenbaker government, and we signified then that we would agree. At that time the province of Quebec—I believe their approach was that they required more information. In other words, there was not unanimity among the provinces.

Mr. Thompson: There is in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, there is relative unanimity in the last short period of time as the result of negotiations that have taken place, and as a result of various developments in the whole situation. Now, our position has been and always has been that we would agree to such an amendment to The British North America Act, but the fact was that there was not complete agreement between the provinces, and of course without complete agreement you cannot have the amendment. Therefore, until that agreement came about we constitutionally could provide something the federal government, I have no doubt, wants to provide, but simply is unable constitutionally so to do. Now, they can and they speak in the legislation of survivors, but a survivor there must be 65 and that brings it into another area and that is as close as they can come. I think a pension plan without survivor benefits is rather like a bird with one wing. It is a part of the plan that should be there. Certainly we would never block the federal government in their attempts to provide this in their plan, but the real fact was there was not agreement at that time. Perhaps there will be now out of these current negotiations—I would hope there would be.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I thank the hon. Prime Minister again. If I could for my own thinking clarify what I feel the hon. Prime Minister has said, first with respect to the existing plans and the integration of the existing plans. He feels that one of the quandaries has been that the federal government has never made a clear statement in connection with how they are going to integrate these plans.

And he would feel—I realize that over the

floor of this House we are not asking you to make commitments but that one of the things that you would wish is that they would say: "We will proclaim the policy for the contributions and the benefits and any existing plans have to adapt themselves to that." I am not saying that you would agree to this but at least you think they should come out with some such statement.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, if that is going to be it.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. And then, sir, the next thing that I would like to clarify is with respect to the widows and survivors, that the hon. Prime Minister is saying that a problem had been—and we refer to Quebec—that Quebec possibly might not have given permission, and it would have to be a unanimous consent by the provinces?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, in fairness to Quebec, I must say that it was not put that way.

Mr. Thompson: No.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It was put on the basis that they wanted more information. The net result was that the amendment could not take place.

Mr. Thompson: I now appreciate that it is clarified that Quebec would include widows' and survivors' allowances, then for your part as the representative—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Does the hon. member mean in the Quebec plan?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am not speaking of the Quebec plan. Again I have been trying to keep in touch with this, but I understood that Premier Lesage had mentioned that—I read this in the *Globe and Mail* during the discussions—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think if things worked out well for him in these negotiations, I am quite sure that he will agree to it.

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: And I do not think that he is trying to block it. Nonetheless, I am just giving you the facts as I saw them and as I knew them and I will not make any comment on it other than that. I think he has intimated, at least I have read in the press where he said that he is satisfied to agree to such an amendment.

Mr. Thompson: Might I say that another point that I felt that the hon. Prime Minister

had wanted to get clarification on with respect to the Canada pension plan was in connection with who was going to handle the investment funds. As I understood it, the hon. Prime Minister was saying that the federal government with his approach would give 50 per cent to provincial projects for the provinces to invest, or the federal government would handle the funds but 50 per cent of the funds would be in provincial projects. The hon. Prime Minister has suggested that he wanted 90 per cent for provincial projects, and if this condition was met would the Prime Minister have a great warmth toward the Canada pension plan?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well certainly, my approach on this particular point was based upon what the province of Quebec stated very clearly. Mr. Kearns, the Minister of Development there, said they wanted a personal plan because of the investment, because they wanted the investment funds.

The federal government has access to all kinds of money for financing. Its fiscal capabilities, if I may put it that way, are much greater than those of any province. Here they are going to come into this province and collect one or two per cent from the employee, and one or two per cent from the employer. Now, why should that fund not be left in the province to work on behalf of the people who are paying it in? Then if the federal government wants various national projects that it must finance, it has all the other means of financing these things which we, as a province, simply have not got.

This is the point, I said 90 per cent. There is an element of arbitrariness in these figures, but I thought if they were operating the plan and since it was their plan perhaps ten per cent would be all right. Roblin from Manitoba says 100 per cent.

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Prime Minister not concede that a national project may be of benefit to Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh my dear sir, I certainly do concede so, but do not draw that red herring across the trail. I am pointing out to the House that the federal government over a great many years has had available to it in the fiscal setup of our country, money. It has the Bank of Canada, it has all sorts of things that we provincially do not have. I see no reason why, if we are going to institute a plan where we are going to collect from the employee and the employer in this province, and only in this province, that money should not stay here. This is not going to cripple

any national plan because the federal government has, in my view, plenty of financial capability to deal with national plans without saying: Well, we want this too. In effect it is a collection of money in this province. Why should it not stay here?

Mr. Bryden: But the legislation the hon. Prime Minister piloted through this House last year did not guarantee that any of the money would stay in the province.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps not, but it was not controlled by any government either.

Mr. Bryden: It was controlled by people responsible to nobody.

Mr. Thompson: I would say that I talked to my hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) and other of my colleagues and that from our point of view, we would feel that the basis of 50 per cent—of if you were suggesting more than this—has a very plausible argument to be handled by the provincial government. And this, sir, if I could add—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I missed the last point. Were you giving us a statement of the position of your party on this matter?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, sir. I, as I say, have talked to my hon. leader and to my hon. colleagues, and from our point of view, if you are going to the federal government and suggesting that you want a larger extent than 50 per cent to be provincial investments, we are in accord with this. Our great concern is, and indeed we hope you feel, that with these difficulties we can work out something which will be a Canada pension plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Right!

Mr. Thompson: And I would say with this—and it seems to me that this is the caution of a man skilled in legal debate or working in the courts of London or wherever it is, I do not know—that your approach seems to me on this to be one not of coming out and suggesting this is what we stand for, these are the conditions we want met, but it has been one of something like a skilled football player who swerves and twists and dodges in connection with it. I say this not critically because the thing that we are all after is to get a touchdown for the national pension plan. I would suggest, sir, that the hon. Prime Minister seems to have swung from the private plan to a public plan and we certainly have followed that situation.

I am not saying this in a critical sense

personally because I think the hon. Prime Minister has watched developments taking place. The thing I think that interests us is that we are working toward the Canada pension plan. I would say if I could that this is meant to be a sort of continuation of my Budget debate, but frankly for my own part I have learned much more in connection with this. This is a very valuable contribution which the hon. Prime Minister has been kind enough to give us in elucidating some points.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): The hon. Prime Minister has made these points many times. Why do you not listen to them or read them?

Mr. Thompson: I was saying, sir, if you had been in the House when I first started, that the hon. Prime Minister at first appeared to be keen on a private plan. We were conscious of the benefits of the private plan. Then he seemed to swing toward wanting the federal government to change the amount of funds that it would have, and then he changed that and he was in favour of the Quebec plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The federal government changed along the way too. This is the point I make. There have been so many shifts. And this is the other point that I make, it is only in the last six weeks that we have ever seen a piece of legislation.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Up until that time we have been talking about—

Mr. Thompson: Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister would talk to the hon. member for Forest Hill then, when he is making his statements.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not criticizing the federal government on this account. All I am saying is, we have had a real public debate over the whole question of pensions. Much of this I suppose could have been done in the back room but in the events of this particular piece of legislation and in the fact that it was thrown into the provincial election campaign last year, it resulted in public debate on matters that under different circumstances might very well have been solved in a much less public and quiet way.

I do not think it is necessarily a bad thing, but if you are going to develop something like this you cannot take rigid positions and say that from this position I will not budge. The second you do that then, of course, in my view, you destroy the possibility of eventually coming up with refinements and

changes which will give us in the final analysis, a better plan.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate this very much. One of the problems—perhaps one of the opportunities—has been that there has been a fluid approach taking place on both sides. But at some point, it would seem to me, in the horse trading or in anything, you have to know what both sides want.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I realize, Mr. Speaker, this problem and I have said this before, that really at the Quebec conference I think it became finally and unalterably clear to everybody that we were not going to be able to achieve a national plan as it had been thought of up to that time. This was the very positive idea I brought away from that conference. Then immediately we started to look at the possibilities of developing a plan here ourselves, having been satisfied from that conference that Quebec was unalterably out. Even since that time, to show you how this changes, there have been further negotiations taking place between the federal government in Ottawa and we may very well come up with something different. In the meantime, we are going ahead in the province and will, in due course, if things remain as they are, we will in due course, come up with a concrete position based upon the fact that we were able to decide at the Quebec City conference that finally we were convinced that Quebec was not in.

But even prior to that conference there were reports of government spokesmen saying that Quebec may be in, but I came away from that conference firmly convinced that they would not be. But as I point out to you, even at this very moment, negotiations are going on which may bring yet other changes, so it behoves us all to maintain a pretty fluid position so that we are not backed into any corners and committed to any course of action we might find difficult to change, always within the context of the best for Ontario and Ontario within the larger scope of Canada.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate this and I appreciate that your position is still one of watching developments.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: At the same time we are building up our own positive position—

Mr. Thompson: Yes, but I think something that concerns most of us, like you: Does this mean that we are working toward a Canada pension plan? In a statement which you made recently, you said that even though

Quebec would come into a Canada pension plan you may still not come in.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not recall making that statement. I really do not. My position has always been that if there was a national plan we would be in it. If there was a plan for all of Canada we would be in it and as I have said, perhaps it might not be so advantageous to Ontario as something else but that we would accept just as at the conference in November last—there were things which came out of that conference which were not necessarily advantageous. In fact, they were anything but advantageous to this province but I said then, if that is the price Ontario pays for Canada, we pay gladly, and we do not want any other province to feel that this is their right; this is what our country is, we must have this type of sharing.

Mr. Bryden: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. Prime Minister would bring in the bill of which he gave notice on March 4, we could all get in on this dialogue.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, this is getting into too much question and answer. I think I shall have to confine it at least to the member who is making the Budget speech.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that you have provided the leniency which you have and if I could say, sir, in connection with my Budget speech that one of the things that certainly has concerned us is this terribly important thing to Ontario and to Canada and, frankly, I think that there has been confusion on this and, if I could come to another area, that it seems to me that when we are thinking of Confederation—I can understand that when the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario goes to Ottawa and when he negotiates, perhaps he does not want to show all his hand to this Legislature and consequently it would go up to the people with whom he is going to negotiate, and I think that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, when we were asking him what points he was going to make in connection with shared costs agreements, said that he did not want to show his hand when he goes to Ottawa and so he would not tell us.

I would suggest, sir, that particularly in connection with Confederation and the discussion that is taking place on federal government and provincial rights, I think it would be helpful not only to the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, but to the people of Ontario. It would be helpful to him if he would tell us more of what his approach is going to be, because he may find, for

example, that from all sides of this House he is going to get a unanimity in connection with this approach. I think this would give him a more solid bargaining position. As he says, "I speak for the whole of Ontario—for every party in Ontario."

I would say again that I appreciate he does not want to do this because he wants to go there playing things close to his chest. With respect to this, and I will come again to the hon. member for Forest Hill, because I would say I thought he had a very fine idea, perhaps I am inclined to say it was a fine idea, because I also had the idea. But I would say I think it is this idea of having a permanent office set up in connection with experts studying the situation of federal-provincial negotiations. Surely this would be most beneficial. I read with interest his article in the *Toronto Telegram*. One thing I was not clear about and I guess I am not allowed to mention—making a speech here, not asking questions—but I am not sure whether he wants the office set up federally, and I assume he would, but I also assume that his emphasis was to have some such office set up provincially for the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, and as I suggested to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I thought this should be done and I think this might be helpful if there was the technical ground work being laid out, because when we really get down to it, apart from the sentiment that we have toward Confederation, the basis for continuing that Confederation is that we should be able to work out the financial relation, the responsibility between the federal government and the provincial government.

Sir, my speech has not quite taken the pattern that I intended it to, but I sit down saying this, that I think we all, on all sides of the House, understand that the hon. Prime Minister is working toward the best for all of Canada and he still wants to see that the conditions for the citizens of Ontario are sufficient that they will also benefit but his priority is that we are Canadians.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Our party seems to have a one-two punch today.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Prime Minister made most of the previous speech.

Mr. Troy: I must say I have enjoyed very much the tête-à-tête between the hon. Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thomp-

son) and I am sure many of us are appreciative of the information we have had this morning.

Some of the hon. members, I think, too, are appreciative of the question that I asked the other day of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrobe) and in his answer he said that there would be a statement issued the following day. I asked him by whom and he said then, Texas Gulf Sulphur Ltd. Whether that sparked the drive towards the brokerage offices, I do not know, but I understand some of the hon. members of the House were very happy yesterday because of events. I should think because of these capital gains and unearned increment that the possibility is good that there might be a little commission to the one who asked the question. So I am ready for any advances in that regard.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Ten per cent?

Mr. Troy: Well, ten per cent will do, it will help me pay the bank for my election debts.

Seriously though, the announcement by Texas Gulf of the very fine strike in Kidd township in the Porcupine area, is very, very welcome news not only to the people of northern Ontario, who will benefit by it most, certainly to the town of Timmins and to our Ontario government-owned railway. There is no question about it, that it will mean a great deal for the ONR and I hope that very soon, within the next year or two anyway, that there will be production and that then, the chairman and his members and the hon. Minister responsible for the operation of that railway (Mr. Simonett) will be quite happy that they can reduce their deficit or wipe it out entirely.

Mr. Speaker, I will say something later on in this speech about the operation of the Ontario Northland. At the moment, I just made that reference to Texas Gulf and the mining industry, and I certainly think, sir, that we should make changes in our mining laws in this country, at least in this province.

It is my understanding that many of the townships of Ontario, northern Ontario particularly, are patented land and in a great number of them no work is done at all. It is much different in the province of Quebec where there are no patents. A company gets concessions and it must work on them a certain amount of work yearly, and then each year I understand that parts of these concessions are reduced, so they must continue work. Surely, if there were amendments to our mining laws so that these companies

that have these patented lands and not doing anything with them, if they were compelled to do a certain amount every year, there is no question about it in the minds of those who know—and judging the geological formations and other conditions—that very likely there are in northern Ontario even more valuable ore bodies than have been uncovered already. And probably some day, too, as the hon. Minister of Mines pointed out, there will be diamonds discovered in northern Ontario. The formation seems to be there and so other sections of The Mining Act should be changed also. It seems to me, judging by the people in the business, that is, the operators, that it takes a lot of red tape in regard to registering of claims and that sort of thing. Of course, the old-time prospector has a difficult time now because the helicopter and the airplane are in the business and so it affects the man on the ground. But I say again that since mining is one of the great industries of Ontario, particularly northern Ontario, anything that will advance that particular phase of our industry, is all to the good, not only for the section of the province in which I live, but for all Ontario.

Now, the tenor of the debate so far on the Budget is quite different from the Throne debate. I notice in the Throne debate the young hon. members who came into the Legislature last September were sometimes quite critical of certain phases of government policy. However, I must admit that the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) was very critical about The Department of Highways. Unfortunately, through other circumstances, I was not able to be present when The Department of Highways estimates were on, because I had certain problems to discuss, but that will have to wait until another day.

But I notice that no longer do we hear the critical and the very healthy observations. Now it is almost paeans of praise for the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), and there does not seem to be any qualms of conscience at all for the support they gave to their hon. leader in the campaign. I remember at the end of the last session, we had the hon. Prime Minister up visiting and talking about each thing being done, after each statement. Now, probably at the end of this session, he can go up and say “done” but it will be spelled a different way and it will have a different meaning. It will be an extra bill for those who ride the automobiles and the trucks and also those will pay hospital insurance.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer used a very appropriate day to present his message to

the country. It was the first day of Lent, Ash Wednesday. And that period is only 40 days of fasting but it will be 40 months or more of fasting for us because of these increases.

The increase in hospital insurance has been roundly criticized by my hon. leader, the distinguished representative from the riding of Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and I shall limit my comments to just one sentence, that this new type of hospital tax which will be increased on the 1st of July of this year will fall heaviest on those of our citizens who are least able to pay, the low-income groups, the underprivileged in our communities. Other speakers from this side of the House have already made cogent arguments against the latest imposition, and sad to relate, these apparently fell on deaf ears. I was interested—I just happened to get back to the hotel last night after the closing of the House in time to hear “Viewpoint” on the CBC featuring the hon. member for Oxford in the federal House. He pointed out that the Opposition in any parliament has a very definite role and its role is correspondent to the government in one way, that it is important and it must offer criticism and it must offer it where it is justified. I certainly think on many occasions in this House the criticism made by the hon. members of the Opposition, particularly some of the debates so far, has been definitely justified. And again I say it has fallen on deaf ears because we have had these increases in taxes. I noticed an editorial in the *Globe and Mail*, I think it was, about the province and its burden, and that the Premier had the courage to announce that there would be necessary increase in taxes. It is unfortunate that he did not have that courage during the campaign because it might have made some changes in the result. At least they would have known beforehand just what they were going into.

Now, hard on his return to power, he warned of new taxes and many of my constituents heard the message and they figured, “If there are going to be new taxes, let us tax luxuries,” and we did get the increase in the liquor control board. I do not know who is getting it, but at least I know the government is getting a certain amount and also the distilleries.

Then the gasoline tax. An automobile nowadays is no luxury. Certainly in this Metropolitan area, most of the people who come to work in the morning would never get to work unless they had automobiles. The same in my own area. The people that work in the industries, the people that work in the

Ontario Hospital come from all over. A lot of them come from the riding of Parry Sound and the western areas. They would never get there unless they had the automobile. They say it is a mode of transport nowadays and it certainly is not a luxury. There might have been some justification throughout the years for the gasoline tax item.

I think it was imposed by the federal government throughout the war. I was not here, but I understand it was and then afterwards the provinces took it over. Originally my understanding was that the gas tax was for the improvement of our highways but then the former Prime Minister of this province changed that and now it goes into general revenue. If it had been for our highways there would be some justification. We would get it back, the trucking industry and the motorist, in highway improvements, but now it is channelled into revenue. My understanding from those that were here at the time and know more about it than I say that the former Prime Minister of this province said this is it, and of course when he said anything that was it. Now from reports I have received from my colleagues who were on the committee on accounts and public accounts, it is doing a very good job of digging. No holds are barred and the committee is given free rein and the privilege of sitting between sessions. It is quite possible and certainly not improbable that they will find how money has been wasted in government operations and that is one of their purposes. Certainly with this great amount of money that it costs to operate this province nowadays, any savings are worthwhile. Possibly some senior officials may have been waxing fat. It gets them back on the road again, with a chance of showing the leadership they should have.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this brings up the point that the hon. member for Dovercourt, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), and the hon. member for London South (Mr. White), I think it is, brought up about commissions. There should perhaps be some official who would let people know their privileges and their rights in all things. It seems to me though, it would be much better if the members of the Legislature had more or less a full-time job, not necessarily in the House here, all the time, but that they meet far oftener.

There are all kinds of commissions operating in this province, and boards. This session, it seems to me, would be an ideal time, with so many new hon. members, to give the new members some idea of the workings of the various departments of this

province. We have the committee on commissions. Before the committee came the ONR for an hour or two, the liquor control board for another hour, the liquor licensing board another hour, and that is all. But we get no idea how these bodies operate; not a chance to delve into conditions of these operations. If we had sittings oftener as committees and with commissions for two or three days at a time, then we would know the workings of the departments.

There are very few in this House, for example, who know much about the Ontario Northland Railway. They know very likely that the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) is the acting chairman and the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle) is also on the commission. They know there is a line that runs from Toronto and goes north, but very little about the operation of the board. I think if we had more time—as I say, the members should be full-time members, not, as I say again, not necessarily sitting in session all the time, but taking a much more active part in the operation of government. I have other things to say about the ONR later.

In Medicare and in the medical bill, there is as you know, a committee sitting, or it has been sitting. It is the Dr. Hagey committee. I do not know when it is going to make its report. I understood this bill was to go in operation in 1965, is that it? It probably is postponed.

Then, in this morning's *Globe and Mail* there is a report about the Ontario Medical Care Plan. The headline is, in this *Globe and Mail* of Friday, April 17, "Ontario Care Plan Cost to Cities Staggering." The head of the welfare department for the Metropolitan area said this. One of the reasons is because this suggested bill will not include coverage for prescription drugs, dentures, glasses and other items relating to welfare costs.

I know in my discussions with doctors in my own riding in regard to Medicare, one of their great concerns was in regard to prescription drugs. I know there are all kinds of doctors, particularly the country, who have on their books probably \$50,000 or \$60,000 and more but they may never get paid. They have to have deliveries of babies and the doctor is there. The appendix is taken out and so on and the doctor may send a bill but in many cases he may never get paid. But if you get a prescription, you go to the drug store, and in most cases it is cash on the line. Nowadays with the new drugs—they are very, very expensive—and there is nothing as far as I know in the Medicare bill that will make provision for drugs.

It is the same way with the optometrists. The situation is absolutely ridiculous as far as I know it. The great bulk of optometrists, under the provisions of the suggested bill, have no privileges. If a person wants glasses and wants them under the bill, he can only go to an ophthalmologist. Now there are very few of them compared to the optometrists. After all, the optometrist gets four years of training. He is able to provide the refraction benefits. He is denied that privilege under the bill.

Then the whole committee seems to me overloaded toward the medical profession. I have all kinds of headings here. They all want to be in Medicare. This is from the *Telegram* of January 7, 1964. This says: "Medicare should be compulsory and paid for through taxes, the Ontario government was told today."

This brief was from the Ontario Association of Social Workers and a brief was presented by the president of the Canadian association, Dr. Elizabeth Govan. She said the government's proposed health plan would divide the province into two classes, first- and second-class citizens, based on the ability to pay premiums. Some people would go without medical care rather than ask for help, she declared.

Then the optometrists, and I think they had a most valid point, submitted a brief through the president of the association, who happens to be very well known and comes from the city of North Bay, who claimed that the oculist, that is the medical specialist in eye care, was favoured by inclusion in the bill, while optometrists who were not medical doctors were being overlooked. I certainly hope that when this committee makes its report to the hon. Prime Minister—I presume it will be to him or to the Cabinet and not the Legislature—there will be recommendations for including services other than just medical, because the government's bill, it seems to me, is not a health bill, but a medical bill only. These services provided by the dentists, by the optometrists, by the chiropodists, by the chiropractors and the osteopaths, are all health services. In the compensation board, a person is directed by the board to go under certain conditions to the osteopaths or chiropractors and the account is accepted, so these services should be considered also when the final bill is drafted and presented to this House.

As E. F. Attridge, president of the College of Optometry, said to the committee, Bill No. 163 is just what the doctor ordered. One of the members of the committee, also one who apparently asked an awful lot of questions,

was a representative of PSI. In fact, at times, from reports, he got so insistent that he had to be brought to task by Dr. Hagey, the chairman. Incidentally, I do not think he is a medical doctor. He is a doctor of philosophy, the president of the University of Waterloo. So I certainly urge the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) and the Cabinet as a whole that when the bill, whatever the number will be, is presented to the House that certain of these conditions will have been considered.

Now, on legal aid, I have a motion on the order paper that says that legislation be enacted to provide in Ontario a reasonable system of legal assistance modelled after the methods now employed in the United Kingdom. The hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Eagleson) has already spoken on that subject. I understand, too, there is a special committee now sitting to consider legal aid, and I will not dwell on this too long, but it is an important thing in my mind that everybody should have an opportunity to get legal aid if necessary.

I will just read into the record here certain things. This is from *Canada Month*, and the heading is:

WHY LEGAL AID IS NEEDED TO STOP COURTROOM INJUSTICE

The principles that weld a democratic state are few and simple. Among them is the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law specifically guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

And they say that unless the accused can be assured of counsel then the law does not fulfill its purpose. Certainly in recent days we have found all sorts of conditions; people languish in jail not realizing they can get legal aid, no bail allowed, or not having bail, and these things cry to heaven for some justice. I know that the county of York Bar has for some time considered the changes in the system of legal aid, and I say again that there is a committee sitting. As a layman I have studied the provisions for legal aid in the United Kingdom and the city of New York where they have legal aid and the public defenders system of the United States. It seems to me the British system is by far the best of the three. The public defender, to my mind, particularly when a public defender is appearing against the Crown attorney, they are both employees of the government and there might be a possible conflict of interest there. In the British system the most important thing, it seems to me, is that when a person is apprehended or sum-

moned, there is attached to the summons and posted also in the jails articles or bulletins indicating just what his rights are under legal aid and what he can get. In our country I do not think there is that provision. So the important thing is that every person hailed before the courts should know that he has the privilege of getting assistance.

Then I think in the past it has been that a great number of those who appear for a client are just young lawyers with not much experience. Again in Britain it is now changed and the legal profession applies the ways and the state applies the means, and there is a fair remuneration for the legal profession in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, I just call to your attention from the publication *Obiter Dicta*, which is the newspaper of Osgoode Hall for the profession at large. I presume that means everybody, not the profession at large outside about which I am talking now. One of the headlines is: "Haines Raps Aid System". The Haines referred to is Mr. Justice Edson Haines, long an outspoken authority, as it points out, on legal aid. He delivered a strong and very thought-provoking address to the large audience and drove home with resounding force that the present legal aid service provided in this province fell very short of the mark.

So, maybe I am presumptuous as a layman in telling the Legislature what should be done, and whether it should accept this system or that system. The main point, I think, that we want to get across is that we are all concerned with the rights of the individual. Certainly every man should be considered innocent until he is proved guilty, and he has a much better chance of not being proved guilty if he has qualified counsel. I am sure the new Attorney General, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart), is a very reasonable gentleman, I certainly have been very much impressed with his attitude both in committee and in this House so far, and I think that he is quite receptive of ideas. Anybody with experience of life in northern Ontario knows that we respect very much there the dignity of the individual and the dignity of man, and I am sure that he will some time soon bring in legislation which will change the present conditions.

During the debate so far there has been much talk of hospitals, the scarcity of beds and so on, and one of the hon. members—I think the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence)—mentioned that we should, in regard to Sunnybrook Hospital, with all the vacant beds there take some action. That

brings up the matter of veterans' hospitals. One of the main reasons that there are vacant wards in Sunnybrook is the fact that they have not got the staff. That is one thing. I understand negotiations are going on very satisfactorily with The Department of Health and with Metropolitan Toronto and the federal government to take over certain sections of Sunnybrook so that arthritic patients of the Wellesley Hospital will be admitted; that is, the patients will be put in Sunnybrook for the time being until Wellesley is ready.

Now I do not think there is any veteran in this country or any member of any veterans' organization who wants to keep Sunnybrook or any other veteran hospital just as the sole preserve of the veterans, if there are a great number of wards vacant, but a veteran who has a pensionable disability by his very right must be admitted into our veterans' hospitals. But there is another section of the treatment regulations which is most important and which gives us the most concern. That is section 13 of the treatment regulations which helps and permits a veteran who has no pensionable disability, to be admitted to hospital. If he goes to Sunnybrook or any veterans' hospital, his income is considered and adjusted and when he gets in the veterans' hospital the important thing is not only that he gets the hospital care, but he also gets the medical service of the doctor. It is included. He does not have to pay for that singly. It is included in the whole bill. Then afterwards, with the adjustment, he gets the bill from The Department of Veterans' Affairs and in some cases he pays, and in a good many cases he does not.

Now if the veterans' hospitals were taken over as community hospitals, the question is, what is going to happen to that particular type of veteran? You say they can be admitted under the Ontario Hospital Services Plan into a community hospital. Sure they can be admitted because they have the hospital insurance. The only thing they get in the community hospital is ward care and the hospital services, but they would have to pay the doctor's bill. That is the "if," the stickler between the veterans' organizations and The Department of Veterans' Affairs. Certainly I think it is quite right that the veterans' organizations should know definitely where they stand on this matter.

Now I come to another project which is of great concern to the people of this province and the people of Canada and also to the people of the United States. There are many, I presume, in this House who have read recently of the suggestion of a canal

from the Pacific Ocean across to the Mississippi River and in fact right across the United States. There is also talk of a canal which would bring the waters of the Pacific, by various methods and existing rivers and so on, into Lake Superior and then down into the Great Lakes system.

There is another scheme—another very important scheme. It is called the Grand Canal—Great Replenishment and Northern Development. It is the scheme of Mr. T. W. Kierans of Sudbury. It also envisages a canal and the main purpose, of course, is to bring water to southern Ontario to fill up the great reservoirs of the Great Lakes. But it also is so that this water eventually can be sold as an export to the United States.

Some day one of the resources we have in this country which will be among our greatest assets will be water. There are 40 million people in the central United States now and as industry develops there and the country grows, they will need more and more usable water. In the next ten or 20 years probably, and maybe the next generation, there will be an increase in population up to more than 80 million in that area.

At the present time, I understand, the levels of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay are away down and the only two ways of increasing the level are by precipitation, and that is in the lap of the gods, and by diversion. I understand though, that last year when water was very scarce the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent), the mayor of Owen Sound, was able to produce water. I do not know if he was the rainmaker, but I understand that the rain came. Then the trouble was that it continued and they wanted him to stop it. But the magician can sometimes bring things but he cannot stop them. So there are two ways in which you are going to get water; by precipitation or by diversion of the waters that now flow into Hudson Bay and James Bay so that they flow down into our Great Lakes system.

It is a fantastic scheme, the scheme that has been presented so far, but of course things that now are commonplace were fantastic a few years ago. Who would ever have thought before the last war that we would have men now revolving around the earth, and that very soon we would be going up to the moon? All these fantastic things have come about, with Telstars in space sending back pictures from other lands. Who would have thought you could pick up your telephone and in seconds talk to Tokyo, or Timbuktu, or Saigon, or Timmins, or wherever you want? It is fantastic, and so is this

particular project fantastic to the uninitiated, Mr. Speaker.

But I understand that to those who have studied it, that it is quite possible. I strongly urge the hon. Prime Minister of this province, when he meets again with the other Premiers across Canada and with the leader of the federal government, that they discuss the water.

The United States of America has spent millions and hundreds of millions in this country on defence installations which are situated in Canada but they are primarily for the defence of North America, particularly the United States. This project that envisages the diversion of the waters that flow into Hudson and James bays, I understand, is going to cost millions—perhaps \$1 billion or more. But eventually, through the power that is developed and the sale of the water, it can be repaid. So I strongly urge that some study be given to it. Involved of course, are the province of Ontario, the province of Quebec and the states that border on the St. Lawrence and our Great Lakes system.

The Great Lakes in our country are one of the greatest reservoirs of water in the world, and probably one of the reasons why we have such a high standard of living in this country. I understand now even up in the Collingwood area they are concerned about the shipbuilding industry because of low water. It is the same in other regions.

They say there are two ways of getting the water, either from the rain itself or by diversion, and the latter is something which must be given some thought. The only thing that can be done first is to have the conferences, at least to get it on the road and to start it. Then there is a possibility that something may be done. I say again it is a fantastic scheme but things that were fantasy before are now commonplace.

Another thing that will arise out of this scheme also is a water route. There is no question about it if the dream of those who lived in Nipissing 50 years ago—if the Georgian Bay Canal had been effective the economy of northern Ontario would be entirely different from what it is today. Envisaged with this scheme is a water route all the way from the Gulf of Mexico right through, with a canal up to Georgian Bay, the French River, the Mattawa and the Ottawa. This great canal would be for barge traffic.

Just note here that Mr. Kierans was speaking to the Northeastern Development Association in North Bay recently. He said, with regard to getting shipments of goods from

Germany, that he can ship from Germany via the Panama Canal to Vancouver and it costs only half as much as it does to ship directly by rail from Sudbury. I will read that again:

Mr. Kierans said it cost his firm about half as much to ship a product from a plant in Germany via the Panama Canal to Vancouver, as it did to ship directly by rail from Sudbury.

Water transportation is cheap transportation and with this scheme of the Kierans brothers we can have not only water but also an artery of commerce.

The Ontario Northland Railway will be discussed, I presume, with the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management. However, there is a certain matter I just want to touch on briefly now.

On April 24, Train 47, which operates out of Toronto and goes north to Timmins, will make its last run as a passenger train. Then on April 25, Train 46, which comes south from Timmins, makes its last run as a passenger train. There are to be great changes in the transportation system of northern Ontario beginning April 26, and naturally there is a great amount of concern in various quarters.

Among those who have concern are the railway mail clerks because no longer will the fast mail be operated, I think, by train. The bulk of it will be done by truck. It means that something will have to be done about these 11 or 12 or more railway mail clerks who operate on the Ontario Northland. Some of them probably will have to be uprooted from their homes and moved to other places. I know there has been correspondence between the railway mail clerks and the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) in this regard.

One of the concerns is the efficiency of the new service. The railway mail clerks will come off the mail cars and, I presume, will be brought into North Bay to the general post office there. Some of these smaller places will be terminals. For example, Cochrane will be a terminal. Now there certainly is no question about it that the railway mail clerk is far, far more qualified than a postal clerk in a small town because every year these railway mail clerks must pass very, very difficult examinations and they must get a percentage between 90 and 100 in order to stay on the job. I think that maybe—of course, time will tell, whether the new service is going to be as effective as the CNR and the ONR consider it.

And I understand we find divergent views.

The post office department said it was not their initiation, it was the initiation of the railways, and I presume that the ONR was moved because the CNR wanted to make the change. Naturally they found, because of their experience in the Maritime provinces, running from Montreal to the Maritimes, with their red, white and blue fares, they had much better traffic, in the way of passenger traffic, particularly in the coaches. As everybody knows, the passenger traffic in parlour cars and sleepers is not much of a paying proposition. So I presume the ONR was forced into the thing by the CNR. No doubt the change in the mail service has been forced by them, and since there is a change in rail transportation then the federal Department of the Postmaster General has decided to use the trucks for mail service.

There was a letter written to the secretary-treasurer by the hon. Minister on March 6, and I will read just certain paragraphs of what the hon. Minister says in his letter to the secretary-treasurer, Mr. J. A. Belland of Hull, Quebec.

From my understanding of your letter it is the feeling of the Canadian Railway Mail Clerks Federation that the changes presently being brought about in the express-freight programme in the Ontario Northland Railway will drastically reduce postal services for the public, and also that the Ontario Northland Railway will experience a considerable loss in revenue.

I am pleased to comment on these two main points.

—the hon. Minister writes. And now the effective change of postal service:

With the exception of the territory between North Bay and Temagami, all points being presently served by trains 46 and 47 are accessible by truck. It is my understanding through the Ontario Northland Railway Commissioners that The Post Office Department intends to provide service which is at least equivalent to, if not better than this service in effect today by either using trains 49 and 50 or the new express freight being placed in operation by the end of April, or by trucks between North Bay and Temagami. On the railway where those affected are almost entirely Ontario Northland Railway employees, the railway will make suitable adjustments for this service.

With all respect, therefore, I feel that the statement that delays up to 24 hours will occur in the delivery of mail is not entirely fair, at least as we see it at this stage of planning.

And then he says about the effective change on the revenue:

The annual report of the operating costs of trains 46 and 47 is between \$550,000 and \$1,200,000, depending on the amount of the indirect costs. Revenue from the mail is approximately \$122,000. Part of this latter figure the Ontario Northland Railway expects to retain, because a portion of this mail will be carried on the new express freight train service. Any additional revenue resulting from the transport of passengers would not be nearly sufficient to pay the operating costs of these trains.

And the railway hopes to improve its revenues by the change.

Then he goes on to say just what happens with the removal of these trains 46 and 47. There will be no more RPOs on these trains and the handling of local mail will be done by highway vehicles, to be arranged by the post office authorities. So that apparently the hon. Minister and the ONR commission really believe that this will speed up service and the railway mail clerks, of course, have their stand that it will not, that it will be more costly, so I presume that time will tell.

The third vice-president of the railway mail clerks—Mr. K. G. Leason of Toronto—said in his letter of March 13. He answered the hon. Minister's letter. I will not read that into the record. But certainly the railway mail clerks take issue with both the hon. Minister and also with The Post Office Department. They feel that the changes will not speed up service, in fact that it will cause confusion in service, because there will be people working at terminals, particularly in certain sections of the north, who will not have the experience, and that it will eventually cause confusion. Whether that is true or not, I do not know. But in any event, it is now an accomplished fact. The advertisements have been out that on April 26 there will be a change in their service, so we will have to see whether that works out or not.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): How long is the hon. member going to be?

Mr. Troy: Well, I am just about finished now.

Mr. Oliver: If you can finish by one o'clock, I am not urging you.

Mr. Troy: No, that is right. Well, I had just better close. I have a clipping in front of me. I do not know whether I should touch it or not. I will use my own judgment.

It is something that rankles me. Just around the time of the visit of the people from the province of Quebec, the members of the Legislature and the distinguished Premier of that province came here and there was harmony everywhere in the House and in the meetings afterwards, the entente between Quebec and Ontario was very noticeable. Somewhere around the same time, I picked up one of the Toronto newspapers and I find this heading: "The Quebec clergy inspired separatism, says Saunders." The Saunders referred to is Leslie Saunders. I, unfortunately, have to admit that he was formerly a resident of North Bay. He is an East York councillor and at one time mayor of Toronto. He is reported as saying that the Roman Catholic clergy planted the seeds of discord when they came to this continent as missionaries.

Well, to me this is a strange stand, hon. members of the House. Why then, are we recognizing the contribution that the Jesuit missionaries made to the history of this country? As already pointed out by the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), we are going to spend hundreds of thousands and maybe millions of dollars in the restoration of Fort Ste. Marie which was founded during the days of the Jesuits and I cannot see that they have inspired separatism. In fact, it seems to me that one of the things they have inspired is a union. So when one sees headlines like that, it always makes one wonder how far we are getting in our co-operation between various races and various creeds.

I will again, Mr. Speaker, refer to the fact that some of the hon. members made a little killing yesterday. I am not saying I was responsible, but at least there was a question asked and an answer given. I will close with that. I will have something to say later on the other matters as the estimates come up.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): On Monday we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 20, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Monday, April 20, 1964

Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	2219
Tabling telegram from the Rt. hon. Mr. Pearson, Mr. Robarts	2220
Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued	2224
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2249

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1964

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today in the east gallery students from Roden Commercial School, Toronto; in the west gallery, students from Forest Hill Collegiate and St. Francis of Assisi Separate School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman). He has had notice of the question.

Have the recently advertised vacancies on the staff of the Guelph Reformatory been filled, and is any consideration being given to increased salary scales for the staff of this institution?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for having given notice of this question.

Question 1: Regarding the recently advertised vacancies having been filled; the answer is that most have been filled.

Question 2: Is any consideration being given to increased salary scales for the staff of this institution? The answer is that salary scales are set by the Civil Service Commission of Ontario and are uniform for the various classifications throughout the province. They are not scaled for any specific institution or locality.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) for which, in the words of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy), all the amenities have been met. I understand there is a similar question from the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer).

What action is contemplated by the government in light of the Ontario Civil Service Association's allegations of "extreme bad faith" on the part of the government, leading to a breakdown in negotiation procedures?

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps this one answer will serve for this question and the question from the hon. member for Downsview which was: What further arrangement is the government making to negotiate with the Ontario Civil Service Association? I think this answer will meet both hon. members' questions at one time.

I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to learn of the action taken by the civil service association in suggesting that there is a breakdown in negotiation procedures because I personally am not aware of any such breakdown. In fact, the members of the Ontario joint council, which you will recall we established last year, met as recently as this morning, in an official session attended by all members. It adjourned at noon today on a motion from the staff side.

I think the hon. members of this House should realize that the joint council derives its authority from this Legislature to negotiate any matter put on the agenda by the chairman at the request of a member concerning the terms of employment of public servants, including working conditions, remuneration, leaves and hours of work. If you will recall it was last year that we established in this Legislature the joint council, which consists of four men appointed from the staff side, as it is called, and four persons appointed from the official side. They serve under an impartial chairman who is non-voting. He is the chairman of the civil service commission.

As I say, included in the authority that we gave this council by legislation is the right to negotiate any matter put on the agenda by the chairman at the request of a member concerning the terms of employment of public servants, including working conditions, remuneration, leaves and hours of work. The rules of the joint council, and the reason we established it, are to provide an orderly method whereby members could place matters

on the agenda of the joint council through a steering committee. The government does not participate directly in these discussions. The official side is composed of four representatives of the rank of deputy Minister within the civil service, who negotiate in good faith with the staff-side representatives.

The fact is that this council has met a good many times since being established and has come to a number of decisions with a far-reaching effect on such matters as overtime pay, superannuation Act amendments, compensation for standby time, and conditions of employment for unclassified staff. I think these matters that it has discussed indicate the council is taking its work seriously.

The last decision was approved by the council at a meeting held on March 12, and the council is continuing to consider matters on the agenda which have not been resolved up to the present time. I have asked for a report and I have been advised that the staff side has no submission before the joint council concerning rates of pay, and has placed no request for negotiation on such matters before the civil service commission which should precede the consideration of these matters by the council.

We in this Legislature approved of the bill containing sections 19(a) and 19(b) which constituted the collective negotiation arrangements. I personally do not interfere with the function of that council. Its activities and its proceedings are managed by the council itself.

Questions relating to the determination of pay for positions in the civil service come within the jurisdiction of the civil service commission, which alone has the authority to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in council on the revisions of salary rates.

I am informed that the association is wrong in suggesting that the government should interfere with properly constituted statutory authorities under The Public Service Act and with this I agree. I am advised by the commission that the rates of pay are constantly under review and salary schedules are maintained up to date. An example given to me is:

Two submissions dated by the commission March 18, 1964, effective November 1, 1963, approved by the Treasury Board and in turn ordered by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. They cover revision of salaries for forest rangers, conservation officers and other like classes in The Department of Lands and Forests, as well as the salary rates for engineers' assistants, survey technicians and highway construction inspectors, with a total

cost of \$449,920 in regard to the first group and \$456,190 in regard to the second group. These pay increases affected approximately 3,000 employees.

In addition, salary rates for building cleaners were revised, effective September 1, 1962. This revision was made on March 26, 1964, and gave retroactive salary adjustments to 1,800 employees in these categories at a cost of over \$355,000. These rates are based upon proper salary research. I am certain that the hon. members of this House support the work of the commission in this regard, and the foregoing apparently announced by the commission in a directive being sent out today in the regular method.

So, sir, I think that is an answer to the question. The machinery is there for negotiation. I would not interfere in it unless I felt there was something there that was not being properly handled. I am informed that these questions have not been put before the joint council.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, on a point of privilege. I would like to refer to a statement last week by the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) in answer to a question of mine. I had asked on that day for any pertinent information regarding the reported strike in the Porcupine area. The hon. Minister said that the next day a statement would be made. I asked by whom and he said by Texas Gulf Sulphur, the company.

According to a story in today's *Telegram* by Mr. Peter Bruton, a member of the press gallery, the statement was released by the hon. Minister of Mines, or at least The Department of Mines, before the stock exchange opened. It also went on to say that a number of hon. members on the other side of the House were able to make a little killing that day. Is that statement of his correct that it was to be by Texas Gulf Sulphur and not, as I now find, by The Department of Mines?

Mr. Speaker: Does the member wish to ask the Minister if he wishes to clarify or to answer the question?

Mr. Troy: Yes, would he clarify; and would there be any possible chance that there was advance information to some who made a killing?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have all that information from the hon. member, because I had no knowledge of it previously. Texas Gulf gave the report to the *Northern Miner*,

I think sometime early in the morning, for release at 11 o'clock in that paper. When I discovered that I thought that the local papers here should be given some information so that they would not be left out of the picture and have the *Northern Miner* with the only release. So Mr. Mollison gave me the release that the papers got.

Now I think it was taken over to the press gallery. I do not know at what time because I gave it to my deputy to see that it was delivered there. This was Mr. Mollison's statement, not mine, and if it got out before the market, I know nothing about it. I read Mr. Bruton's story and I do not know who could have made any money, or who did.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Maybe the press gallery!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I hope they did! That is the answer, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. I know nothing about it other than that.

Mr. Troy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to bring to the attention of this House, some of the outstanding hockey achievements of the town of Bradford. Bradford is situated 40 miles north of Toronto on Highways 11 and 88. It is the centre of the vegetable-growing industry of Canada. It is also situated in the great county of Simcoe.

I had the honour of being Bradford's first mayor and now I represent them in this honourable House. We have a very small population, just a little under 2,500 people, but we have had many champion hockey teams.

In 1957-58, we won the Ontario intermediate "C" championship; in 1960-61, we won the Ontario intermediate "C" championship; and in 1963-64, we won the Ontario intermediate "A" championship, defeating Dundas in four straight games in the finals.

I would like to compliment Mel Irving and his team for bringing such fine entertainment and sportsmanship and honour to our town.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. Report of the board of governors of the University of Toronto for the year ending June 30, 1963.

2. Report of the president of the University of Toronto for the year ended June, 1963.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to rise on a matter of privilege just to set the record straight again. The letter I am speaking about is one to which the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) referred on Thursday last, but unfortunately I was a little late entering the House and heard only the last few moments of his statement. Without taking too much of the time of the House, I will just repeat from *Hansard* what my hon. friend said, and I quote:

Yesterday in the estimates of the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information when the hon. Minister was asked how much Dalton Camp and Associates got from his department for advertising purposes, he told us that in his opinion this was the only government agency from which Mr. Camp received money.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, the question from, I think, the hon. member for Bruce, was this:

Mr. Chairman, would the commissioner explain what the \$67,000 was spent for on Dalton K. Camp and Associates?

And I replied:

Mr. Chairman, the commission's advertising programme was handled by D. K. Camp and Associates and probably has been as big a part in making the operation of the commission successful from the outset as any other thing. The breakdown—

And then the hon. member asked a question as to whether this came under tenders and I explained that one cannot call tenders for advertising but proposals had been submitted and Camp's had been selected. Then I gave the breakdown and my hon. friend thanked me.

But after the House rose, members of the press asked me further questions about this matter and I think the matter to which my hon. friend was referring was not what I had said in the House but what was reported in the *Globe and Mail*. Just taking the last paragraph, I quote:

He said the agency was chosen in 1960 from about four or five which had submitted presentations. The commission liked its work and has continued to use it. It is the only work the agency does for the province, Mr. Auld said outside the House, this allocation has nothing to do with Mr. Camp's political activities.

I think that is correct and the question that I was asked was for the current fiscal year and it was to that I was referring when I answered the question.

This is not a vital matter, Mr. Speaker, but I did want to have the record correct.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a statement to the House concerning a telegram which I received from the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada on Friday last. Mr. Pearson asked that this be kept confidential until this afternoon. I believe that he has tabled it in the House of Commons. I have respected his wishes as far as the contents of this telegram is concerned, of course, but I feel that I am now free to place this telegram before the Legislature in order that everyone may be aware of its contents. It reads as follows:

DEAR PREMIER:

SINCE THE CONFERENCE IN QUEBEC CITY AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MONTH, MY COLLEAGUES AND I HAVE CAREFULLY REVIEWED THE PROBLEMS THAT WERE DISCUSSED THERE.

AT THE CONFERENCE I REAFFIRMED WHAT I HAD SAID AT OUR PREVIOUS MEETING IN NOVEMBER: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FULLY RECOGNIZES THE INCREASING BURDEN OF PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TRUE, AS MANY PREMIERS HAVE EMPHASIZED, OF EDUCATION. WE ALL AGREE THAT, WITH OUR INCREASING POPULATION AND WITH THE EFFECT OF ADVANCING TECHNOLOGY IN REQUIRING HIGHER LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN MORE AND MORE JOBS, THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES IS A PRIORITY NEED OF THE COUNTRY. OUR TAXATION ARRANGEMENTS SHOULD RECOGNIZE SUCH PRIORITIES. THIS MEANS, AS I HAVE SAID, THAT IN ORDER TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE AS EFFECTIVELY AND ECONOMICALLY AS POSSIBLE, THE RANGE OF TAX RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO THE PROVINCES SHOULD BE INCREASED.

IT WAS IN THIS SPIRIT THAT, AT THE NOVEMBER CONFERENCE, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT UNDERTOOK TO MAKE CHANGES IN THE FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE OPERATED IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR, 1964-65. THESE ARRANGEMENTS RESULTED IN INCREASED REVENUES TO THE PROVINCES OF \$87 MILLION.

IN THE SAME SPIRIT, IN SPITE OF OUR OWN FINANCIAL NEEDS, THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT AGREES THAT THE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING YEARS, WHICH WERE MADE IN 1961, ARE INADEQUATE.

I THEREFORE PROPOSED AT THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE THAT WE SHOULD JOINTLY UNDERTAKE A REVIEW OF THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL TAXES IN RELATION TO THE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH NOWADAYS HAVE TO BE CARRIED BY CANADA AND THE PROVINCES. THIS IS INTENDED TO BE A THOROUGH REVIEW, WHICH MUST TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FINDINGS OF THE VARIOUS ROYAL COMMISSIONS AND OTHER INQUIRIES INTO TAXATION WHICH ARE UNDER WAY AT PRESENT. IT THEREFORE CANNOT BE HURRIED.

ON THE OTHER HAND, AS WE SAID IN THE COMMUNIQUE OF THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE, THE TAX STRUCTURE REVIEW SHOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE EARLY SOLUTION OF FINANCIAL PROBLEMS. AFTER REVIEWING WHAT WAS SAID AT THE CONFERENCE, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS COME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT IT WOULD NOT BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE COUNTRY TO WAIT FOR THE RESULTS OF THE JOINT REVIEW, OR FOR THE END OF THE PRESENT FIVE-YEAR FISCAL ARRANGEMENT, BEFORE INDICATING TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS THE SCALE OF THE ADDITIONAL TAX ABATEMENTS AND EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS WHICH WE ARE PREPARED TO PLACE AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE PROVINCES IN FUTURE YEARS.

THE SCALE WHICH THE GOVERNMENT IS PREPARED TO RECOMMEND TO PARLIAMENT, IN DUE COURSE, IS EQUIVALENT TO AN ADDITIONAL ABATEMENT OF THE FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX OF TWO PER CENT COMMENCING IN JANUARY 1965, AND A FURTHER TWO PER CENT COMMENCING IN JANUARY 1966, IN ADDITION TO THE INCREASES AT THOSE DATES ALREADY PROVIDED IN OUR LAW.

THE OTHER MAJOR TOPIC DISCUSSED AT THE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE WAS PENSIONS. TWO FEATURES OF THIS DISCUSSION SEEMED TO ME ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT.

ONE WAS THAT THE QUEBEC PLAN, AS OUTLINED TO THE CONFERENCE AND SINCE MADE PUBLIC, WAS IN MOST RESPECTS NOT GREATLY DISSIMILAR FROM THE FEDERAL PLAN.

THE SECOND FEATURE OF THE DISCUSSION WAS THE GENERAL SENSE, EXPRESSED PARTICULARLY CLEARLY BY THE PREMIER OF ONTARIO, THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO THE UNITY OF OUR COUNTRY THAT OUR PENSION ARRANGEMENTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY SHOULD NOT SET UP OBSTACLES TO THE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE, AND THEREFORE SHOULD BE NATIONAL IN CHARACTER.

IT THEREFORE SEEMED TO ME THAT I WOULD BE ACTING IN THE SPIRIT OF THE CONFERENCE IF I EXPLORED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT WHETHER THE TWO PLANS WHICH HAVE NOW BEEN FRAMED—THE FEDERAL PLAN AND THE QUEBEC PLAN—COULD BE BROUGHT TOGETHER.

I AM VERY HAPPY TO REPORT THAT DISCUSSIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC DURING THE PAST TWO WEEKS HAVE SHOWN THAT THIS IS POSSIBLE.

UNDER THE PROPOSAL WHICH I NOW WISH TO PUT BEFORE YOU, AND IN WHICH THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC CONCURS, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD PROPOSE TO PARLIAMENT LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD ESTABLISH A CANADA PENSION PLAN AND PROVIDE THAT ANY PROVINCE WHICH SO WISHES MAY TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR APPLYING THE PLAN TO EVERYONE EMPLOYED IN THAT PROVINCE. SUCH A PROVINCE WOULD PASS ITS OWN LEGISLATION TO ENABLE ITS GOVERNMENT TO ADMINISTER THE PLAN IN EVERY WAY, COLLECTING THE CONTRIBUTIONS, INVESTING THE FUNDS AND PAYING THE BENEFITS.

ALTERNATIVELY, IN PROVINCES WISHING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ADMINISTER THE PLAN, THE LEGISLATION WOULD PROVIDE THAT THE FUNDS ARISING FROM

THE PENSION PLAN SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS FOR INVESTMENT. THEY WOULD BE DIVIDED AMONG PROVINCES IN RATIO TO THE PENSION CONTRIBUTIONS FROM RESIDENTS OF EACH PROVINCE. THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO GUARANTEE TO THE PENSION FUND A RATE OF INTEREST AT LEAST EQUAL TO THE RATE ON LONG-TERM FEDERAL SECURITIES.

AS PART OF THIS PLAN, THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC WOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, TO WHICH OTHER PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE ALREADY AGREED IN PRINCIPLE, ENABLING THE FEDERAL PLAN TO PROVIDE BENEFITS TO WIDOWS, IRRESPECTIVE OF AGE, TO ORPHANS AND TO DISABLED CONTRIBUTORS.

THE FEDERAL PROPOSAL, CONCURRED IN BY QUEBEC, WOULD PROVIDE THAT PENSIONS SHOULD BE 25 PER CENT OF EARNINGS UP TO \$5,000 A YEAR. THIS LIMIT WOULD BE ADJUSTED, AS WOULD THE EARNINGS ON WHICH BENEFITS ARE BASED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHANGES IN AVERAGE EARNINGS AVERAGED OVER A FAIRLY LONG PERIOD. BENEFITS IN PAYMENT WOULD BE ADJUSTED TO CHANGES IN THE COST OF LIVING, SUBJECT TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF TWO PER CENT IN ANY YEAR.

THE TRANSITION PERIOD PROPOSED, BEFORE PENSIONS REACH THEIR FULL RATE, WOULD BE TEN YEARS.

PENSIONS WOULD BE PAID ON RETIREMENT FROM AGE 65, BUT UP TO AGE 70 WOULD BE SUBJECT TO REDUCTION IF EARNINGS EXCEED SPECIFIED LEVELS.

CONTRIBUTION RATES WOULD BE DESIGNED SO THAT THE AVERAGE RATE IS 1.5 PER CENT EACH, FOR EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE, AT THE AVERAGE LEVEL OF EARNINGS. THIS MIGHT BE ACHIEVED BY PROVIDING THAT THERE WOULD BE NO CONTRIBUTION IN RESPECT OF EARNINGS UP TO \$600 A YEAR, AND A RATE OF APPROXIMATELY 1.8 PER CENT WOULD BE PAID ON EARNINGS ABOVE THAT LEVEL, UP TO THE \$5,000 MAXIMUM.

THE CONTRIBUTION RATE FOR SELF-EMPLOYED PEOPLE WOULD BE THE COMBINED EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RATE.

COVERAGE WOULD BE COMPULSORY FOR EMPLOYEES WITH SALARIES EXCEEDING \$600 A YEAR AND FOR SELF-EMPLOYED PEOPLE WITH EARNINGS EXCEEDING \$1,000 A YEAR. SELF-EMPLOYED PEOPLE EARNING BETWEEN \$600 AND \$1,000 MIGHT PARTICIPATE VOLUNTARILY.

I BELIEVE THAT THESE PROPOSALS ARE A SATISFACTORY COMBINATION OF THE TWO PLANS WHICH HAVE BEEN WORKED OUT IN DETAIL. I THEREFORE PUT THEM FORWARD FOR YOUR COMMENT. THE FEDERAL LEGISLATION WILL THEN BE PREPARED IN THE LIGHT OF THE VIEWS EXPRESSED BY YOU AND THE OTHER PROVINCIAL PREMIERS. WE ARE CONCERNED TO DO THIS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HOPES TO PROCEED SHORTLY WITH LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF FAMILY ALLOWANCES TO CHILDREN WHO, EITHER BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT PHYSICALLY FIT TO WORK OR BECAUSE THEY ATTEND SCHOOL, REMAIN DEPENDENT AT THE AGES OF 16 AND 17.

BECAUSE THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC HAS AN EXISTING PROGRAMME OF A SIMILAR NATURE, THESE EXTENDED ALLOWANCES WILL NOT BE PAID TO QUEBEC RESIDENTS. INSTEAD, THERE WILL BE A COMPENSATORY FISCAL ARRANGEMENT SIMILAR TO THAT WHICH EXISTS IN THE CASE OF UNIVERSITY GRANTS.

IN THE LIGHT OF THE COMMENTS MADE BY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS AT THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INTENDS TO PROPOSE ARRANGEMENTS WHEREBY GUARANTEED BANK LOANS FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS WOULD BE AVAILABLE IN EACH PROVINCE UP TO A DEFINED AMOUNT TO STUDENTS DESIGNATED BY SUCH AGENCY AS THE PROVINCE AUTHORIZES. IF ANY PROVINCE PREFERS TO RELY ON ITS OWN LOAN PROGRAMME, IT WILL BE ABLE TO RECEIVE EQUIVALENT COMPENSATION.

THE VARIOUS PROPOSALS IN THIS LETTER ARE MADE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE BELIEF THAT THEY WILL HELP TO UNIFY THE COUNTRY. I KNOW THAT ALL PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS SHARE MY BELIEF THAT THE WISHES OF ALL CANADIANS CAN BEST BE FULFILLED WITHIN A FEDERAL STRUCTURE, SO THAT THE RIGHTS OF THE PROVINCES ARE EXERCISED NOT TO THE DISRUPTION BUT TO THE ENHANCEMENT OF THE UNITY OF CANADA. IN THAT SPIRIT, I HOPE YOU WILL CONSIDER THESE PROPOSALS SYMPATHETICALLY AND LET ME HAVE YOUR VIEWS AT AN EARLY DATE.

(Signed)

L. B. PEARSON

Mr. Speaker, in commenting upon this telegram I would say first that it deals with two matters which were topics—it deals with four really—but two major matters that were topics of discussion at the federal-provincial conferences held both in Ottawa and subsequently in Quebec City in November of last year and March of this year.

The first of these matters is the increase in revenue required by the provinces if they are to carry out the responsibilities which fall to them and which grow constantly heavier. The government of this province welcomes the announcement that an additional two per cent of the personal income tax collected in this province by the federal government will be returned to this province commencing in January, 1965 and a further two per cent on top of that in January, 1966. These increases will be in addition to the one per cent increases in each of these years as provided for in the present agreements.

In other words, we have a five-year programme by which the abatement, as it is called, of personal income tax collected in this province increases by one per cent. What is being suggested here is that for the years 1965 and 1966 in addition to the one per cent, there will be an additional two per cent in 1965 and then an additional two per cent on top of that for the year 1966. We

estimate that the new two per cent increases will bring to Ontario an additional \$21 million in 1965 and \$42 million in 1966, or an additional \$63 million for the two years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, in answer to the question, Mr. Diefenbaker instituted the plan that provided for these increases in the first place and provided for a system of equalization payments, which was reversed by the present government in Ottawa last October or November.

Sir, this additional revenue, from our point of view, will assist us in meeting the ever-rising commitments we have—requirements for schools, universities, roads, health and, of course, our municipalities. We welcome this recognition of the needs that we put forward and have emphasized during the course of these conferences.

In this regard too I must say that we recognize and agree that the long-range studies decided upon at Quebec City will take time. At one stage there was something of a deadline being put on these and perhaps that deadline was related to the fiscal needs of the provinces. But in my opinion those inquiries over a long period of time are very fundamental to the future of our country and I do not think that those studies should be in any way hurried.

We are entering into a new concept of inquiry really, because this inquiry is not being done under the aegis of any government, it is being done under the aegis of a federal-provincial conference. Therefore it is being done at the direction of 11 governments acting in concert. This in itself is something completely new in the history of our country. If these arrangements will serve to give us what time is necessary—and I quite agree that these studies should be done as rapidly as possible, although on the other hand we have 100 years of history behind us and we have 100 years of history before us and I would not like to see the studies upon which these important decisions will be made hurried because of revenue needs of our province—but if it is expedient that this proposal of the federal government will lessen that pressure, apart from the fact that we are delighted to have the additional funds we can so well use here. I think the second effect of giving us time to do these studies is very important indeed.

The next matter in the telegram is pensions. I can say that I welcome heartily the announcement of the Prime Minister, sir, which indicates that it will be possible for us

to have in Canada a pension plan with common terms, with common contributions, with common benefits which will extend across Canada from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

In our approach to this what perhaps could be termed a vexing problem in Canada in the last few months, we have always advocated and we have always proposed that a plan of this type would be the best for all Canada in that it would assure portability of benefits. That is where our pension discussions, at least in this province, started because we were seeking to provide portability of benefits for workers here. We were seeking also, of course, to help the older worker. In any event this type of plan will simplify administration for hundreds and hundreds of employers. It will provide the portability we all seek, and it certainly will simplify the whole question of pensions for many millions of employees. I am delighted that we have been able to find a solution that comes about in this way.

Mr. Sopha: Quite a change of heart—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think not.

Mr. Sopha: I think so.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, while this telegram cannot be expected to set out complete detail—you will notice the wording of it: the Prime Minister has asked for comments from all the provincial Premiers—I would point out that there are several areas covered in it which agree with ideas which we have consistently proposed. The first of these, of course, is the one I have mentioned and that is that it be national in concept. The second is that through this proposal and through these agreements it will be possible to extend coverage under the pension plan to widows, to orphans and disabled contributors, and with the changes that have been made the plan will apply to even broader groups of our people. This, too, is something of which we have had some concern.

I might also say that under this proposal contained in the telegram, regardless of who might administer the plan, it provides that the control of the funds arising from the pension plan will remain in the hands of the government of the province in which these funds generate. We had a little conversation about this toward the end of last week and I believe we received some measure of agreement from my hon. friends opposite on the position we have taken in this regard.

These conclusions go a long way to meet

the comments that we have made over the months concerning what should be included in a national plan, during the course of the very many discussions that have taken place.

Sir, there are details in the paragraph dealing with the amount of the pension and various questions of adjustment in benefits and contributions, and I can say in that principle what is set out here is agreeable to us. We are pleased with the basis on which the self-employed are included and we also agree with the compulsory features of the plan.

As I have said, the telegram asks for—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, when the time comes when we can make the necessary adjustments in order to produce for our country the kind of plan that we appear to be getting toward with this, I think that we will all have put ourselves in a much too inflexible position.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: To get back to the question at hand, I would say as far as I am concerned I am particularly pleased that it is possible for us in this country, by discussion and negotiation, to adjust our thinking in order that we may devise solutions to our problems which will be satisfactory to all of us and which will leave us with a sense of national unity and a feeling of confidence that while we may have differences, we are able to settle them in the best interests of all.

There is another matter I would like to refer to in connection with the pensions. The hon. members will have noticed as I read the telegram that provision is made to permit any province to administer the plan if it so desires. It does appear as one examines this situation that the question of administration will not affect the national character of the plan nor its availability to our citizens from coast to coast. Certainly the administration by a province of its own plan offers certain definite advantages and in particular it offers the right of consultation and discussion with the federal government in the event of any alteration in the terms and conditions of the plan. This might be achieved by a firm agreement between any participating province and the federal government that the conditions of the pension Act would not be changed without prior consultation and a reasonable measure of assent.

The soundness of any pension plan is of vital importance to the people of this province

who are, in the final analysis, going to pay for it. It is vital, I think, too, to all the people of Canada in the other provinces, and it may be desirable and it may even be considered imperative that the participating provinces should have some discretion in the amendments that may be made to the plan in future. I think this is a matter that causes a good many people concern, as to whether we can devise some means whereby we can have stability in this plan so that it will not be altered every time we have a general election. This is a matter which will be discussed no doubt and I do not think any decision on this point is necessary at the present time.

I would like to deal very briefly with the final few matters that are contained in the telegram, the first of which is the extension of family allowances to children not physically fit or at school during the ages of 16 and 17, and loans to university students. Both matters were of concern to the province of Quebec, the first one because they have such a system of their own under which they are paying allowances, and then, of course, we all know what their attitude has been toward assistance to the universities. However, in each of these matters we have accepted the position of the federal government and have promised again co-operation and our organization to facilitate implementation of both these programmes in this province.

Finally, I would like to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we in the government of Ontario feel that this telegram and the culmination it represents of a great deal of effort and discussion and negotiation brings us a long, long way toward the national plan of pensions that we have sought. We offer our fullest co-operation in order to make it a reality and I feel perhaps even more than that, that we are pointing the way for methods and approaches which we can use to solve many more problems that will face us in keeping our country united and whole.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would permit a question relating to the statement he has just made?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I would be happy to.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would consider providing an opportunity at a reasonably early date for some or all of the matters referred to in the telegram and his statement to be debated in this House, and more particularly, the

question of pensions, although I would suggest that some of the other matters are rather important too.

We have heard a great many statements from the government, as we should, but the House itself has had little if any opportunity to express its views on these very important matters. I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister might see fit to make some opportunity for us to do so.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I recognize what the hon. member is discussing. There will be an amendment brought in to our Pension Benefits Act which would provide some—

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Prime Minister is still planning to go ahead with that, is he?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We are going ahead with the portion of it that is applicable to the portability of pensions, which will be over and above any pensions covered by a national scheme. In other words, we have never ceased in our efforts to achieve true portability of pensions, not only in what might be a minimum scheme provided by the federal government or by the government of the province, but in those schemes that will be above that and which are financed privately. What I did undertake to do was to introduce an amendment to remove the lower area of pensions in that bill. In other words, on January 1, 1965, according to that bill, there are certain requirements placed upon those people in the province employing 15 or more people. That will be removed. I will introduce an amendment to the bill in order to achieve that. This may provide an area for debate on pensions, but I would be happy to make what arrangements are necessary to permit the matters to be discussed, because they are of importance to all of us.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It could be done on that occasion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It could very easily be. As I say—

Mr. Singer: By unanimous consent.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There is an order of business that will deal with the whole question of pensions.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would also grant me the opportunity, the indulgence, of asking him whether he intends to make his views known to the government at Ottawa expeditiously and to continue negotiations with that government

to the end that the pension legislation of the federal government will be dealt with this session at Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with it as expeditiously as possible. I do not know what their plans are. This obviously is going to require, I would say, a complete rewriting of the bill presently before the House of Commons. Mr. Pearson says in his telegram that he will make the changes after some form of discussion with the provinces. I do not know what form this will take. I do not know whether this will require some form of conference again. I rather doubt that the thinking has gone so far as to make those decisions. But certainly we will press on and make our position known, and the answer to this telegram will go forward as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Twenty-ninth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (continued)

On vote 601:

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I will not take too much time of the House this afternoon because, as I explained before, we will be asking many questions under the various headings that come under this particular department of government. But I might say that I was rather disappointed in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) the other day when he did not dwell to any great length on his water management programme.

I think it was only two or three days ago in this House that the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) suggested that the greatest single problem facing this government at the present time was organized crime in the province of Ontario. But I would suggest that an equally serious problem, and in my opinion, even more so, is the level of the Great Lakes and water tables throughout the province of Ontario. There are literally thousands of people who are very worried about the fact that the water in the Great Lakes has gone down so greatly, particularly this year. There are thousands and thousands of people whose livelihood is concerned in this—not only those people in the tourist business, but also in the

shipping business, commercial fishermen and people such as that. I know in my own area it is an exception for one to see a tourist dock or a cottage dock that is now in the water. During this past weekend I visited some of the tourist areas in the Bruce Peninsula area and the water was down farther than I have ever seen it in my life.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that it is necessarily the position of the Minister of Energy to keep the water at a respectable level in the Great Lakes, as far as the province of Ontario is concerned. But I do suggest this, that it is a problem that must be faced not only by the federal government but by this government. We were disappointed on this side of the House that nothing was said about it in the comments of the hon. Minister in his report the other day.

I would like to read an excerpt from the *Toronto Telegram* which deals with this problem, to show the hon. Minister just how worried we are about it on this side of the House. It is dated April 4, 1964 and it is entitled:

LOW LAKE LEVELS COSTLY

Great Lakes water levels are critically low in some places, again bringing gripes and grief from the Lakehead to Montreal. Lake Huron, three feet below normal, has dropped to its lowest level on record dating back to 1860. The Lake Michigan level is almost as low. Lake Ontario was down two feet, Lake Erie about a foot and a half below normal, and Lake Superior one foot. The St. Lawrence river has plunged to its lowest point in 30 years between Kingston and Iroquois. Montreal harbour is thirsting for water.

The recent and unusually low amount of water, rain and snow, an unusually high amount of evaporation over the 100,000-square mile Great Lake basin, and water levels as fickle as the weather that controls them, have puzzled scientists, cheated shipping companies, played hob with hydro power and angered cottage owners for more than half a century. Scientists measuring lake precipitation say it has been eight inches under the 60-year average in the last three years. Evaporation has been correspondingly high. Low levels are expected to start rising in June before hitting a midsummer peak.

The low level repercussions are familiar and costly. Big cargo vessels cannot get into ports early in the season without cutting tonnage. Captain Bert Bazeley, fleet manager for Upper Lakes Shipping

Limited, Toronto, says each of the company's ten large carriers is shipping 1,000 tons light every trip. It is the same story with other fleets.

Tourist operators, commercial fishermen and cottagers on Georgian Bay have literally been left high and dry. Heavier boats will have to be dragged to water which once lapped at boat houses and docks.

The water is so low at Collingwood that the town's main industry, Collingwood Shipbuilding Limited, may have to shut down, throwing 1,000 persons out of work. Says company general manager Alexander Webster, "The lake has dropped four feet in the last three years and if it falls another foot this year, we could go out of business." The company is hesitant about building new ships, afraid there won't be enough water to launch them. Two boats ran aground trying to dock this week. The town, company, and chamber of commerce are pressing the federal government to dredge the harbour, not done since 1932, to beat the low level crisis.

The situation is also serious at Owen Sound and Parry Sound. Georgian Bay residents blame the crisis on the dredging of the St. Clair River to eliminate navigation hazards.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this editorial or article describes the situation very well. I would hope that when the hon. Minister comes to that part of his department entitled "The Water Management Programme" that he might say something about this. This is something, as I said before, that affects the lives of thousands of people in the province of Ontario, not only in the problem of making a living. It affects thousands of cottage owners who have built expensive cottages, many of them, and who have built docks out into the water that are today completely high and dry.

In my own town of Wiarton, the federal government last year, or the year before, had an expenditure of roughly \$100,000 in building a dock there and at the present time no boats can go into it at all.

I think that this government and this hon. Minister must have some answers as to the studies that are being undertaken, so that this problem can be looked into and perhaps something done about it. There have been various answers given, of course. It has been said in this House that there should be perhaps a diversion of water from Hudson Bay which would be terrifically expensive. It has also been suggested that there should be a dam or locks at Port Huron and Sarnia, but

we would be interested to know what the hon. Minister has to say about this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) is going to say something about Ontario Hydro. The estimates for rural hydro come up under that particular department and at that time I will have something to say about hydro in the province of Ontario, too.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, before I commence my remarks, I wonder if I might have some clarification on an announcement that was made earlier and about which some uncertainty seems to have grown up.

Am I correct that the conservation estimate, 604, is to be left until The Department of Lands and Forests estimates?

Hon. J. R. S'monett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): No, I understand that they will come up under our estimates.

Mr. MacDonald: It will come up under this estimate?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I think I was in the House when the hon. Minister made his opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, and apparently I misunderstood the procedure, so what I said was incorrect.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, if it is coming up now, that clarifies that; and of course the Ontario Water Resources Commission and water management programme will be dealt with under this estimate now?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Yes, but it will be dealt with by me as water resources Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: But under this estimate?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Correct; by this department at the right time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to divide my remarks into roughly three parts. First, some comment on the department as a whole, since it is a new department; second, reference to our handling of natural gas, and particularly storage in the province of Ontario; and third, the Ontario Northland Railway.

Now if I may come back to the first one, this new department and its scope and its function, I want to say at the outset that my reaction is not one of agreement with the comments of the hon. member for Bruce. The fact, Mr. Chairman, that only a small

proportion of the money that is being voted here is actually going to come under the immediate direction of the hon. Minister; that a great proportion of it is going to come under the direction of various agencies that report through him to the Legislature, it seems to me is irrelevant. It seems to me that the important consideration is that in this department we are seeking to provide for a co-ordinated and an organized approach to energy and resources management in the province of Ontario and in my view this is extremely useful.

As a matter of fact I can recall, Mr. Chairman, the early years in which I was in this Legislature, when natural gas was emerging as a new source of power, not only across this nation, but particularly in eastern Canada, and the policy issues related to the handling of natural gas were the orphan children of this government. They were bounced all over the lot. They were handled by one man, Dana Porter, who happened to be in a succession of departments, just because he had been involved with some of the early negotiations with regard to pipelines.

But there was no real study and concerted action by the government in terms of thinking through basic policies, with the result that something of an emergency situation developed and the government placed it under the direction of that human dynamo who has turned his energies in another direction—for some reason or another—the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay). Under his direction the department was organized and there was, for the first time, some serious coming-to-grips with this problem.

Now in my view, in the province of Ontario today the whole question of energy, basic not only to the needs of the people as residents but basic to our industry, the whole question of resources management and their husbanding for this generation and future generations is a matter that is of extreme importance. Rather than have them lost in the shuffle with other departments which are not charged with the specific responsibility of looking after resources, I think that this is a good move to have it co-ordinated within one department, particularly if we have a Minister who now becomes answerable for some of the major emanations of the Crown like Hydro, along with the hon. member for Muskoka who is on the Hydro commission, and the water resources commission and others, too.

I wanted to make that comment at the outset—if this Minister does his job, if the department does the basic studies for the

formulation of policy, then this department can play an extremely important role, even though it may be responsible in the first instance for spending only a relatively small percentage of the actual money that we are going to be voting on when we complete these estimates.

If I may go to my second major point, with reference to natural gas and its handling in the province of Ontario, and perhaps for a moment place it in the whole broader concept of our basic policy with regard to power. Now the puzzling thing here, Mr. Chairman, indeed I would add the tragic thing, is that we in the province of Ontario have a traditional policy with regard to power. It is a policy that was laid down by the government of this province, indeed another Conservative government, but a government which faced up to the fact that power at cost is one of the major contributions to the economic development of the province. Therefore they moved, more than 50 years ago, to establish a publicly owned Hydro system across the province of Ontario in conjunction with the municipalities.

Tragically, when we moved toward the public policies for the handling of this new source of power from natural gas, the modern breed of Tories had forgotten the basic validity of the policies that were laid down years ago and they moved pretty directly toward a policy which would leave the handling of natural gas in the hands of private enterprise.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I think leaving it in the hands of private enterprise is rather a weak way of putting it. They shaped a policy which directed that it would be handled by private enterprise. In other words, they were flying in the face of the very successful experience with the public ownership of power through Hydro.

I can recall, for example, the debates we had in this House, some seven or eight years ago now, when the government at Ottawa refused to consider the proposition of public ownership of the whole trans-Canada pipeline. Even, indeed, when the then leader of the Conservative Party, George Drew, insisted, after the serious mismanagement of that whole affair, that this was the only answer, that we should have public ownership.

Indeed, when the promoters of the trans-Canada pipeline refused to build the line in the one area that did not look immediately profitable—through the rocky and less heavily populated areas of northern Ontario—this government was willing to participate with the government at Ottawa in establishing

public ownership for the development at least of the northern Ontario link of trans-Canada pipeline, and to do so in an arrangement which gives the private interests the right to be able to reclaim this whole development built on public funds at its original price, with any rentals payment in the intervening period to be deducted. So they are going to get a developed, highly valuable economic enterprise some years hence at the original cost price, all of it being developed on the monies of the people of the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada.

It is this kind of confused approach to the basic policies of public ownership or private ownership that we have seen. I remember, too, that this government was opposed to public ownership at the local level—for the local distribution systems. Indeed, the role of some of the men who sit today on the front benches of this government on this score is a rather intriguing one.

There was a meeting, in the formative years on this whole issue, held in the town of Timmins—a meeting chaired by the then mayor of Timmins, who sits today as the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the province of Ontario. That meeting, sir, was unanimous, or virtually unanimous, in supporting the idea of public ownership for the distribution of gas in that area. And yet the same man went out and participated from that point forward in the establishment of private ownership of the distribution of natural gas at a meeting of mayors and reeves for northern Ontario and subsequently in his varying capacity as a member of this House and as a member of the Cabinet.

I remember, for example, when the people of northwestern Ontario, particularly the Lakehead, determined that they wanted to have the distribution of gas in that northwestern part of the province under a locally owned company. They promoted Twin City Gas and then suddenly we discovered after all of the presentations of the people of the Lakehead in northwestern Ontario that the company was going to be locally owned and locally controlled, at the eleventh hour—under considerable pressure from the then fuel board, before the company was granted its certificate of economic feasibility, or whatever the correct term is—it was forced to sell half of its shares to the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Co., so that in effect it was reduced to a subsidiary. The net result of the whole effort, a manifestation of the policy of this government, was in effect to have led the people of the Lakehead and northwestern Ontario down the garden path in the belief that they

were getting a locally owned and controlled company. In fact, at the eleventh hour, it became a subsidiary of the company against whom the people had decided that they wanted to have some opposition when they granted the franchise in the first instance to Twin City Gas.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt with regard to my assertion that it has been this government's direction that we should have in the province of Ontario private ownership in the distribution of natural gas, I have an interesting testimony to document this. I trust I am not going to run afoul of the rules of the House on this one little excerpt, from the newspaper account of the testimony of Mr. Landreville a week or so ago downtown. In the *Toronto Daily Star* on April 14, Mr. Landreville, who was speaking of his experience some years ago when he was the mayor of Sudbury, said this:

The distribution of gas in northern Ontario was directed at the provincial level and even at the federal level.

He said that the Attorney General at that time, Dana Porter, now Chief Justice of the province, had told Sudbury representatives that there should be only one gas company in northern Ontario—

if I may be interpolate: the whole of northern Ontario:

—and recommended it be NONG.

In other words, this government directed that NONG was going to get the franchise.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: But that is on unsubstantiated evidence that you are quoting from the newspaper.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if this is unsubstantiated, it comes from the man who was mayor of Sudbury at the time and knows. And furthermore, Mr. Chairman, it documents what I have had from many other sources and learned to be the facts years ago.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It came from a judge.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not think my hon. friend from Sudbury would accept that as evidence.

Mr. MacDonald: To continue:

The Attorney General made clear, Mr. Landreville said, that municipal ownership would not be approved because of its cost and the dangerous nature of natural gas.

Mr. Sopha: Where did he make this statement?

Mr. MacDonald: In the trial downtown, in the testimony. The interesting thing is that the two reasons given are because of its dangers, Mr. Chairman, and secondly because of the cost.

The only thing that would be different in the terms of cost is that it is going to cost the people more if it is going to be privately owned than publicly owned. There is just no argument on this proposition that with public ownership you can provide power at cost, and that cost will be less than the so-called power at cost if it is handled privately. As for the red herring drawn across the trail that because gas is dangerous it should not be handled municipally, this I must say is the first time I have ever heard that argument advanced.

However, let us now proceed to examine the up-to-date manifestations of this positively directed policy of private ownership in the handling of power as related to gas and its storage. I have related many times in this House what seems to me to be another tragic element in this government's handling of the whole use of natural gas in the province of Ontario. That is, that if we had had a publicly owned system it could have been integrated in a very intimate way with the exceptional natural resource we have in Lambton county—of something over 130 billion cubic feet of storage area. That integration with an overall system in the province of Ontario would mean that you could pump the gas in there during the summer off-peak season, and you could take it out and put it into the distribution systems during the rest of the season. You could thereby cut something like 25 cents per thousand cubic feet in the cost to the consumer. This is something that has been discussed many times. We have been beating our heads against a stone wall in terms of getting the government to recognize the basic validity of this—even in spite of the experience it has had with Hydro down through the years.

Let us see what has happened in recent months to complete this picture. Up until now Union Gas has had, for quite some time—exactly how long I do not have at my fingertips at the moment—control of 76 billion cubic feet of gas storage in Lambton county area—47 billion cubic feet of it is working gas storage area, the other 29 billion cubic feet is cushion gas. A considerable unused portion of gas storage was remaining in Lambton county. Recently the government moved to make this available to a new company, a joint company, Tecumseh, established by Consumers' Gas Company here in Toronto and the Imperial Oil Company, which had been in-

volved in the field in the first instance because of its interest in oil.

Union Gas, during the time that it had control of gas storage and transmission through its own company, for which it built a pipeline from the Dawn field through to Oakville a few years ago, was charging in the range of 25.5 cents per thousand cubic feet—17 cents for storage and approximately eight cents for transportation. Some years ago, when Consumers' needed the protection of some storage area to be able to meet peak requirements, and I suppose also to deal with any emergency condition, it entered into a limited contract, limited in terms of the amount of gas that it would allow to go through Union's pipelines into the Dawn storage area and bring back when Consumers' needed it.

Mr. Oakah Jones, the president of Consumers' Gas, stated in public testimony or before the standing committee of the Legislature here, that one reason why the contract was a limited one was because the cost was exorbitant—that the storage and transmission costs were uneconomic. Yet the interesting thing that has happened now, Mr. Chairman, is that under the aegis of this government the rest of this storage area—some 56 billion cubic feet, of which 16 billion or so has been in the hands of Imperial and 40 billion cubic feet has now been handed to Imperial and Consumers' through the new company called Tecumseh—has been handed over so that the whole of this resource has now been handed to the three companies, either Union or Imperial or Consumers', the last two acting jointly through their subsidiary, Tecumseh.

For better or for worse, for all future years now, this great natural resource is going to be handed over to these three companies. The interesting thing to bear in mind is that as compared with this eight cents transmission cost or 17 cents storage cost—a total of 25.5 cents—we have down through the years the testimony—in one instance for example, of Mr. Crozier, the chairman of the fuel board—that storage could be handled for as little as five cents per 1,000 cubic feet. You have a comparable storage price or charge in Michigan, just across the border, of 11 cents. Here we are putting the stamp of public policy on a storage price of approximately 17 cents, which is going to be built into the rate base that is being charged to the people who happen to be buying their gas from Consumers' in the Hamilton-Toronto "golden horseshoe" area and east from here.

Now I want to present to the House, Mr. Chairman, my considered views as to what

the overall consequences of this implementation of government policy are. The average family in the "golden horseshoe" and in the areas in eastern Ontario is now paying an extra \$50 a year on its gas bill as compared with western Ontario, and government policies now being implemented will confirm this excessive payment in perpetuity. The tragedy of the situation is that an unsuspecting public is not even aware that its interests are being sacrificed for the benefit of Consumers' Gas Company and Imperial Oil.

The average residential rate for Consumers' Gas in Hamilton, Toronto and areas to the east, is \$1.35 per thousand cubic feet. The average residential rate for Union Gas west of Toronto, throughout the whole of western Ontario, is \$1.07 per thousand cubic feet. In this way the average family in the "golden horseshoe" area pays approximately \$50 more per year.

Why? The reason lies in the fact that Union Gas has been using the storage basins of Lambton county so that they benefit from the advantage of cheaper off-peak summer gas coming in from western Canada. Consumers' Gas has been using the Lambton storage basin to some extent through Union's transmission facilities through Oakville to the Dawn Valley. But Mr. Oakah Jones informed the standing committee as far back as 1958 that the transmission and storage charges which Consumers' had to pay were so high as to price as to make extensive use uneconomic. And now the government is in the process of handing over virtually all of the remaining storage basin capacity, some 50 billion cubic feet, to Consumers' Gas acting jointly with Imperial Oil.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Jones was unwilling to pay to Union in the past is going to be collected through this new subsidiary owned jointly with Imperial Oil, and the extra charge to the consumer will continue in the future instead of dropping rates to those which Union has been able to offer.

An important point to be noted here is that this is government policy. The *Sarnia Observer* on September 6 last—the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) is not here, I wanted him to hear this—in the midst of the election campaign carried the following front page story, and I am quoting:

Two competitive fuel companies, Imperial Oil and Consumers' Gas of Toronto, will form a joint company to make use of the underground gas storage facilities of Moore township. In an announcement today by The Department of Energy Resources, later confirmed by the Consumers'

Gas Company, nearly \$20 million will be spent in preparing three underground gas pools in Moore for use as natural gas storage units.

That is the end of the quote.

Thus it will be noted that it was the government which took the lead in announcing this new development and Consumers' Gas tagged along with an announcement. Just to confirm that it was all a carefully timed election pronouncement, the same edition of the *Sarnia Observer* quotes the Conservative candidate, J. Ralph Knox, as hailing the news. He is quoted as saying that it was:

A tribute to the far-sightedness of the Progressive-Conservative government in Ontario. There are few things that go on in this province with which the Robarts administration is not familiar, stated Mr. Knox, and it is through the efforts of men of the calibre of Mr. Macaulay and his associates that the people of Lambton West benefit greatly.

Later on when we get a chance to deal with the estimates in detail, we shall pursue such issues as the vain efforts of the people of Lambton West to get equitable assessment on their gas facilities, and the relentless battle over the years on the part of the farmers to get a square deal on royalties. There is a great deal of evidence that suggests that the people of Lambton county, among others, are being exploited—and there are no huzzahs from the other side at that point, we seem to have got a short circuit in that wired-for-sound arrangement that sometimes operates over there.

But let us return to the position of the great majority of Ontario consumers in the "golden horseshoe" and to the east. Make no mistake about it, there is nothing far-sighted in this except to make certain that the gas consumer is going to pay exorbitant prices for gas transmission and storage, and because Consumers' Gas is now going to reap this profit through its own subsidiary, it is content with the situation. The situation which it deplored five years ago, it is now content with, because the uneconomic and excessive costs are going to go into their own pocket and they are going to do so by permission and approval through this government's policy.

Let us take a more detailed look into these exorbitant transmission and storage prices for gas. Alberta gas can be delivered in the summer months to Ontario for 33.5 cents per thousand cubic feet. Built into the ultimate price paid by the consumer is a figure of 25

cents for transmission and storage in Ontario. Just how profitable the gas transmission business is can be seen by recalling the fact that when the prospectus for the Ontario Natural Gas Storage and Pipeline Limited—this is the subsidiary of Union Gas that handles its storage and its pipeline from the Dawn pool to Oakville—was released in January, 1958, it was revealed that for the year 1962 they anticipated a gross profit of \$3.688 million on a capital stock of only \$9.51 million. That is a profit of 38 per cent on the money invested. These figures were accepted by the government and the energy board and have been included in the rate base. Now that Consumers' Gas and Imperial Oil have established their own subsidiary to be known as Tecumseh, these are the kind of profits that are in the making and the consumer is going to have to pay for them.

May I remind the hon. members that at one hearing in 1958 Mr. Crozier, chairman of the fuel board, was quoted as saying that he felt that gas could be stored for as low as five cents per thousand cubic feet, and further that storage charges just across the line in Michigan, in pools that are by no means as good as ours in Lambton, are only 11 cents per thousand cubic feet. Yet we have built in an 18 cent transmission charge which Union has enjoyed through its subsidiary for years, and now the government is going to permit Consumers' and Imperial to share in the same kind of profits through its subsidiary.

In Lambton county there is a joint gas committee representing consumers through Guy Tyndall, president of the Sarnia Labour Council; ratepayers through Gordon MacDonald, president of the Lambton Ratepayers' Association; and with Norman Wilson, president, and Byron Young, secretary, of the Lambton Gas Storage Association as its other members. This group has presented many briefs to the government. They have asked the government to freeze all these developments until we have a report on the issues that years ago were referred to the Langford committee—and we got no reply—and then two years ago were referred to the fuel board, from which we still await a reply.

The government has ridden roughshod over the interests of these groups. Union Gas has already been granted, some eight years ago, rights to some 76 billion cubic feet of storage space and now the fuel board has granted the remainder of this lucrative natural asset, a further 56 billion cubic feet, to Consumers' and Imperial.

As the Lambton joint gas committee has pointed out, if these storage facilities were

handled as a publicly owned utility and integrated with the gas distribution system through southern Ontario, with a line looped from the western gas fields in Alberta, gas prices could be standardized throughout all of southern Ontario at a price between 90 cents and \$1 per thousand cubic feet. This would be significantly lower than Union's present price of \$1.07 residential rate, and greatly lower than Consumers' residential rate of \$1.35 per thousand cubic feet.

If this were done, with storage and transmission rates fixed at something other than the present exploitive levels, the savings to each family in western Ontario under the Union distribution could be from \$14 to \$34 per family; and in the Hamilton-Toronto and eastern areas of the province under Consumers' distribution from \$71 to \$91 per family. Such is the price the consumers pay for government policies which are worked out to meet the interests of the distribution companies, not the consumers.

As the hon. member for Lambton West stated during the election campaign, Mr. Chairman, there are indeed few things that go on in this province with which the Robarts government is not familiar. Obviously it has been party to a behind-the-scenes deal in this case for which the gas consumer is going to pay through the nose for years to come. It was worked out so intimately that the whole development was carefully staged as part of the Conservative election campaign last September.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Prove it.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, you want me to prove it, eh?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You might as well.

Mr. MacDonald: We will not waste our time in trying to pursue the proof of whether it was a behind-the-scenes deal. The simple fact of the matter is that after years, they had worked it out and handed it all over to the companies, and did it during the election campaign.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Why do you always have to get down into the mud?

Mr. MacDonald: If I do, I will find you right there, sir.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Most constructive you are.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You really don't hate us that much, do you?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not hate you. I sometimes have a deep feeling of sympathy, that is almost overwhelming when I listen to the fatuous comments that come from over there when a point really strikes home.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I like you, but I am ashamed of you at times. We do our best to keep you on the right track.

Mr. MacDonald: All I might add, Mr. Chairman, to that last comment, is that it is mutual, both the liking and the shame.

Mr. Chairman, I want to turn for a moment to the ONR. The ONR, I think, is of particular importance to members of this Legislature. It is true that it has relationship only to a corner of this province, but it is a corner which recent days have revealed is rich in wealth, and some of that wealth certainly flows to the benefit of the whole of the rest of the province. Further and most important of all, the ONR is a publicly owned railroad. It was built as a development railroad. We, sir, the members of this Legislature are, in effect, its board of directors and we are the people who should be shaping its policies. We have something in the nature of a personal responsibility and obligation, and it is that personal responsibility which I ask the hon. members to face up to.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that we had a relatively useful meeting of the legislative committee on government commissions this year. The acting chairman of the ONR—he persists in “acting” instead of a full-time appointment; I do not know why the government is slow on this one—and the rest of his commissioners and the officers of the ONR came before the committee and provided us with the answers to many questions.

After that meeting was over, for a time some of my doubts and apprehensions with regard to what had happened were allayed. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that with further information that I got from various quarters in northeastern Ontario as a result of the revelations that came out in the news stories that flowed from that meeting, my apprehensions have been rebuilt.

I want to come back to a rather serious consideration of exactly what has happened here. In the first place, I think a great deal of the trouble that the commission now finds itself faced with in northeastern Ontario, is of its own making. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is a fairly valid case even for private industry—when it is going to launch some new development or some serious curtailment of its operations, which will have a

great impact upon the communities in which it is operating—there is an obligation even on private industry to treat the community at large as co-operators in this venture and not present them with a *fait accompli*.

We have had many debates in this House as to the irresponsibility of industries that suddenly uproot themselves from a community and move out because they think it will be more profitable elsewhere, even though that community has sunk millions of dollars in providing the services for the industry, and even though its workers have sunk all of their life savings in homes in the community. The companies feel that it is their right to pull up stakes and move out on their own decision.

This government refuses to come to grips with this problem—with the need for shaping a policy so that under that kind of circumstance the community can be taken into the confidence of the company. If it can justify its move, at least the community can plan so as to soften the blow the community will suffer when the industry moves.

However, Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt at all as to the obligation of a private company taking the community into its confidence, there is certainly no doubt at all with regard to a publicly owned institution like ONR. I come back to this basic point. I submit that the ONR has got itself into a pack of trouble because it suddenly presented a decision like a bolt from the blue—that is not quite accurate, there were a few weeks of rumours, but that just served to stir up the public—and then the commissioners went up to northern Ontario and tried to explain what it had already decided to do.

I think I will take refuge for a moment in some quotes from people in northern Ontario because I want to try to reflect the mood and feeling and reactions of the people of northern Ontario to some of these developments. If I make the comments, somebody on the opposite side of the House, particularly when the point is telling, will suddenly blurt out, what do I know about it in York South. So let me speak, Mr. Chairman, with the voice of a genuine northerner who lives with these problems.

For example, on this question of the manner in which—and this is what I am dealing with, and this alone for a moment—the ONR and the hon. Minister handled this whole matter. I have here a copy of the *Timiskaming-Speaker* for January 30, in which there is a column entitled "The Rambling Reporter" under the byline of C. E. Bond—

An hon. member: Published in *New Liskeard*.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. I am quoting from his column:

Ontario's new Minister of Energy and Resources, John Simonett, must be a real whiz-bang. The other day we received a notice that he was coming north on a fact-finding tour to find out just what the ONR or the government could do for the benefit of the north, presumably industrial-wise.

We noticed his schedule. He was allowing three hours for interviews at Porquus Junction, Iroquois Falls and Matheson. Then he was journeying to Cobalt and was allowing about a little more than an hour to hear representations from Cobalt and Latchford. After that, Haileybury was to take him there to hear its suggestions, and that was it.

No matter how good a man the Minister thinks he is, the time allowed for such a mission leads one to believe that there is either nothing wrong with the economy of this section of northern Ontario, or that the trip is just a gesture and that the Minister has come to a conclusion that nothing can be done.

Again, it could be that the trip is to draw a red herring across the ONR commission which is threatened with personal investigation by Arnold Peters, MP [whatever that is] and to kind of take some of the sting out of the attack by Timiskaming's member in the Legislature, R. A. H. Taylor.

I have not heard much about it so far. There has been no attack, let alone any sting.

We suggest if the government and the ONR are really serious about carrying out the slogan "Ontario's development road"—it is on every ONR freight car—then at least a reasonable opportunity should be given all municipalities in the area served, sufficient notice of such a meeting, with time to prepare representations and then have a sitting where the feasibility of the presentations could be discussed in an intelligent manner and acted upon.

Perhaps we are hoping for too much. Or are we? During the last election campaign, John Kennedy of North Bay, a member of the ONR commission, asked the writer what the ONR could do to improve conditions along the railway. We suggested at the time that perhaps the matter should be allowed to rest until after the election and that we could get a representative group together and really discuss the matter without any political slants. That was the

last we heard of the suggestion. Mr. Simonett had acting ONR chairman Allister Johnston, and other members of the ONR commission in his entourage.

That is the first point I want to make—the mishandling of this whole affair; the appearance—and quite frankly I think it is a reality not an appearance—of presenting northeastern Ontario with a *fait accompli*. The people can protest all they want—there is not going to be any budging.

However, when we proceed a little further we find that there are other quotes from northern Ontario that I shall take refuge in as a fairly accurate representation of my views, but certainly a representation of the views of the people in northern Ontario.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I was also interested, in reading through some of the clippings that I gathered on this, to discover that one of the commissioners from northern Ontario on the ONR, a man who was at a meeting that Arnold Peters addressed in Kirkland Lake—I will find it in a minute, I have too many things here.

Oh yes, here we are! My filing is like Fibber McGee's closet; it is not lost, it is just filed:

On January 22, when Arnold Peters spoke to the Rotary Club at Kirkland Lake, sitting there was one of the ONR commissioners, W. Roy Thompson of Kirkland Lake, who commented for the press at the end of it—

and I just throw this in for the benefit of the hon. Minister of Mines since he thinks some of the things I am quoting from Mr. Peters are a little off base:

I do not agree with everything he said, but I do agree with his thinking.

Mr. A. Johnston (Parry Sound): I spoke to him about that.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member told him he should not say that again, eh? Yes, I think there are a lot of people up in northern Ontario who are going to be told not to say that kind of thing again.

However, this is the reaction of northern Ontario. I am quoting once again from the New Liskeard *Speaker*, in an editorial on January 30:

ONTARIO NORTHLAND

The Ontario Northland Railway fact-finding safari left this district last Thursday evening with one fact: residents of the north are not satisfied that the ONR is in fact the development railway that it is touted to be.

Over the years it is becoming increasingly evident that there is a double interpretation of the term "development railway." Business men in the north interpret this to mean that the railway was built to give the north an even break with the south so that our manufactured articles could compete and that our necessities would cost no more than they do in other parts of the province. But for the commission, the development tag means the development of the railways as a successful and dividend-paying business, built with high freight rates, paid by the north.

It is hard for people in the north to believe that the Ontario Northland Railway Commission has done much more than use the original investment of \$30 million to develop our railway and communications complex, now valued at \$90 million, at the expense of northern industry and northern consumers. It is hard for the farmers of Timiskaming to believe that the Northland is a development railway when he pays from \$10 to \$15 more per ton for fertilizers and feed grain than his more fortunate brother in the south. It is hard for the homeowner to believe that the ONR is a development railway when he pays 20 per cent more for fuel oil and gasoline. It is hard for businessmen in Elliot Lake to believe that the ONR is a development railway when the commission has already called all section gangs from Kenabeek and there is a persistent rumour that the branch line is to be abandoned.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member said Elliot Lake; he does not mean that.

Mr. MacDonald: Elk Lake!

An hon. member: They insist on putting these rumours in these reports!

Mr. MacDonald: This is not a rumour, this is an editorial from the *Temiskaming-Speaker*. Are you saying that they are peddling rumours?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Is the Elk Lake line closed?

Mr. MacDonald: We will come to that in a moment, when we get to the details later in the estimates, we will discuss the rumours of closing, then the decision of closing, and the political influence that led to the re-affirmation that it would remain open—for how long, who knows?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Do not bring politics into this.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister of Mines is inimitable—let me put it that way.

The concluding paragraph of the editorial on which I was so rudely interrupted is as follows:

It is hard for anyone in the north to believe that the Ontario Northland Railway is in fact a development railway.

Whether the commission likes it or not, whether the government likes it or not, that is the overwhelming view of people in north-eastern Ontario, that you have forsaken the original objective with regard to this railroad. It is the view of practically everybody who is not so tied in with the Tory Party that he is silenced or expects he is going to be told by the acting chairman of the commission that he should not say something critical again.

What is the result of all this, Mr. Chairman? I think while I am quoting let me just put one more quote on the record. This is from the New Liskeard paper once again, January 30, and this is a front page editorial. This one is rimmed in black. I think there is some significance in this. It is entitled:

NEW COMMISSION

We never thought that the day would come when this newspaper could agree with Arnold Peters. But for once anyway we agree with the Timiskaming firebrand MP when he claims that a complete change in the composition of the ONR commission is needed.

Last week at Haileybury the ONR commission attended a public meeting. We witnessed the rather pathetic spectacle of an amiable group of politically appointed gentlemen being hammered at by all and sundry, and individually and collectively being incapable of justifying their position. In fact, it is fair to say that the commission has been sold a bill of goods by the management and was present to cover up its employees' sins and errors rather than to present any basic policy before the people of northern Ontario.

The commission members were clearly surprised at the number of people who attended the meeting, they apparently had no idea of how strongly the people of this area feel about the ONR. This is hardly surprising, for how much do the commissioners know about the area served by the railroad? With the recent death of Mr. Aubert at Englehart, there is only one commissioner, Roy Thompson—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Aubert was not on the commission at the time of his death.

Mr. MacDonald: Was he not?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No.

Mr. MacDonald: He must not have made a good enough Tory, that is the only comment I have to make, because if there ever was a substitute for the Senate in Ontario, a provincial Senate, it is the ONR commission.

—there is only one commissioner, Roy Thompson of Kirkland Lake, who comes from the area served by the ONR. The only other northerner on the commission, Rene Brunelle, MPP for Cochrane, lives at Moonbeam, which is not served by the ONR. Many business people feel that to properly serve the north the ONR commission should be composed of representative northerners, each distinguished in his own field. Agriculture, industry, mining, forestry and distribution should each be represented on the commission. Now while it may be necessary to consider politics when making the appointment, knowledge, experience and ability and residence in the true north should be the prime qualifications. Certainly one thing is obvious—

I read this with a degree of sadness because it is truer than perhaps the members of the commission would care to admit:

Certainly one thing is obvious, the present commission is nothing but a rubber stamp for a management that can see no further than the nearest dollar bill. What is needed, desperately, is a commission with courage, imagination and vision; a commission which will refer to its original and historic terms of reference and devote itself to the development of the area.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: In other words he thinks they should be criticized—

Mr. MacDonald: He not only thinks they should be criticized, but I would suggest to the hon. member that he has done a rattling good job of criticizing.

Now there is the feeling of the north, there is the attitude of the north towards this whole development. Let us get down to some of the basics in the situation on which, I must say to the hon. Minister and to the acting chairman of the commission, that the more I ponder them the more I wonder why the commission panicked into the decisions that were made this year. For example, I have here the second last annual report, not the one that has just been given to us last week for the year 1963 but the annual report for the year 1962, the year ending December 31, 1962.

On page 4 of that report I read this:

The earnings position of the commission was substantially improved for the year 1962 with a net revenue of \$349,848.27 as compared with a net amount of \$12,309.14 in 1961.

In other words, the year before this panic move was made, you had the commission itself, in its audited statement, in its report to this Legislature, stating that the earnings position had substantially improved and had risen from \$12,000 to \$349,000.

What happened last year? Last year, admittedly, a number of things happened that are documented on page 3 and again on page 11 of the new report for the year 1962. It is pointed out, for example, that on one hand the poorer earnings position is due in the main to an increase in operating expenses of roughly \$1.1 million, and it attributes this to increased wage costs which in 1963 amounted to approximately four cents an hour increase. Just let me pause there, Mr. Chairman. I do not think anyone—I hope there is no one—who would say that a four-cents-an-hour increase in the year 1963 to the employees was an exorbitant increase in wages. And it was partly due to the accelerated programme of equipment maintenance.

A little later the commission points out that the main reason for the drop in revenue was because of the New York strike which resulted in a sharp drop in the amount of paper that was delivered over the ONR through the lengthy duration of that strike. Indeed, I think, that in itself amounted to a loss of approximately \$500,000. Then there is a reduced scale of passenger fares, and this has resulted, presumably, in some sort of a drop. But when you go to examine the over-all position of the company you will find that its position in 1962 was a surplus of \$877,000 and in 1963 it was a deficit of \$64,000. You have approximately \$900,000 variation in the net position of the company, one half of which, it concedes itself, arises from a drop in freight earnings because of the paper strike in New York.

Moreover, the commission itself says the investments in communications are going to bring larger returns. This is noted in the 1962 annual report. Further, the commission says that by the end of 1964 or the beginning of 1965 there will be increased traffic because of the development in mining in the Boston Creek area out of Kirkland Lake. I had the opportunity of seeing that development during the election and I can vouch for it as a promising kind of development.

In other words, the moves of the department were taken one year after it commented on its own stronger earning position, a year in which it had a non-recurring drop in revenue—one can assume that the paper strike is not going to be repeated—and the prospect of increased revenues from a variety of sources—communications and the mining development outside Kirkland Lake, to say nothing of the mining developments which may be coming outside of Timmins, if half of what we are reading in the papers today comes true.

I would agree, Mr. Chairman, that if this commission can provide more efficient services, there is justification for changes. But whether there is need for cutting the services while providing greater efficiency in the manner that the commission has, it certainly has not satisfied a great many people in northern Ontario and the rumblings of discontent continue. There are many detailed aspects of this question that I want to come to when we come back to the ONR estimates as a whole. But I wanted to deal with the over-all policy at this stage, with what I think was the mishandling of the situation by the commission; with the feelings of the north in forsaking the development aspect of the railway, and with what seems to me to be a degree of panicking this year in face of a temporary drop in revenues and the prospect of increasing revenues that may have made some of this panic action unnecessary. As to the details, I shall leave them until we get to the estimate itself.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Bruce the other evening and again this afternoon, it would seem that his main concern first is whether there is a need for this department, and I am sure I can answer that. It is the policy of this government that we have this department.

Then after listening to the hon. leader of the NDP this afternoon, he agrees with the government, although we have two schools of thought. I would suggest to the hon. member for Bruce that I think this department will continue and I am sure that whoever is the acting Minister he will have plenty to do.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He also mentioned this afternoon his concern regarding water in the province of Ontario and especially in the Great Lakes. I would like to state now, Mr. Chairman, that this week it is my wish to announce to this House a policy regarding

water in southwestern Ontario. Our main concern first is water for human consumption and for livestock use. I am sure when we make this announcement this week that perhaps the hon. member for Bruce will agree with me and with the government that this might be a start to remedy this situation that they were faced with up there last year.

As regards the water in the Great Lakes, I am sure that we on this side of the House are as concerned as anyone, but I would say that I would think it would be a federal matter and we are willing to co-operate with any federal department to remedy this situation. Just to back up that statement I would like to read from the federal *Hansard*, Monday, April 13, where the member for Parry Sound, Mr. Gordon Aiken, asked this question:

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources.

Is the Minister ready to make the statement on the water levels of the Great Lakes and Georgian Bay, which he promised last week?

Hon. Arthur Laing: Mr. Speaker, this report was prepared. I read it but I was not too happy with this. There are further discussions.

Mr. Nowlan: You are not too happy with what, the water levels or the report?

Hon. Mr. Laing: I thought there was not enough water in it. I expected to make the report tomorrow.

Mr. Aiken: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? May I assume that the Minister is asking for an objective report on whether some action can be taken to remedy the situation?

Hon. Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, it would still appear that the best thing we could do is pray for rain.

And I think we could all agree with that and it would solve our problems but perhaps that is not the answer.

And again on Wednesday, April 15, when the leader of the Opposition, Mr. John Diefenbaker, asked this question of the Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson:

Mr. Speaker, the question I wish to ask has to do with the critical situation with regard to the water levels on the Great Lakes, a matter that greatly affects potential shipping this year as well as carrying with it detrimental effects in various fields of endeavour.

I would like to ask the Rt. hon. Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that the situation is most serious—for example, the Lake Huron water level being at its lowest since records were first kept in 1860—any negotiations are being undertaken at present with the United States with respect to the Chicago conduit which draws off 3,000 cubic feet per second of drainage from the Great Lakes, and whether there is any co-operative plan now being considered by the governments of Canada and the United States with regard to this very important matter that will affect the economies of our two countries.

And the answer by the Prime Minister, L. B. Pearson:

Mr. Speaker, I share the right honourable gentleman's appreciation of the seriousness of this situation that seems to be cyclical on the Great Lakes but which is certainly very serious at the present time. I am not aware at the moment of conversations which may or may not be going on with the United States concerning this matter, but I will be glad to look into it and make a report to the House at the earliest possible date.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, after those remarks, that it would be a federal matter and that we in Ontario would be only too willing to co-operate at any time in this matter.

The hon. member for York South, as I said before, agrees that there is a need for this department. Of course he did not say there was a need for its present Minister and I might agree with him on that, but nevertheless I am very happy to see he agrees with the government and that there is a need for this department.

He spoke of natural gas and I took from his remarks that it is his feeling that natural gas should be distributed in Ontario, or should have been at the time of its inception, by a Crown corporation. Now I would expect him to say that, but I would say that there are two schools of thought regarding it.

Mr. MacDonald: The right and the wrong!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The right and the wrong, and I am sure that the one we are using today is right, whereas the hon. member is sure that the one he talks about is right.

Let me go back, and I do not know too much about natural gas at the time it first started to come into Ontario, but I think if any Minister had brought before this government the facts and the cost of bringing

natural gas into the province of Ontario some five years ago that he would never have got it through here.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, they made lots of money.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Let me say this, since I have been Minister of this department last fall I have had very little complaint about any gas company in the province of Ontario.

As I said earlier, there are two schools of thought. We have one school of thought today, and I have had more people since October 25, or last September, come in and tell us that Hydro should not be a Crown corporation.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister agree with them?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I do not.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the hon. Minister not agree with them?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, because Hydro was set up as a Crown corporation and it is operating and I think doing a good job. I would say the same about the gas in the province of Ontario; they were set up as a private enterprise, they are serving the people, and as I said earlier there are very few complaints and have been since I have been down in that office.

Mr. MacDonald: They are all screened before they get to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I do not know who screens them.

Now he mentioned the ONR, and of course this has been a topic in the north country during the last six months. When he mentions this he only mentions one particular town on the ONR where there has been any opposition to the proposed change—not proposed now, it is going to be a change on April 26.

Mr. Troy (Nipissing): Oh!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member for Nipissing says "Oh", but there have not been too many complaints out of Nipissing, outside of a very few. He could pinpoint them and so can I, because I have been in Nipissing, or in North Bay, several times since I took over last fall. After all if you are going to run a department I do not think you would expect the Minister to spend six months up on the ONR and still look after the work down here. I think we have met with those people, I know we have. Most of them we

met with were satisfied with our explanation and satisfied to go along with this new service.

In fact, we think we are improving the service, not curtailing any service to the people in the north. As I said to most of the municipal representatives with whom we met, we would be willing, after six months, to sit down and review this and if the commission were wrong perhaps we can make adjustments then that will do the things that the commission has told to me and told to the people in the north that this new service will do.

Mr. Troy: You must follow the actions of the CNR. Your operation must tie in with theirs.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, all right then; he agrees that we cannot do anything and that we will go along with the CNR, is that what the hon. member says?

Mr. Troy: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Then the hon. member has answered the question of the hon. member for York South so I will not need to go any further on that, but I doubt if that is just right. After all, I think if the government felt that this service was not going to be adequate that we could do something about it and would do something about it.

Now I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the rest of the questions I would rather answer as the votes come up.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just draw this to the attention of the hon. Minister. I neglected this during the course of my remarks. If he thinks the protest is concentrated in New Liskeard I shall table here a copy of a petition which has been circulated and he will notice that the names are from anywhere from North Bay to Englehart to Virginiatown to Larder Lake. It is not just the New Liskeard area protesting the moves that the commission has made.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that petition never was presented to me. I heard about it but I have never seen it. I do not think the hon. member for York South puts too much stock in petitions, because I find you can go up and down the street and get people to sign for and against if you ask them. I do not think we should pay too much attention to that.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under vote 601, would this be the

proper place to ask about oil and gas lease forms?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Spence: Well, what vote would you discuss it under?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oil and gas leases, 602.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I wish to make some remarks about pollution of our rivers and lakes and some measures to ameliorate this. Would this come in a general way under 601 or do you wish me to make it specifically at some other vote?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 605.

Mr. Young: Under 605? Thank you very much.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, could you answer my question? Under what vote should I discuss oil and gas leases?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Vote 602.

Vote 601 agreed to.

On vote 602:

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, at the opening of the remarks of the hon. Minister he stated that there were new finds of oil in south-western Ontario and I think he named the places where different oil finds are situated. Since that time there have been a lot of companies leasing land for gas and oil.

Now there are many forms of gas and oil leases. On my desk here this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I have five different forms that are used for leasing properties for gas and oil. One company may use one form and another company may use another form. When you look at these gas lease forms, the first thing you notice is it is all made out in fine print. Of course, that is one of the things that has frightened me all my life, that is the fine print, and after reading some of these forms over I would say that the fine print is not to the advantage of the lessor.

Mr. Chairman, we are out of the dark ages and I think that these oil and gas lease forms could certainly be in larger print, because many of the lessors in this province have been gypped, have signed these leases and after they have signed the leases found out that they had signed something that they did not think they did.

I would like to say that there are too many different kinds of lease forms; and also that in these oil and gas lease forms, the fact there is payment of rent should be made a

lot clearer. Some of the lessors have to give 90 days notice to the lessee that he is in default as to payment of rent, and then the lessee is given 90 days to correct the situation, which means a half a year.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that in many cases the term of these leases is for 20 years, so if the lessor makes a mistake, it is practically a lifetime before he can correct that mistake. I would say that the term of these leases should not be any more than ten years. If a company cannot develop these properties in ten years, I do not think there is too much hope in 20.

I would like to say, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, that there should be a standard lease for all companies leasing property in the province of Ontario. The term of these leases should not be any longer than ten years and the fine print certainly should be enlarged.

I would like to hear from the hon. Minister on this.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Kent East I would agree with him that if a standard lease form could be developed that would fit under all circumstances, that it would be an ideal situation.

I would think that the gas companies would go along with that, providing one would be developed, but that seems to be an impossibility because you are dealing under different conditions on practically, I suppose, every lease.

With regard to the fine print in any lease, I would think that these are all two-party agreements and that anyone should check with their solicitor before signing a lease for 20 years. I would think that with a lease of that many years, surely they would check the fine print in order not to get into any trouble and I think you would agree with me, sir, although these things would be nice, I do not think the government could force upon any company, or anybody, any type of lease, or lease form.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the hon. Minister that I do not see why the general run of a lease could not be standard, and if the companies or if the lessor want something added into it, it could be added. But when one paragraph differs from the next paragraph, that can be quite confusing.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, there have been many signed leases without the assistance of a lawyer. Although I know they should have

the assistance of a lawyer, many do not. There are many high pressure agents traveling on our highways and also out seeking property and I think the time has come when there should be a standard lease in general use. Either the lessor or the lessee can add to the bottom. Maybe that might be encouragement to go to a solicitor and have that done.

Surely the department of the hon. Minister can come up with a standard lease. Even I just picked up five different forms of leases used in this province. I think the hon. Minister could do a lot of good for a large number of lessors.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that this matter is being discussed between the gas council and the industry at the present time and I am sure if they can come up with something near a standard lease that the industry would be very happy to do this. I say this because since I have taken over this department, I know that any time we have asked anything of the industry, it has been very easy to get along with and is trying to iron out many of these difficulties that have happened in past years.

Mr. Spence: I appreciate very much that the hon. Minister is giving his consideration to it.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to get some guidance from the hon. Minister as to when specific questions should be asked.

The hon. Prime Minister, when these estimates were first presented in the House, Mr. Chairman, indicated that there would be an opportunity to deal with Hydro. Now when does the hon. Minister envisage that Hydro would appropriately be discussed under the estimates, since there is no specific vote?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think on the approval of our estimates that the hon. member for Muskoka is here to answer any questions regarding Hydro and he will take over.

Mr. Bryden: That will be after the last item?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: Did I understand the hon. Prime Minister correctly when he said that questions relating to the conservation authorities branch will be dealt with for this year when the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests are before the House?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, they are going to come under vote 604.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is one matter I would like to raise under vote 602. It relates to the ever-recurring problem of safety. I do not wish to go into all the ramifications of that problem at this time; there are many of them, but I am interested in one phase in particular at this time.

As most of us will recall, in August, 1962, there was a serious explosion and fire at a liquefied petroleum gas installation at Maple, Ontario. Following that explosion and fire, which resulted in the death of one man, there was a coroner's inquest held on August 22, 23 and 24, 1962. The coroner's jury was quite critical of regulations relating to these large propane-gas distributing installations, of which there are a good many in the province, and made a number of recommendations to improve procedure for ensuring that they are operated in a safe manner. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to find out from the hon. Minister exactly what has happened within his department with regard to these specific recommendations of this coroner's jury.

There were five recommendations all told. One of them relates to the activities of The Department of Municipal Affairs. That is the fifth recommendation, so I will not raise that one at this time. The other four relate pretty directly to The Department of Energy and Resources Management, as it is now called.

First of all, and I am now quoting from the verdict of the coroner's jury:

The jury has found that evidence revealed an appalling lack of co-ordination and assumption of responsibility by government departments in relation to fire safety installation and inspection.

Therefore the jury strongly recommends that the governments so concerned take immediate action to correct the situation—

Somewhere else, I think in the report, there was a reference to the fact that the fire commissioner and others seemed to be involved in this, but none of them seemed to know what the other's responsibility was.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister what has been done in relation to that recommendation in the year and a half, or year and three-quarters, since the coroner's report was issued.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Woodbine I understand that this matter has been referred to an interdepartmental committee under the

chairmanship of the deputy Attorney General, and that the report is in draft form at the present time and should be presented to me within the next month.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, as I have said, it is about a year and a half, or a year and three-quarters, since this recommendation was made by a coroner's jury. Could the hon. Minister explain why it has taken so long to get a report from this interdepartmental committee? I realize that he has only recently taken over the portfolio and cannot be held responsible for what happened before he assumed this responsibility, but is there any explanation of what I would consider a long delay in acting on a matter of vital importance to the people of the province?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this regulation affects about five different departments. The committee has been going ahead on this, and although to the hon. member 18 months may seem to be a long time, I understand that they are making good progress and we can expect a report soon.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 602 agreed to?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am far from finished with this matter. I must say that I regard the hon. Minister's answer as quite unsatisfactory. It is reminiscent of answers that we have always got in this House relating to matters of safety affecting gas and some of the petroleum byproducts that are even more volatile than gas, such as propane. We have had, with unfortunate regularity, some very serious disasters in the province of Ontario in the handling of gas, natural gas and manufactured gas, including propane. Every time the matter has been raised in the House we have been assured that "everything is under control," but now we get an answer from the hon. Minister that this affects about five departments of the government and it takes quite a while to get them all going in the same direction, or I take it that is the gist of his answer.

He is a new man on the job and they say a new broom sweeps clean. I hope he will start getting some action. This is a serious matter. The Maple explosion created real havoc in the town of Maple and resulted in the death of one man. It was pure good fortune that it did not result in the deaths of a great many others. I would have thought that would have produced some action by the government, but as far as one can make out they are only getting around to considering ways of getting together to get adequate

action and co-ordination of action in regard to the inspection of these installations.

There are a great many of these installations throughout the province. The Maple one was a large one but I do not think it was by any means the largest. B-A Oil down at Clarkson has quite a large LP-gas installation. Does the department have any idea whether it is operated in accordance with safe practices? Some of the information I have from people working there—I will not reveal any names—leads me to believe it is far from a safe operation. Is the government just sitting waiting until this interdepartmental committee reports, or when can we expect some action?

An hon. member: They are not answering.

Mr. Bryden: Then I will take the second recommendation of the coroner's jury:

The jury further recommends that the office of the fire marshal of the province of Ontario, assume the responsibility for regular inspections in connection with fire prevention and equipment in similar types of installations.

It may be that this does not come under the hon. Minister's department, but is he in a position to answer as to whether or not anything has been done to implement that recommendation?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not get the hon. member's question—if there was a question.

Mr. Bryden: I asked the hon. Minister if anything has been done to implement the second recommendation of the coroner's jury that inquired into the disaster at Maple. The recommendation was:

That the office of the fire marshal of the province of Ontario assume the responsibility for regular inspections in connection with fire prevention and equipment in similar types of installation.

That is, similar to the installation at Maple. I want to know if anything has been done to implement that recommendation.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that all of these have been placed before the committee and we are waiting for a report on this. As soon as we get it we will implement whatever recommendations there are. I can assure the hon. member that I doubt if this plant is as bad as some of the employees say it is as far as safety is concerned. If it is, sir, I would ask that you let our department know because we are concerned about these things.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it should be a question of me letting the department know. Neither I nor any other layman is in a position to have any precise scientific information on matters of this kind.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Why talk about it then?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But the employee knows.

Mr. Bryden: But we have had enough disasters. If some of those hon. gentlemen over there were concerned about this thing they would know that. I think it is time the department knew what was going on and did not ask us what is going on. We know from what has happened that there has in the past been inadequate inspection. The regulations have been inadequate and the enforcement of them has been inadequate. We have had coroners' juries investigating these disasters, asking for action to be taken. I am dealing with the recommendations of a coroner's jury which presented its report at the end of August, 1962. I think it is fair to ask what has been done, and it appears that nothing has been done. They are studying it. They have been studying this matter for over one and a half years—a matter that surely is of vital importance to the safety of people in many communities and to working people in many establishments.

I suppose I will get the same answer on all of these recommendations so it is possibly not necessary to go through the rest of them. But for the information of the House I would like to read the other recommendations made by this coroner's jury:

3. That a study be made in respect of the dispersal and installation of all types of stationary pressure tanks or vessels, and that the office of the coroner of the province of Ontario direct this recommendation to the proper authorities.

In this particular incident the jury is concerned with evidence suggesting that the size and pressure setting of relief valves may not have been adequate.

I am led to believe, but I am in no position to make a technical determination myself, that such a problem exists not only in the ill-fated Maple installation.

4. That an intensive study be made at provincial level with a view to enacting legislation to control the location of industry considered likely to create danger to health or danger from fire or explosion.

5. That a review be undertaken by The Department of Municipal Affairs of the

method of appointment, qualification and arbitrary powers given to committees of adjustment.

6. The evidence at the inquest revealed that adequate records of maintenance, repair, replacement and inspections of company equipment were most inadequate for the efficient operation of this type of industry.

The jury therefore recommends that companies involved in this type of operation be required to keep accurate and up-to-date logs of all equipment.

Mr. Chairman, surely that last recommendation is one that could have been acted upon without a report from the interdepartmental committee. Therefore I am going to ask the hon. Minister if at least that one has been acted upon. That is, is there a provision that is enforced whereby companies involved in this type of operation, the storage of liquefied petroleum gas, are required to keep accurate and up-to-date logs of all equipment? Is there such a requirement, and, if so, how is it enforced?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. member for Woodbine, I understand that it has not been acted upon and that we are awaiting a report from the interdepartmental committee.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this is a doleful tale. I do not hold this hon. Minister responsible because he has had only a very short time in his portfolio, but I hope that he will buck up the administration. It clearly needs to be bucked up if the people of this province are to be assured that these dangerous gases are handled in a safe manner.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, on vote 602. People servicing gas burners now have to carry a licence. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell me whether people servicing oil burners and installing them must have a licence too?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that at the present time, no. But we are proceeding with the plans to license installers of oil furnaces as well as gas.

Mr. Davison: Could the hon. Minister tell me when he feels that these people will have to have a licence to service and install oil burners?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that this will be effective in 1965.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on the same chain of thought, might I ask a question of the hon. Minister regarding the inspection of heating appliances? Is this the correct vote for that—602?

Recently I have had two complaints from oil dealers in my particular riding, the first one of which I pointed out to the deputy Minister two weeks ago. Since then I have had another. The complaints do not suggest any collusion between government and Union Gas, but they do point out the fact that they feel the positions of Union Gas inspectors who do the inspecting for the department are being abused, and that Union Gas is receiving unfair advantage in the fact that it has men going into the homes who apparently are condemning coal and oil installations. Possibly this is just due to overeager salesmen on the company's part, but I would like a comment from the hon. Minister on this situation if he could.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the hon. member right, that inspectors from Union Gas are going into homes and condemning oil furnaces? Is this what I understood?

Mr. Paterson: It comes back to this fact that they do make the inspection for the hon. Minister's department. I believe that is correct. As such the salesmen enter the home and the installation may have a red tag placed on it, and as such they have an initial advantage to make the sale.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that these fellows are licensed to inspect, but I would think as an owner that if I knew that somebody from a gas company came in and was rejecting my oil furnace to sell me a gas furnace, I would be the one who would buy another oil furnace. I believe most people would. I would doubt if this is happening.

Mr. Paterson: I have heard this from various parts of my riding through oil dealers.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would be very happy, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would bring it to my attention. I would like to follow up further on this one.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister an incident that has happened recently in my own riding, where furnaces which have been installed under the name of Good Cheer have proved to be defective. Now I will say that the gas company concerned

was very co-operative here and once the defective furnaces were discovered inspections were made over the whole area and a large number of these furnaces were discovered, but it did mean that the people who had bought the furnaces in good faith a year or so before had to have them replaced.

I am wondering if the hon. Minister has given any thought to regulations of any sort by which gas furnaces in particular must have a guarantee of life over a period of years against defective workmanship of this kind. Because, if this particular gas furnace had not been caught—two or three of them as a matter of fact—if it had not been realized what might happen, we might have had some rather serious consequences in that whole area.

I do not know whether this is true, but I did have a phone call not long ago when some chap, who declined to give his name because, he said: "I do not want to get into this controversy"; said that these furnaces were still being installed. He gave me the name of the company that was installing them, and I will pass that on to the hon. Minister if he wishes.

I think this should be investigated very carefully. I am wondering if any thought is given to this business of safety factors built in through a guarantee over a number of years for this kind of installation.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member I understand these furnaces are inspected and pass inspection at the time they are sold, but I think it is the hon. member's concern that they seem to have a short life. I would be afraid there would be nothing this government or the department could do to legislate as to the life of the piece of equipment. I would be afraid that would be beyond our jurisdiction.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor - Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, one year ago in the discussion of these same estimates, the Minister at that time (Mr. Macaulay) commented that there would be no drilling in any of the Great Lakes other than Lake Erie, perhaps forever. Has the department changed its policy, because I understand that the Sarnia area has made strong representations to the hon. Minister concerning the possibility of Lake Huron oil drilling.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member was in the House when the hon. Prime Minister made the announcement regarding drilling in Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair and the St. Clair river. I do not think

any further question is necessary beyond that point.

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister did not answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I answered the question as I understood it. What was the question?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, one year ago in the discussion of these same estimates, the then Minister of Energy Resources made the following statement; that there would be no drilling in any of the Great Lakes other than in Lake Erie, perhaps forever. Just approximately one month ago, the city of Sarnia made strong representation to this hon. Minister concerning the possibility of drilling in Lake Huron. Now the hon. Minister in making a reply mentioned that there is always a chance of oil and gas wells coming along and causing serious pollution. Has the department changed its policy in relation to drilling in lakes other than Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I answered it, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Prime Minister made a statement regarding that.

Mr. Newman: Has the policy been changed? Can the hon. Minister say yes or no. That is all; is he tongue-tied?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Tongue-tied? Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the hon. member wants me to say. I cannot say any more than the statement of the government.

Mr. Newman: Has the policy been changed, yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Newman: That is all I wanted.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I said that in the first place.

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister did not say that.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the final item in vote 602, energy studies, what exactly does this encompass? Specifically, does it encompass studies as to the most economic use of the various forms of fuel that we have in the province?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is an economics and statistics department unit.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, in south-western Ontario, it is mostly American concerns which are developing our gas and oil

in that area. Is the energy board doing anything to encourage our Canadian firms to do some developing of oil and gas in south-western Ontario, which we think is quite a large amount?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. member, I would say that I do not know what the government is doing to ask Canadian industry to promote these wells, but I understand Imperial Oil—I doubt if you would call it a Canadian firm, but a firm that operates throughout the North American continent—I understand are spending millions of dollars in promotion every year in the province of Ontario. I do not know that there is any way, or I do not know if we would want, to force Americans out and let this promotion stand idle.

Mr. Spence: I do not wish to force the market up, but I thought we should be doing something to encourage our Canadian firms to do some of this developing also.

Vote 602 agreed to.

On vote 603:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 603 there are a number of points I wanted to raise. I do not want to reopen the ideological discussion—if I could describe it as such—which I had with the hon. Minister, except that it is the inconsistencies of this government which puzzle the onlooker. As we were saying earlier with regard to pensions, if the government is merely flexible in regard to its policies, and therefore it makes changes, that is one thing, but when it changes its convictions from year to year then one wonders exactly what a conviction is when held by the government.

For example, I was interested in the hon. Minister's initial statement when he introduced his estimates. On page two of the mimeographed version of it, he said:

In the years to come one of the main tasks of the department will be to see that the energy from different sources will at all times be available in abundance and at the lowest possible cost.

Now in light of our experience with the handling of hydro power, the lowest possible cost is public ownership; and no economist can come up with any argument to the contrary that the lowest possible cost with gas is going to be available through public ownership. You cannot on the one hand extol hydro and its great contribution, and then dismiss it out of hand, otherwise some day you may have to face up to the same

thing as the hon. Prime Minister did on pensions and throw out your private approach and accept a public approach because it is more economic.

However let me come to two or three specific arguments under the energy estimates. First I want to return to the questions which the hon. member for Kent East put to the hon. Minister with regard to lease forms. Am I not correct that the whole question of lease forms, and conceivably even a standardization of storage rates, royalties and things of this nature, is under consideration by the energy board? This was originally with the Langford committee, now handed to the energy board. When can we expect a report from the energy board?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that we can expect this report in two to three weeks.

Mr. MacDonald: Well again I am puzzled, Mr. Chairman. If we can expect it in two to three weeks why did we not have it for this year's estimates?

You know if there ever was a magnificent illustration of that old phrase around Queen's Park, "in the fullness of time," this is it. This problem was first presented to the government in 1957. It was kicked around from Minister to Minister. It finally came to the office of the hon. member for Riverdale. He could not handle it, Mr. Chairman, so he handed it to the Langford commission. They were going to bring in a report and when they brought in their first report, it was not dealt with. When they brought in their final report it was not there. Then they handed it over to the energy board. If there ever was a group of people who have been driven from pillar to post, in waiting for the solution of an obvious injustice, it is the people who are trying to cope with this business of companies playing off one against another.

For example, I was interested in the hon. Minister's first reply to the hon. member for Kent East when he said he could not intervene in this two-party arrangement of a lease between the companies and the owners—the farmers who had these wells. When he got a little advice from his deputy he switched his policy because he was just five years behind the times. It is under study precisely for the purpose of trying to get some order out of the chaos—to establish some kind of standard approach so that we do not leave the companies with their high-priced counsel in a position to lick any little farmer with whom they happen to deal.

It is all very well for the company to go

in and high pressure some person who happens to be a widow or an old woman who is in desperate need of money so that she will sell it for a song by comparison with what really should be paid. They make a break-in there, and having made a break-in there they exploit that to put pressure on the others. I want to submit to the hon. Minister that when we get this report I trust it is going to indicate the possibilities of a standard approach such as we have had in the United States for years—a standard suggestion as to what storage charge should be paid and what percentage of that should be in the nature of a royalty to the person who actually owns the property in the first instance. However, we will have to wait for still another year. It is a wearying prospect but we live with the Tory government and that is part of the cross we bear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: When all the back benchers, including the hon. Cabinet Ministers, have had their say I will get on to the second point I wanted to raise with the hon. Minister.

This conceivably does not fall four-square within his department. It may ultimately have to come into The Department of Municipal Affairs, but I trust, Mr. Chairman, you will let me raise it briefly. This is another of the complaints that the people in the Lambton area have been pressing upon the government for quite some time—with regard to assessments. Their contention is that you should have an assessment of storage facilities on the same general basis as you have for above-ground tanks, whatever be the kind of fuel that is put in those tanks.

They have suggested what seems to me to be logical—that they should be assessed on the same Btu capacity as the ground storage. These underground storage areas are just as valuable as the surface storage tanks. I understand that the average assessment on the surface storage tanks is one cent per gallon of capacity. If one accepts the Btu formula I understand that slightly more than 6.25 gallons of fuel oil produce the same heat as a thousand cubic feet of gas. In other words it would work out at eight cents assessment per thousand cubic feet. In the one township, Moore Township, from which representations have been made to me, this would mean an assessment of \$3.2 million, approximately one quarter of the present assessment of that township.

I want to submit to the hon. Minister that this is a fair proposition. As a matter of fact,

let me put it this way: Why should one company that is storing above ground have to pay taxes, another company that is storing underground not be obliged to pay taxes? Why do you set up this unfair competition, this discrimination between the companies? It seems to me that there is a solid case for government action here and I am wondering whether this hon. Minister or the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is in a position to enlighten the House as to whether or not the government is going to act on these representations.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for York South, I know that I have heard this discussed several times. I do not think I have ever heard anyone come up with any answer as to whether they should assess gas under the ground in comparison to gas above the ground. I would think that this matter, if it is solved one way or the other, would come under The Department of Municipal Affairs and not under this department.

Mr. MacDonald: Would it be unfair for me to ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs whether this matter has come before him?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not unfair at all, and the answer is no.

Mr. MacDonald: It has not come before the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No. I would suggest to the hon. member that it is probably going to be considered by the Beckett committee.

Mr. MacDonald: The Beckett committee?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The legislative committee that is studying The Municipal Act and related Acts. It has been in operation for two years now.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, that Beckett committee!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I was wondering if the hon. Minister had stated some new government policy.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I am wrong here but I have had repeated representations from people who have come into Queen's Park on this issue, and I will satisfy myself as to whether they have ever been told that the appropriate place to make representations is to the so-called Beckett committee.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, none of these people, that I can recollect, has ever been in touch with me in the days that I have been in The Department of Municipal Affairs. I will say this, I did attend a meeting with a township council in that area some years ago at the request of its member. We discussed this question of assessment of pipelines, but we never discussed the question of a municipal assessment of underground storage areas. What the hon. member has read today is something entirely new to me. I have never heard of it before. Basically, I do not think that it has too much merit, but if the people involved would like to send me that material I would be very glad to have a look at it myself and have it studied by the officials in my department.

Mr. MacDonald: That will make interesting reading to the people who have been making the representations for quite some time. The hon. Minister's deputy and other people in the department have umpteen briefs in which this is one of the points, and it would seem to me that if it does not come under the jurisdiction of this department it should have been passed on to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs a long time ago. However, in the fullness of time we will come to grips with this one too, I suppose.

Let us get to another one that is clearly within this jurisdiction and I wonder what the reaction is going to be as to whether this is an unfair assessment of it.

I have never been able to get any clear picture as to what this government's policy is with regard to the cushion gas left in these wells. For example, to take one specific case, in the instance of the Payne pool, millions of cubic feet of gas were in there when this area was designated as a pool. Will the hon. Minister tell me whether the company has to pay for the amount of gas that is left in there to the people who own it? That is question one; perhaps we should take them one at a time.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that that is determined by the energy board.

Mr. MacDonald: Then my question once again then: Does the energy board designate whatever millions of cubic feet of gas left in the pool shall be bought by the company, and that it shall pay a royalty on it to the owner of the property just as though it had actually taken the gas out? If there was no gas in there, the company would have to put it in to build the cushion storage.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, the answer is, yes, and they are paid at the rate of two cents per million cubic feet.

Mr. MacDonald: Two cents per thousand cubic feet is what is paid. If they do not take that out—just a minute, if they are paid at two cents per thousand cubic feet—

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): They are, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: They are. Representations have been made to me—and I am certain that they are accurate, I am just trying to sort out the complexities of this very complicated thing in my mind at the moment—and I can give you one specific case here in a minute.

For example, in the instance of the Payne pool when it was converted to storage, the right to surface and sell the 11 million cubic feet of gas contained in the field was purchased by the company; had this gas been surfaced the income tax would have amounted to \$1 million. Canada was therefore short-changed \$1 million of income tax over \$3 million price being a capital gain. Now this is the contention of the Lambton Gas Storage Association, is this the case?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would doubt very much if that is the case. I would want to know more about it before I could answer the question.

Mr. Henderson: It is under appeal!

Mr. MacDonald: It is under appeal? The same pool. I appreciate the assist from the hon. member for Lambton East.

Let me ask the hon. Minister another question. At what figure, for example in the Payne pool, was the cost of the cushion gas estimated?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we have no estimate on that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I have been told \$3 million. Let us suppose for a moment that it is \$3 million. Is this price incorporated in the calculation of the rate base, so that it effects the rate in perpetuity, or at least until the whole thing is reviewed again by the energy board?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The answer is yes, down to 50 pounds pressure.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not pretend to be master of all the complexities of the situation, Mr. Chairman, but just as in the instance of the Ontario Natural Gas Storage and Pipeline Limited that was built across

the province this government and the energy board were willing to accept the prospectus in 1958 which anticipated this company making 38 per cent in 1962 on its capital investment. So I suggest to you in many instances that rate base is a padded rate base and the result is that the consumers are paying through the nose. I do not know whether the people of this province can ever be aroused to exactly what has happened.

I have had no comment, for example, from the hon. Minister as to the basic proposition I was making earlier. Why should the people in the Hamilton-Toronto area be paying \$50 a family more for gas than is charged west of here? Just because Consumers' Gas happens to be in the position that they are now going to incorporate that price in perpetuity through a storage subsidiary, how can the government justify it?

An hon. member: The equipment is all paid for—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for York South could answer that if he would think back to his farm days. You could always buy a cord of wood cheaper at the farm than you could in the city. If he could answer why there should be a difference there, I think he would have it on gas. It costs money to transport and to store and to do these things. This has been so as long as I have known anything about fuel and energy. You can always buy cheaper at the source than you can ten miles down the road or 50 miles. I think that is the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Can the hon. Minister explain to me why the storage charge in the province of Ontario is 17 or 18 cents, why Mr. Crozier, back some years ago estimated it could be done for five cents? Or why in Michigan it is eleven cents? Can we deal with just that one point?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would say comparing Ontario with Michigan would be two different things. I think the cost of storage, after we get storage areas and they get in their expensive equipment, as the years go by I would think you would see the cost of storage reduced considerably.

Mr. MacDonald: I would suggest to the hon. Minister that this is nonsense, because the storage in the province of Ontario is better storage than it is in Michigan. We have better storage basins than they have in Michigan, they will contain the gas more

effectively than Michigan. Perhaps the hon. Minister then will explain to me why a few years ago Mr. Crozier felt that five cents storage was a possibility in the province of Ontario? At what time, in the fullness of time, in the year 2500?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, no, before that!

Mr. MacDonald: Why are we paying at this present time 17 or 18 cents in Ontario, and it is eleven cents in Michigan? There is no justification for this. You are just sitting tight and leaving these companies set up a storage and transportation subsidizing so that they too will be making 38 per cent profit on their investment. This is what they did in the company that was established as a subsidiary of Union, and at that time Oakah Jones said it was uneconomical. And now Oakah Jones, with Imperial, sets up his own subsidiary so Consumers' Gas pockets the money that he thought was uneconomic.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): That is good business.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, it is good business. It is good business for a Tory government that is working hand-in-glove with these companies so that they can continue to exploit the consumers.

Mr. Cowling: If we do not have profit we do not have anything.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense!

Sure, you are the type who wanted to let the used-car dealers get away with it—go along with the Attorney General until finally the people got angry about it. But there is no justification for this government perpetuating a policy that lets these companies exploit the consumers.

Mr. Cowling: That is just your opinion.

An hon. member: Is it 38 per cent per annum?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I repeated it earlier—in the prospectus that was submitted by Union Gas when they established their subsidiary in 1958, their own estimate in round figures was that on a \$9 million investment they expected \$3.8 million as a return in 1962. A 38 per cent return.

An hon. member: That is four years!

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no, they expected it in the year 1962 alone, a return of \$3.8 million which would have been 38 per cent of their invested capital.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): What have they invested in the meantime?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if this government and back benchers want to tolerate policies that are going to exploit the people then we will just have to get out and see if we cannot get the facts across to the people so that they will set a fire under you. This is just another example of exploitation. The suggestion over here, for example, when I read an earlier comment from the *Sarnia Observer*, that these policies were designed in the interest of the people of Lambton county—they are not designed in the interests of the people in Lambton county. They are designed in the interests of these companies. The townships do not get assessment, the farmers do not get adequate royalty, the companies get this kind of profit and the consumers are paying for it and this government puts the stamp of approval through its policies.

An hon. member: We get a whole lot of taxes.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask before we left this one, whether in the hon. Minister's opinion and that of his advisers, that over the next few years the consumers might expect a reduction in the price of natural gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say yes in answer to that question. I had the opportunity of being up in their fields this winter and when you see the expensive equipment and the things they are doing up there to create this industry, I would think as time goes on and we take the write-off into consideration, that the answer would be yes, we are bound to.

Mr. Sopha: Is the government concerned about the apparent move of what is known as the Little Long Lac group to win control, gain control, or in the words of the street, "make a takeover," of Northern Ontario Natural Gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think maybe the hon. member could answer that question. I do not think we are concerned—

Mr. Sopha: Well, is the government satisfied with the present management of Northern Ontario Natural Gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say that I have not heard anything against the management of Northern Ontario Natural Gas.

Mr. Sopha: So the government would be in a complete state of equilibrium and equanimity, would they, if another group moved in and took over control of this great industry?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why we should not be, as long as they live up to the regulations and they are regulated. We are concerned about the consumer, not the company.

Mr. MacDonald: You are concerned about the consumer?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to pursue it a little further. Does the government study the annual financial reports of the company in order to keep abreast of how the company is doing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would say yes.

Mr. Sopha: Does the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: He does. And he has noticed that this company has fared fairly well economically, has he?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that.

Mr. Sopha: That it has begun to pay a dividend?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What is the hon. member trying to get at?

Mr. Sopha: Since the company has come to a point in its career—it has only been in operation, I think, five years now and has made an increasing amount of profit each year—does that compel the hon. Minister, I ask him through you, Mr. Chairman, to see whether the time is not ripe to order that there be a decrease in the cost to consumers or is this five or ten years away?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we just completed a rate hearing on that last year and issued a report early in 1964.

Mr. Sopha: So there is going to be a decrease in 1964, is there?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I did not say that.

Mr. Sopha: Well, when is it? When, in the opinion of the hon. Minister, will a decrease in rates take effect?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have no way of telling that.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister has no way of telling.

Well, I just want to make one last comment: One of the methods of advertising and one of the attractions of natural gas, as I recall when it first came into northern Ontario, was that the price was going to be substantially less than oil-fuel heat, competitively speaking. I can vouchsafe that that has not been the experience. I believe the figure was going to be at least 15 per cent less than oil-fuel heat and I can say from my own experience, my own investigations, that that has just not materialized. I wonder to what extent the government has any worries or any concern about this.

I note in my own community that the attraction of Northern Ontario Natural Gas into that community was, of course, for the purposes of supply to the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited. Perhaps quite properly so, I am not one to gainsay that it is not proper, the rate offered to International Nickel Company was substantially less, appreciably and markedly less, than that offered to the local consumers. But apparently in the machinations—is that too strong a word to use when referring to Northern Ontario Natural Gas?—apparently somewhere along the line, the supply to International Nickel Company and the supply to the homeowners of Sudbury were inextricably interwoven, so that they could not have one without the other. In other words, the supply to the residents of Sudbury, the dormitory municipality, was a *sine qua non* of them coming in.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the hon. member to say that in order for International Nickel Company to get gas that the homeowners in Sudbury had to take gas?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, one infers that that was a condition.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But is that the condition or have they a choice? They have to buy gas; they do not have a choice to buy oil or electricity?

Mr. Sopha: No, no.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is what the hon. member is trying to imply.

Mr. Sopha: I am speaking of natural gas.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But they can buy any fuel they wish.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, they can burn wood.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Certainly the hon. member was trying to imply that the home-maker had to—

Mr. Sopha: They can buy a peat bog; they can go and chop up hunks of peat, too. But I say that the two things were woven together. If they were to supply International Nickel, they also had to have the franchise to supply the city of Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But there was no compulsion on the homeowner to buy natural gas?

Mr. Sopha: Of course not.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: All right, then.

Mr. Sopha: Whoever suggested that? There is no compulsion on anyone to buy ice cream either.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, why bring it up here then?

Mr. Sopha: What I have been bringing up the hon. Minister obviously cannot comprehend. He just cannot understand what I am saying, so I will have to put it in a simple form. I will put it in a very simple form. This is my last statement.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: It is well that you do what you can to bail the hon. Minister out because it is easy for him to get into trouble.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am not in trouble.

Mr. Sopha: All right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, may I say that it is 6 o'clock but I would like to answer the hon. member before we adjourn. There is no one in the province of Ontario bound to buy any fuel; he can buy anything he wants.

Mr. Sopha: There is no question of that; no one said differently.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is what some people are trying to imply and the hon. member is.

Let me say this, and just listen for a minute. If natural gas was not competitive, why do people install natural gas when they can get oil, electricity, wood and coal? All the things are there for them to burn; why

would they have to install natural gas? Can the hon. member answer that one?

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister has reached unparalleled heights of lack of attention, I commend him.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, may I—

Mr. Sopha: Will you remember I have the floor?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 603 has been carried—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, no.

An hon. member: Yes, it has.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, no. I have the floor and it is not passed. Shall I continue?

Mr. Singer: If you want it to be carried, then the hon. member for Sudbury can speak for another half hour.

Mr. Sopha: Does the hon. leader of the government wish to move that the committee rise?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In the midst of this incomprehensibility I will move that the committee of supply rise and report certain progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with these estimates. On Thursday the committee on labour, legal and municipal bills will meet at ten o'clock in the morning to deal with various matters that have been referred to it by this Legislature. Following the estimates of this department, we will take the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 21, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued	2256
Recess, 6 o'clock	2291

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Stratford Northwestern Secondary School; in the west gallery, students from St. John's Separate School, Newmarket; and in the Speaker's gallery, members of the Progressive-Conservative Women's Incorporated Group, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). He has been informed of the content.

The question is: What steps has the hon. Attorney General taken, or what steps does he propose to take, to protect the small uninitiated investor from suffering serious financial loss in the current market?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I thank the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, for giving me notice of the question. I might tell him that I got it about five minutes ago as I entered the House, but that was through no fault of the hon. member. I understand he got it in just on the hour.

I was proposing to make a statement on this matter before receiving the question. I would say this, although I have no prepared statement in my hand: I discussed the matter of the whole situation, with respect to the tremendous speculation that is going on in stocks, with the chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission, with a view to seeing if there was any action we might further take. As a result of that discussion, I think that everything is being done that we feel can be reasonably done, in the way of requiring the filing of information and setting out the fullest material which is informative by way

of prospectus, the names of the persons who are concerned with the various companies who offer stocks for sale, the reserves which are shown on that information—in fact, all that type of information—is with the Ontario Securities Commission and is available to the public.

I think all we can say at this moment is a cautionary word. It is scarcely possible to restrain the public from speculating and I would say it would seem to me, and I think surely most of the public is aware, that many of the stocks they are purchasing must be of an extremely speculative variety and nature. I would say that you can scarcely take people by the hand and lead them away from the stock exchange or from the broker, or lead them there and advise them what stock to buy.

But I think it should be suggested to all members of the public that they should acquaint themselves most thoroughly and fully with the information which is available, as to the personnel of the companies in whose stocks they propose to deal, as to the amount of stock which is issued, as to the assets which are shown on that information, which is very full and complete; and they should study the location of the areas concerned and the assets owned by the companies which are offering and trading in stocks.

If they have not knowledge; if the individual himself does not have the knowledge to assess those things, he should have the best advice. And I think a good deal of that advice might, perhaps, be of a nature which would restrain him from entering this very speculative market. Beyond that at the moment I do not know of anything I can say in answer to the question of the hon. member.

The securities commission, sir, does come within my department; and we have taken, in the past and up to the present, all steps to make available to the public a knowledge of companies in all respects. That information is available, and I would strongly urge every member of the public to seek that information, to study it, and make himself thoroughly acquainted with the article he is buying before he buys it.

Mr. Troy: I thank the hon. Attorney General for that information. It is too bad that it had to be broadcast all across the country—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, could I say I did have a discussion with Mr. Kimber, the chairman of the commission; and it was at my suggestion that he made a statement. I understand that statement is being made this afternoon.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General when we can expect an announcement of the appointment of a Crown attorney for the county of Grey?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thank the hon. leader of the Opposition for giving me notice of the question and I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to inform him now that the appointment of Mr. Russell McEvoy of Owen Sound as Crown attorney for the county of Grey is effective, his appointment having been made by order-in-council, effective April 20, which was yesterday.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to make a statement.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), before the orders of the day, asked questions regarding Guelph Reformatory. Specifically, the questions were, and I quote: "Have the recently advertised vacancies in the staff at the Guelph Reformatory been filled?" and "Is any consideration being given to increased salary scales for the staff of this institution?"

In reply to these questions, my answers were, to the first, that "Most have been filled" and to the second, that "Salary scales are set by the civil service commission and are uniform for the various classifications throughout the province. They are not scaled for any specific institution or locality."

In a matter of moments after my reply was given, the hon. member for Yorkview issued a press release which had quite obviously been prepared well in advance, having been processed by duplicating machine. The statement alleged that there was "simmering discontent now rife among staff members in the Guelph Reformatory. Low salary scales are the basic trouble", and that "Workers in the institution start at \$3,600 per year and progress to a maximum of \$4,400 in four years. Inevitably under these conditions, staff is hard to get and difficult to hold." He

further stated that: "work in an institution of this nature naturally carried with it an element of danger," and that "this was highlighted not long ago when two inmates, using shears from the tailor's shop, tried to escape using a guard as hostage." And that is the end of the quote from his press release.

The hon. member for Yorkview, in attempting to establish his allegation that "staff is hard to get," pointed out that we have recently advertised 15 vacancies, and further that, in his words, "many present staff members are working at other jobs during off hours in order to maintain their families." The hon. member finished his press release with a statement that "a reforms institution of all places should have a staff which is not riddled with unrest and discontent."

Mr. Speaker, I shall not comment on the rather unusual procedure employed by the hon. member, whereby he asked a question of a Minister, prejudged the reply which he had not yet heard, and issued a statement repeating and amplifying his questions and including the allegations to which I have just referred, no mention of which was made in his questions. However, as the press release contained allegations which would have the effect of misinforming this House and the public, I am most anxious to set the record straight.

I wish to state most emphatically that there is no truth to the statement that there is, in the words of the hon. member, "simmering unrest and discontent" amongst the staff at the Guelph Reformatory.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That shows what a sheltered life the hon. Minister leads.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The superintendent of that institution informs me that morale amongst the staff is higher than it has ever been, to his knowledge. The salaries quoted by the hon. member also give a distorted picture of the salary situation. The actual range in salary for the various classifications runs from \$3,600 to \$12,500 per annum, exclusive of the superintendent. However, presuming that the hon. member was concerning himself only with the custodial staff, which he did not make clear in his press release, the statement that the maximum is only \$4,400 per annum was also incorrect, as the range for custodial officers is from \$3,600 to \$6,300 per annum. There are many other classifications at the institution and their salaries vary according to their responsibilities. The salaries for the industrial staff, of which there are 62, range from \$3,900 to \$6,600

per annum. Thus, the press statement made by the hon. member is inconsistent with the facts. The salary range he mentioned applies only to custodial officers one, two and three, who do receive a maximum of \$4,400 per annum. This salary, which averages \$85 weekly, compares very favourably for the average in the Guelph area.

We also have no difficulty in maintaining people on staff at Guelph, as alleged by the hon. member. This is reflected in the number of vacancies occurring in the institution. It is absolutely incorrect to state or suggest that there are 15 vacancies or that we even advertised 15 vacancies. At the present time, there are only five vacancies and this out of a total complement of 398. This in itself should establish that we are not having any difficulty in maintaining staff.

It may be true, as the hon. member alleges, that there are some people working on other jobs to augment their incomes. However, as this is permissible in accordance with the regulations of The Public Service Act, this is no concern of ours. Certainly this is not very prevalent in our Guelph institution, and in any case many people in many walks of life and many with very high incomes engage in such practice. According to the superintendent at Guelph, the efficiency of the work of the staff who may be engaged in such outside work, has not in any way been affected.

The hon. member for Yorkview also stated that there is an element of danger in the work and that this was highlighted by the fact that not long ago two inmates, using shears from the tailor shop, tried to escape, using a guard as a hostage. I would be the last to deny that there is an element of danger in some positions in any kind of correctional institution, but I should like to point out that in this specific case where the hon. member is attempting to relate this situation to what he alleges is poor pay and difficulty in retaining staff, the staff person involved earns a salary of \$6,000 a year with a maximum of \$6,600.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, and the concern of my officials, in respect of the hon. member's release to the press is that statements such as he has made and which are incorrect—that staff at the institution is riddled with unrest and discontent—can of themselves do a great deal of harm in our recruitment of staff. I am sure the hon. member would not want to make it more difficult for the staff of my department to carry on their very necessary and important work. At the time I presented my estimates, I stated very emphatically that I was indeed very proud of the staff of the department for their efficiency and effective-

ness and I am sure the hon. member would like to help us keep it that way.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Speaker: The Minister's statement is not debatable. You may ask the Minister a question if you wish and if he cares to answer.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to announce three new provincial programmes which I feel will have a widespread interest throughout the province and which deal with Ontario's water problems and resources. They deal with increased financial contributions by the government in three areas: (1) The construction of water supply reservoirs—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: This hon. Minister's estimates are before the House. Surely that is the appropriate place for this kind of a statement.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister took this matter up with me before he entered the House today. I understand the statement is new policy and the contents are not in any part of his estimates where he could give this statement. The Minister asked therefore if he could make it before the orders of the day.

Mr. Oliver: Surely, Mr. Speaker, on that point, the water conservation vote is still to come, as I understand it. When we come to that vote, I do not know where you could find a more appropriate time for the hon. Minister to say what he wants to say.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that the Ontario water resources vote is being taken by another Minister in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right.

Mr. Oliver: Supposing it is being taken by another Minister as you suggest, Mr. Speaker, surely at the time the Minister is taking the part of the present Minister in explaining the matter of water conservation, then the hon. Minister would have an opportunity of making his announcement, but surely not now.

Mr. Speaker: Is that satisfactory to the Minister?

Mr. Oliver: Nobody has an opportunity to say a word in reply at all.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition does not want to hear what we are trying to do to alleviate this problem, well we can—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no feeling one way or the other in this matter, except I cannot understand what all the fuss is about when the government is simply trying to put before the House a question of government policy. Whether it comes now or whether it comes half an hour from now, I do not know what the difference is. But I fail to see why there should be an objection raised, sir, to a Minister putting before this Legislature, before the orders of the day, what is obviously new government policy and in which all the people of this province are interested as well as the hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the argument before the House, I would ask the Minister therefore if he would make his statement during the Ontario water resources vote.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-ninth order. House in committee of supply. Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(continued)

On vote 603:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, you will recall that when the clock chimed six last evening, I was discussing with the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) the differential in the rate of the sale of natural gas to resident consumers in Sudbury and the rate of the sale of the same natural gas to the International Nickel Company in the environs of Sudbury. I want to make it clear to the hon. Minister—as he appeared to have some confusion in his thinking at the time for which I cannot take the responsibility of being the author—that I am not now discussing and was not talking then about the comparative prices of the sale of natural gas and other forms of combustible fuel. I want to hasten to clarify for him that I am speaking only of the rate of the charges for the sale of natural gas.

In that regard I pointed out that there is a considerable differential in the price for industrial users and residential users. I also brought to his attention that when this com-

pany came into Sudbury, as I suspect it did in many other communities in northern Ontario, one of the sales pitches so to speak, one of the attractions to people to purchase this type of fuel was that it was said that the cost of it was going to be considerably less than for oil fuel. I think in that regard—and I have nothing to document it but my memory usually does not play tricks on me—that the differential in the price which it stipulated was going to be about 15 per cent.

I do not think that experience has proved that that differential exists. Therefore my query to the hon. Minister, put as explicitly as I can possibly put it, is whether his department and particularly the fuel board—and I note the representative of that board is not here as he was last night—has looked into that question from the point of view of requiring this company to give an early reduction in the cost of natural gas to the homeowners in Sudbury, and indeed to the homeowners in the other communities of northern Ontario which the company serves.

I say in that connection, somewhat fearlessly, because I do not want especially to curry the favour of Northern Ontario Natural Gas—I would not go out of my way to curry its favour and anyone who wants to draw any inferences about that may draw whatever inferences he pleases. They are pretty patent, the inferences that can be drawn from that—I want to say, though, in connection with that company that their experience in northern Ontario has been pretty profitable and pretty rewarding. If it comes to be a question of write-offs, or the depreciation and payment for capital equipment, they have suffered at the hands of fortune some pretty pleasant experience. They have been in business for about six years now—I think this is their sixth year.

I will go on now. Maybe I will throw caution to the winds a little bit because I get swept along in the tide.

I recall last fall in my own community when the president of that company came into the community, they lionized him. You would think it was a veritable crusader back from the crusades against the infidel, the way he was received by the community. Not by myself, I did not go to the meeting. In the space of six years they have had a pretty good result in their capital investment and I believe it was last year—perhaps the year before—but they started to pay a dividend on their common stock.

One observes that Trans-Canada Pipe Lines has not paid one on their own yet, but Northern Ontario Natural Gas has and their

profit picture has been pretty stimulating to the owners of that company and the management. So I think the time is at hand when the government—whatever the views of the hon. Minister are, I trust that we will hear them—that the government should begin to think in terms of some relief for the residential users of that product. As we were told, it was our birthright, almost, when that great resource was piped from western Canada; it was not only going to be a great boon to industry in that part of the country but was going to afford a great measure of relief, economically speaking, to the people who, through some nine if not ten months of the year, ten months some years, have to use some form of oil heat to heat their homes. That is one of the penalties, of course, of living in northern Ontario, that until on in the month of May as well as the month of September, sometimes in June and sometimes in August, the thermostat activates the furnace on as a protection against the discomfort of cold nights and mornings.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): But there are many compensating factors.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. My hon. leader tells me, and it is quite true, that there are many compensating factors for living in that part of the country.

However, if it is such a great blessing, then I am not one of those who is particularly concerned about the comfortable profits of that company. In fact, let me go on to say, and this will be my final word, a lot of people will not like me for saying it, it will take a good many years in my life, if the Lord preserves me over a normal span, till the dirty taste in my mouth from that company is washed out of it and disappears.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, may I say that there was a rate hearing last year before the board, in 1963, and anyone who was interested in rates could appear before that board. I would think that this was called for the benefit of people in the north. The report is finished and was presented in 1964, this spring. If the hon. member would like, or has any other specific question, I would be only too happy to get it for him from the board.

Mr. Sopha: I will not pursue it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, let me pursue another aspect of the same question.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, may I bow out at this time because the hon. member wants to pursue a similar question. I want to divert into another area, if you do not mind.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a couple of questions, just to get a little background here? Is Union Gas still operating on its contract bringing gas from the southern United States or has that been completed and are they now getting their gas from Trans-Canada?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, they are still bringing some in from the southern United States.

Mr. MacDonald: When will it be a complete switch to the trans-Canada sources?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure of this, and I have talked about it to officials at Union Gas, but I believe it is 1967.

Mr. MacDonald: One of my hon. members from that area suggests even 1970. In other words, it is some years hence.

Can the hon. Minister also inform me what percentage of the gas that Union distributes is gas produced from wells in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I have not the exact figure here but it would be less than one per cent—that is, Ontario gas used by Union Gas.

Mr. MacDonald: The situation as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is this: Union Gas is now getting its gas from the southern United States, which is almost as far away as western Canada; when it finishes getting it from there, when its current contract is completed, it will get it all from Trans-Canada; coming in the same way, for example, as Consumers' here in Toronto is getting its gas.

So I come back to the question I raised yesterday. What justification is there for the consumers who are being served by Union Gas being able to get fuel for \$1.07 per thousand cubic feet, when the consumers who are being served by Consumers' Gas Company in Hamilton, Toronto and east of here, are paying \$1.35 residential rate? What justification is there for that continued spread which amounts to about \$50 per family on an average year's consumption?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, it is not possible for me to give the hon. member

an answer at this particular time, but I will get the answer from the board, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. MacDonald: I would be very glad to get some explanation.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Would there be any possibility that Ontario Hydro might have some effect, with its shadow permeating the scene and affecting the price of gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a question which perhaps could be asked of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) when he is up speaking on Hydro.

Mr. Troy: I think it is up to the hon. Minister to answer that one because Ontario Hydro say: "Oh, no, no! We are not—"

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, so would I maybe.

Mr. Troy: I thought the hon. Minister might have a different answer, but I see they are all in the same boat.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, following the remarks of the hon. member for Nipissing, then following also the hon. member for Sudbury in his remarks respecting the Northern Ontario Natural Gas; this company, according to him, and according to the figures that we have seen, has done pretty well. It would almost seem that something should be done by way of a decreasing rate to the consumer in the province.

Personally, I share the view of the hon. member for Nipissing that into this picture enters Hydro and Hydro are afraid, desperately afraid, of the competition that gas could give them if they were made to supply gas at the rates that they could supply it in this province and still make a profit.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister if there is that thinking in his department. Is there a suggestion that if you were to, by the circuitous route that is employed, order gas to be reduced to the consumer of this province, it would then become a much more formidable opposition for Hydro, and Hydro would not like it, and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman realizes I have only been in this department six months, but I would say I do not think we have any fear along that line at the present time. I think it is the feeling of the department that we in Ontario are going to need perhaps all the Hydro we can develop, and we are going to need all

the gas that we can develop, over the next five or six years in order to meet the demand. When you are going through a development stage, I do not think you start worrying about surpluses or competition in this field.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, let us stick with this for a minute now. The hon. Minister says he is new in this department and this is right. I do not happen to be able to go back to the record and pull out the quotes now, but there is on record—because I have heard them myself—from predecessors of his, Ministers who were responsible for the handling of gas in the province of Ontario—indeed I remember the hon. Dana Porter, when we were questioning why the government was so reticent, indeed it became evident it was opposed to the proposition of public ownership, he as much as said that this would provide unfair competition for other fuels. This is a statement of policy that is on the record back in 1956 and 1957.

In other words this government, either because of its doctrinaire belief in free enterprise, or under pressure from the oil and conceivably Hydro, decided that it was not going to have public ownership of the distribution of gas; because with public ownership of the distribution of gas it would become a severely competitive fuel with existing fuels.

So what this government determined in its policies was that it was going deliberately to fritter away the opportunity for this new source of power to be available at cost, namely, natural gas. And the way it was frittered away was to dictate and to direct that under no condition would it be handled by public ownership, because this would make it available at a severely competitive price.

I quoted from the record yesterday the testimony of the former mayor of Sudbury, in which he stated that this was the directive which came from the hon. Dana Porter at that time, and I submit it has been a policy of this government—not only opposition to public ownership throughout northern Ontario; indeed it directed that the whole of the distribution was to be given to this one company. In other words, it deliberately frittered away the advantage of a lower price which could have come from natural gas, and the hon. members on this side of the House are correct: You created a situation in which this Northern Ontario Natural Gas is sitting on a gold mine, figuratively speaking. It is getting great returns; it is now in the position where it is going to start buying out other concerns.

This is not only true of Northern Ontario Natural Gas. I can remember, when we were

considering the arrival of western gas here in the Metropolitan area, that there was a great deal of discussion in the paper about the relative heat capacity of natural gas as compared with the manufactured gas which had been used in many communities in southern Ontario. The heat capacity of natural gas is much greater; I have forgotten what the ratio is now. Therefore the calculation was that if you had natural gas you would be able to get your price down so much below what manufactured gas was, and be able to get the same production in terms of heat.

The interesting thing is that when consumers got the gas from western Canada, there was not this reduction in price. And I will give Oakah Jones full credit; he is one of the slickest PR men in this country who is running an industry. He kept his price at the top level and he has been bringing it down in very small degrees over the years, each one with a great unveiling of propaganda as to what this company is doing. But his price is still above what it should be if it were relative to the heat capacity of manufactured gas.

This is the reason why I come back and tie in with the comment I was making earlier; I am convinced that Consumers', like Northern Ontario Natural Gas, has by the policies of this government, been conceded a position in which it is making an extraordinary amount of money. Therefore it is able to expand. If I may just relate this to the whole burden of my case yesterday—now that the government has handed over to them—jointly, through a subsidiary, with Imperial Oil—the rest of the storage areas in Lambton, the uneconomic cost of storing and transporting gas to the Lambton areas about which Mr. Jones was complaining years ago, he is now happy with because it is going to be channelled into his pocket instead of into Union's pocket.

In other words, the government has created a situation in which the gas companies of the province of Ontario are making money hand-over-fist. And the time has come—indeed it is past—when there should be a severe re-examination of all the factors which go into the rate base and which are used to justify the present charges that they make to the consumer.

So the consumers of Northern Ontario Natural Gas—not only in Sudbury but in this whole area of the golden horseshoe and east—should be getting a reduction which, I submit to this House, should be something approaching 25 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. And in doing so, the price would still be as

high as Union is now charging in western Ontario.

Mr. Troy: Yes, and there is another matter too, which the hon. Minister said about Hydro a moment ago. If he looks at the advertisements down in the lobby of this building, he will find out it says there that our sources of added Hydro power are very limited, that you have to go into thermal power; that is going to be more expensive because you have to bring coal from the United States—the Maritimes or the west are out of the question. It also says we have to get atomic power, which is to be more expensive, so naturally you are going to get still more pressure from Hydro to keep the gas prices up.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): What did the hon. member have in 1943?

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, would you please discipline that boor?

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I will try very hard, after that last comment, to behave myself. I do not want to be disciplined, but I think at this stage of the game I would like to—last night during the debate someone mentioned taxes pertaining to the gas companies.

As I understand it, and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong, the Union Gas Company, on its structures, the buildings it owns and the land it owns, pays municipal taxes the same as any private enterprise does.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It was on transmission lines.

Mr. Bukator: Just a few years ago, the government saw fit to extend it to transmission lines. It pays business tax on transmission lines also, in municipalities. That is correct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right.

Mr. Bukator: Why I make this point is that I would like the hon. member for Muskoka—I understand he is going to speak directly after your estimates on Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to make this point at this time: While the biggest competitor for the gas company is Hydro, the gas companies do pay municipal taxes wherever they are established. Hydro pays grants in lieu of, which is much lower. I will make a bigger and better point, I hope, when the

hon. member for Muskoka has a chance to speak on it. There has been an inequality here for many, many years and I think the gas companies are, in this instance, carrying their load; Hydro is not.

Vote 603 agreed to.

On vote 604:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 604, I had rather hoped that we would get some sort of a statement on government policy insofar as conservation is concerned. When the original estimates were introduced, it was my understanding that because this was a comparatively new department the new hon. Minister would deal with the energy portions of the estimates; the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) was supposed to deal with the conservation portion, I think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) was going to take on water resources, and the hon. member for Muskoka was going to take on Hydro.

Mr. Sopha: With the help of the man from Renfrew South.

Mr. Singer: The man from Renfrew South? Well, I do not really know.

But I gather there has been some change of thought insofar as this method of procedure is concerned, and the task of enunciating government policy insofar as conservation is concerned falls upon the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. I listened carefully to his remarks, both when he introduced his estimates and subsequently, and unfortunately there has been no statement at all about whether there is or is not a government policy, or any different government policy, insofar as conservation is concerned. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that this would be something that the government would be most interested in and worried about, particularly in view of some of the material that has been presented to the public over the last several months.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I tried to make a statement here regarding conservation before the orders of the day and I was told to leave it until the proper vote comes up, so perhaps that will answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I will gladly give way to the hon. Minister if this statement is what he wants to read. I have already read it. It really does not say anything about conservation. It has something to do with having the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.

Stewart) give some more money for farm ponds and a few other little things.

I wonder if he should not draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) to the fact that this was in the hands of the press before it was delivered in the House, because he was a little perturbed that the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) had a predigested press release handed out. But this is the one that the hon. Minister is talking about. If he wants me to give way for a few minutes, I gladly will. Go ahead, read it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the report was handed to the press as I started to give it before the House, before I was so rudely stopped. Now, if we can carry on with conservation.

Mr. Singer: Well, does my hon. friend want to read his statement?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I will read it on the vote, that is what you people want.

Mr. Singer: Should we plead with you to read it or do you—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the fact remains that we have no government statement on the policies in regard to conservation presently before the House and this statement does not really deal with conservation either.

I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that the government would have been somewhat concerned about news stories such as that concerning the new Fairy Lake park, which was opened with a great deal of public acclaim on the Wednesday before July 2 up at Newmarket and within a few days it was closed again because it was polluted.

One would have thought that somewhere along the line, in the diversification of various government efforts into these fields, that there could be some joining together of government authorities to make sure that when they open a park that they are not going to have to close it within a few days because the stream or the pond in it designated for swimming purposes is polluted. This is a typical example and highlights, more than I can by any series of examples, the inadequacy of government approach insofar as this important field is concerned. Here is a park in York county, that is opened, and within a few days thereafter the health authorities move in and they close it up because it is polluted and they cannot allow the public in

because of danger of infection. Could there be any greater condemnation of the lack of government co-ordination in these fields?

Mr. Chairman, I came across, and I am sure that most hon. members were in receipt of this same publication, a pamphlet called "Crisis on the Credit" written by Robert Turnbull in a series of articles in the *Globe and Mail*. This, as a matter of fact, was the series of articles that entitled Mr. Turnbull to the outstanding distinction of a national newspaper award for his ability in writing about matters of public concern. This is a pamphlet, if the hon. Minister has not read it, and I would presume he has not because he has had nothing to say on conservation, that I would urgently commend to his attention. As a matter of fact, after I am through speaking I will send it over to him so he can read it. There are certain portions of it marked here that I am going to draw to his attention now. Mr. Turnbull had this to say:

Water and soil are the two most precious substances on earth. On them all life depends, yet they are the resources most prodigally squandered by mankind.

Throughout the centuries the abuse of water and soil has turned fruitful lands into barren deserts, a creeping evil that is far from ended. Today priceless soil is being smothered under the sterile concrete of urban expansion across fields and forest cover. Today equally priceless water is being polluted by human sewage and industrial wastes and water levels are rapidly dwindling so that in the summer muddy trickles remain where once proud rivers ran.

As man builds he also destroys and by the destruction of natural resources he is sapping the very foundations on which he seeks to build.

Now the hon. Minister made a discovery when he prepared this press release. He discovered there had been a drought last year, and suddenly all of the resources of government are being mustered to do something about the very thing that Mr. Turnbull points out has gone on for many years.

The creation of this department and the bringing into it of the conservation branch and the water resources branch still leaves the same fragmentation of authority in government thinking that existed before. As I mentioned when the bill forming this new department was set up, we are playing a little game called "Button, button, who has got the new commission?"; and apparently it is this hon. Minister's turn at this time. But we still have the planning authority left with

the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Chairman, and, in this statement that the hon. Minister is going to read sometime later in the afternoon when he gets in the mood, we have additional responsibilities given to the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

It is small wonder that we are not getting anywhere in the field of conservation. It is small wonder that we have the crisis on the Credit that Mr. Turnbull talks about so eloquently. It is small wonder, Mr. Chairman, when there is this diversification of authority within government and with the various Cabinet Ministers and within the various commissions, that there is not anyone on the government benches that is prepared to stand up and say this is our policy on conservation. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is no government policy on conservation and that there cannot be a government policy on conservation as long as there is this great diversification and confusion that exists in the minds of the Cabinet.

Mr. Turnbull talks about the ravaged Humber or the sleazy Don. Now any of us who live in the Metropolitan area and are familiar at all with the Humber River or the Don River will recognize that these are most apt descriptions, notwithstanding the efforts that have been put forward over the years, and I commend the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. I think they have done a very fine job, under a very serious limitation. Notwithstanding their efforts—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): With the great assistance of this government and with some assistance from Ottawa. Now be fair!

Mr. Singer: All right, I will be fair, as the hon. Minister says. This government has given some assistance and Ottawa has given some assistance. And I will be just as fair as the hon. Minister. He talked about "great" and "some". I will say that at least both levels of government did something, but they are still a long way short of having produced something that can be described as beautiful rivers again, or even clean rivers, or even attractive rivers. The descriptions "ravaged Humber" and "sleazy Don", I say, are most apt.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, when I drove down the Don Valley Parkway this morning there were froth bubbles from detergents about two feet high on portions of the Don River. This is a common occurrence on the Don almost every day and I would presume it is the same on the Humber, although I do not see it quite as frequently as I see the Don.

These rivers are running slow, they are open sewers in fact, and there is very little being done or attempted in any enunciation of government policy that is going to clear this up.

Mr. Turnbull says that in the year 1954, and I am going to talk about the Credit River because it was possible, and perhaps still is possible, to do something to save the Credit. He says this:

In the year 1954 the provincial government established the Credit Valley Conservation Authority to be the guardian of the river. In 1956 a voluminous study covering every conceivable aspect of the watershed was completed and it made 55 recommendations which it deemed necessary to the betterment of the protection of the valley.

During the years since dust has gathered on most of the suggestions, although there are some indications that some of the cobwebs may be blown away this year.

That was 1963. I do not know what cobwebs were blown away in 1963, and perhaps before the debate is over the hon. Minister will be in a position to tell us.

This paragraph goes on to say:

Admittedly, good progress has been made in developing public park lands but that is about all that has been done in a physical sense.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Chairman, should, I think, pay some attention to that remark, because he wanted some credit and Mr. Turnbull gives some credit. He says that:

Admittedly, good progress has been made in developing public park lands but that is about all that has been done in a physical sense.

And what, in fact, I am talking about, is pollution.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I would suggest to the hon. member that he get Mr. Turnbull to meet with Dr. Ross Lord, the chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto Conservation Authority, and he will tell him a thing or two. Much more than that has been done, let me assure you.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am happy that the hon. Minister should mention Dr. Ross Lord. I know Dr. Lord very well. I worked with him on the planning board of the township of North York. I had a bit to say at the time he was appointed to his present position. At the beginning of my

remarks I commended the Metropolitan Toronto Conservation Authority for the work it has done.

My criticism is not directed to it or to the chairman, Dr. Ross Lord. My criticism is directed to the government and I am suggesting that the government has not as yet seen fit to co-ordinate its efforts in this field and it is still a hodge-podge of confusion. But since some responsibility apparently is with the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, and some is with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and some is with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and some is with the water resources commission, and some is with somebody else, order cannot possibly be brought out of the chaos that exists there. The government, in continuing this chaos, is making sure that very little is being done to clean up the pollution.

Look at the Don River, look at the Humber River, look what is happening to the Credit River; that, Mr. Chairman, is the condemnation of the government's policy and if there is any answer to this, it is not just sufficient to have somebody say, "Talk to Dr. Ross Lord and he will set you straight." I would have hoped, and I think we were entitled to hear from the government benches today, some defence of government policy, some plans about how it is going to clear up river pollution. But we have not heard a word from any one of them.

The hon. Minister piqueishly says, "If I had read my statement it would have fixed everything up." Well, in due course he will read his statement. But there is nothing in there about pollution and there is a further division of authority. The hon. Minister of Agriculture is given some additional responsibilities. Again the confusion is extended rather than limited. Again there is no policy.

It is interesting to hear that in 1956, when these 1955 recommendations were introduced—no, I am sorry, it was a year later—a gentleman named Leslie M. Frost, who held a position of substantial authority at that time, said:

This is the time to act. We must do something now.

In 1957 Mr. Frost was making those statements, but in 1964 very little has been done.

On page 3, Mr. Turnbull said:

Yet if the physical health of the watershed waits much longer for attention, the river inevitably will wither. Pollution will increase as the water flow decreases. Life dribbles away irretrievably with each day, month and year of inaction.

We have had a lot of days, months and years of inaction from this government.

There is a picture here on page four and the title under it says:

Sewage and detergents are stirred into an unsavoury mess. Born in purity, the Credit progressively changes into a coffee-coloured sewer.

I am not going to read all of this book. It runs through 46 pages, but there are some extracts in here that are certainly worth careful study.

Again, on page 17, Mr. Turnbull has this to say:

Already then, the river has waited more than seven years since the CVA report of 1956 for remedies, and has 15 more years at least to wait before a partial cure. But there is no doubt that a 70 per cent improved flow would go far to combat pollution:

In the meantime, though, urbanization of the valley will increase the pressures on the river so the time for action is now.

Words with a familiar ring, for they were said about the same problem in 1956 by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Frost.

On page 18:

So it was not until 1956, two years after the authority was formed, that a detailed report on the Credit River was produced.

Again reference to the 1955 recommendations, and most important to the health of the valley:

Most of them have not as yet been implemented.

On page 27, Mr. Turnbull refers to conversations he has had with municipal officials:

Looking to the future of Chinguacousy, Reeve Clarke sees a city of 50,000 persons growing up around Bramalea subdivision and hopes the valley will be developed as one big recreation area.

What does he regard as the greatest problem plaguing the river in his township? "Pollution," says Reeve Clarke.

T. W. Glassford, the reeve of Caledon, says, "Water pollution is our greatest problem."

The title under the picture on page 39 of this pamphlet reads:

Turbid and tarnished, the Credit dies amid the urban hubbub along Lake Ontario.

On page 41 I read:

Several factors have caused the deterioration of the fishing: silting, through gravel

washing operations, which are now controlled; pollution from sewage and rubbish dumps; dwindling water flow with resulting high temperatures that play hob with fish such as brook trout, comfortable only in cold, clean water.

And then, finally, in his last article, entitled, "Too Many Doctors for an Ailing River," he has this to say:

The greatest problem, however, is the confusion over who is responsible for what. So many fingers on so many levels of government and departments thereof dabble in the stream that the waters of responsibility are inevitably muddled.

For example, planning and land use, including building, come under eight separate bodies: the municipal council, the Ontario Municipal Board, The Department of Municipal Affairs, the Ontario Water Resources Commission, the conservation authority, The Department of Lands and Forests, The Department of Agriculture and Metropolitan Toronto planning.

I would like the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, because he seems to be the only one who is even the least bit concerned about this, to tell us how, with these eight different authorities involved in this thing, he can expect to get any order out of the chaos that exists.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Does the hon. member want an answer now?

Mr. Singer: Yes, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member realizes very well that he is just attempting to confuse the issue. He knows very well that the Ontario Municipal Board, for instance, to which he has referred, is the final authority in hearing all of the discussions and all of the problems and all of the recommendations in connection with planning. He understands that better than I do, but still he attempts to confuse the whole issue by saying there are eight authorities responsible. Nothing of the kind. The people responsible are the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and other authorities, and they are the ones doing the job with respect to the Credit River and other streams in this general area.

Mr. Singer: I am glad that we have the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs into that point. I did not throw the municipal board in; I said Mr. Turnbull did. But I must go on and say that there is joint responsibility among municipal authorities in the hon.

Minister's department, in the new Department of Energy and Resources Management, in the water resources department, in The Department of Agriculture, and in a couple more too.

I suggest that it is no answer for the hon. Minister to stand up and say, "Well, first of all it is not a Metro conservation authority that is concerned in this, it is the Credit conservation authority, which is a different one." The Metro conservation authority comes in nevertheless. If you are going to produce any answer on the Credit—the Humber and the Don are probably gone irretrievably, I do not think you are ever going to be able to fix those up—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): No, they are not.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for High Park says no, they are not. I hope he is right.

Mr. Cowling: I am going to speak when the hon. member—

Mr. Singer: Well, I hope he is right. I hope there will be the day when somebody can drive down the Don Valley parkway and not be able to see four or five feet of detergents going through that open sewer, which used to be, 50 years ago or perhaps 100 years ago, one of the finest streams in Ontario. I hope that day will be coming but I have grave doubts. I hope the hon. member for High Park and I live long enough to be able to see that, to see a nice clean stream there where the Don River now runs, and where the Humber River now runs, but I doubt it very much. Certainly we are not going to get it as long as there is this mix-up in authority on the government benches.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There is no mix-up at all.

Mr. Singer: I am quoting again from Mr. Turnbull:

Water supply, including financing of systems, is touched by six bodies: municipal council, OMB, Municipal Affairs, conservation authorities, Lands and Forests, OWRC.

And he did not have available at that time a new Department of Energy and Resources Management, but that can be added in now.

Finally, he says this on page 46, which is the last page:

Perhaps the Credit River has too many doctors, when one considers all the government fingers that feel its pulse. All of these physicians know that the river is sick and it requires treatment and nursing back

to health. And for nearly ten years now they have stood around the patient's bed; while they stand the river's life blood, water, is failing.

And in the last paragraph he says this:

Without dams and reservoirs one year of drought—

and I think we had that last year:

—it might be this year, or next year or the one after, there is no telling, could destroy the Credit River. The time for action is now.

Now this criticism is not levied only insofar as the Credit River is concerned; this criticism is applicable equally in all of the river valleys in southern Ontario certainly. And even in the north as well.

But when the government deliberately carries on this fragmentation of authority, this balkanization, if you want to call it that, the government is encouraging a lack of action that Mr. Turnbull complains about so eloquently in this series of articles.

The planning is with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and his department. The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management has a supervisory jurisdiction over the water resources commission. Apparently he has the responsibility—and I am not clear on this and I wish he would tell us—for the conservation authorities. I suppose it really relates to the handing out of money.

Part of that responsibility he gives over to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The water resources commission comes under this hon. Minister as well, but the water resources commission is, after all, a commission, and is independent; so the hon. Minister is not supposed to, by the rules, interfere too much with this.

Mr. Chairman: The water resources commission comes under—

Mr. Singer: Oh, I agree, Mr. Chairman, and my criticism is not the water resources commission; my criticism is—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member does not know what it is; let us be fair.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, I have only one copy; but I will send it to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management and he can pass it on to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, merely this: This government has the most unhappy record in the field of conservation, and in its actions taken in this session of the Legislature it has

done nothing to give any encouragement to the people of Ontario that it is really concerned about the problems which exist.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the hon. member for Downsview about conservation and I think an awful lot the hon. member said was with tongue in cheek. It must be. For example, he referred to the Don. I used to swim in the Don in the old swimming hole, just where the Don Valley Parkway is, and it was pretty clean in those days.

The hon. member must remember that there is much more of the Don, up north of where you drive past every day, than there is south of that area; and much of it up in there is in pretty good condition.

However, I am going to confine my remarks to the Humber. I live out on the banks of the Humber and I am much more familiar with it. As one of the government members on the Metropolitan Toronto conservation authority, I think that there are some things which should be said about the work of that great body, Mr. Chairman. Certainly the pollution of the water is one part of their work which is receiving not only attention but action; and I have some comments to make on the annual report of Dr. Ross Lord, the chairman of the authority, made just a month or two ago; I think they would well go into the record, Mr. Chairman.

For example, he said:

The land acquisition of the Metropolitan Toronto conservation authority has grown, from 1,800 acres in 1957 to over 13,500 acres in 1963. The conservation areas, now numbering nine, open to the public, comprising some 4,300 acres, attracted 157,000 people in 1957; and in 1963 the attendance for the first time topped the one million mark.

I hope the hon. member is listening to this, Mr. Chairman.

The million people are not going into this area just for—well, I was going to say the fun and games, but actually they are going for that reason; they are also going there because they use the water, and the water in the conservation areas north of the city of Metropolitan Toronto is clean enough to use, to bathe in, and to enjoy.

Mr. Singer: Fairy Lake Park?

Mr. Cowling: Yes, including that one.

Mr. Singer: That was the one they closed down—

Mr. Cowling: Well, listen to this now. The flood control plan, which is all helping to keep the water pure and usable, launched in 1961, after the signing of the agreement between the federal and provincial governments and the authorities, is now well under way. The Clairville dam will be completed by the summer of 1964, and many other projects are either completed or progressing favourably. I have seen these jobs under construction. The conservation school at the Albion Hills is completing a most gratifying first year.

I can remember suggesting several years ago in the House, and maybe hon. members on the other side did too, that we should take advantage of this conservation and make sure that the students in our schools should have firsthand information about this important subject.

So this government assisted in having a school built in the conservation area at the Albion Hills. It is a very remarkable place; I have been there several times. School boards have reserved time for the entire academic session, and the 1964-65 season is almost completely booked up at this date. The school has already proven itself to be a fine addition to our facilities; it is a beautiful building and, at the same time, is efficiently functional. You should go up and have a look at that, if you have not already done so.

The conservation services work of the authority has continued to expand. During the year, 337,000 trees were planted. The farm tree replacement programme handled 3,000 trees and there were 25 farm ponds built in 1963.

During the year various schemes were initiated to increase the holdings in the conservation area by 525 acres, and there is a great list of new areas which have been taken over by the authority. In addition to the above-mentioned areas, the authority owns and manages the following: Bruce's Mill, Glen Major, Uxbridge and a Palgrave wildlife conservation area. A total of 7,000 acres of flood lands have been developed.

The flood control road work is proceeding as quickly as funds and engineering designs permit. The Clairville dam, under construction since last fall, has 80 per cent of its concrete and 40 per cent of its earth placement completed. The dam construction is well ahead of schedule and should be finished by August 1964. The Indian Line road for this project has been completed and the contracts have been let.

In 1963, there were 84 properties and

1,538 acres; the total to date is 195 properties, 27,000 acres. This is under the federal-provincial authority for participation projects, which this government is so active in supporting.

A significant contribution to the conservation services division this year was the preparation and presentation of the brief on recreation and water pollution in the Metropolitan Toronto region. This brief studies in detail the factors contributing to the pollution of our rivers and recommends a plan which, if followed, will preserve certain areas from pollution for years to come.

Mr. Singer: Well, that is the whole point.

Mr. Cowling: All right, we are getting on with it. Get this, Mr. Chairman:

The report, already approved by the authorities, has been presented to the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board and will be presented to other area boards and councils within the next few months.

Information and education—in this division of our work, the outstanding event during 1963 was the completion of the conservation school; the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) opened that school. Any one of the hon. members, sir, who have not visited the pioneer village just north of Metropolitan Toronto, should certainly take advantage of the fine weather and go up and have a look at this display.

Now, something of the future. Last year it was said that we were well launched on the flood control programme. The programme has been considerably advanced this year. The Claireville dam, completed in 1964; the Black Creek, the York Mills channel, should be constructed this summer. Our land acquisition for flood control has reached 6,300 acres.

This land, Mr. Chairman, is being acquired as fast as funds will permit.

In the report a year ago, it was stated that pollution of our rivers must be attacked in a more vigorous fashion. I am happy to say that the authority has taken the first major step in this direction by the production of this report on recreation and pollution control in the area. This report lays out a working plan, which, if followed, will enable us to conserve certain waters from creeping pollutions for a few decades at least. In my opinion, the report is a forthright attempt at the solution of what many thought to be an almost unsolvable problem. It is my sincere hope that all planning boards and municipalities will adopt the plan.

Now, you were saying we were just moving helter-skelter on this thing and that nothing is being done about the pollution of our streams. I think it lays out in this report that this particular authority, with the assistance of the government, is doing something, is actively engaged in doing something about cleaning up our waters in this great Metropolitan area. And as Toronto goes, so do the other conservation areas. No doubt they will all have an opportunity of considering this report on pollution, because as you know the 31 conservation authorities which operate in the province meet together annually. I understand that the chairman and vice-chairman and others meet more regularly than that, to discuss mutual problems. Certainly this one on pollution is at the top of the list.

What I am pointing out, Mr. Chairman, is something is being done about it. We are past the talking stage and we are going to work on the problem.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Frost said that ten years ago.

Mr. Cowling: As we all know, the 23 municipalities in the Metropolitan area make it possible for this particular Metropolitan conservation authority to carry on its good work and they have a very active part in the whole situation.

Mr. Chairman, it is so easy to criticize this pollution matter.

Mr. MacDonald: It is even easier to do nothing.

Mr. Cowling: It is a very simple thing to criticize the air pollution, with which I have had some experience, but things are being done about it.

This government set up the first air pollution control. It was this government that established The Conservation Authorities Act in the first place; everybody else just talked about it.

Now I do agree, Mr. Chairman, that there has been some overlapping of authority in various departments. As a matter of fact, I suggested some time ago that maybe we should have a Minister of conservation only and maybe that will come about one of these days. But in the meantime, my view, Mr. Chairman, is that the conservation authorities are now in the right place, sir, under the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Here is a man who will give conservation the place that it deserves in the role of government and working together we can go a long way to conserve these

wonderful natural resources we have in this great province.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, it was with a great deal of interest that I listened to the hon. member for High Park and his last suggestion that perhaps a Minister of conservation be appointed. It is a good suggestion, and with the obvious interest of the hon. Minister I think he should talk to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) about it and perhaps get an appointment directly to the Cabinet for this purpose.

Mr. MacDonald: That may be the quickest way.

Mr. Young: Well, it might kill it, we do not know. We have to experiment here a little bit.

But I think what he said about the Metro conservation authority is all good, and certainly I think all of us agree that the Metro conservation authority has been doing an outstanding job within the power which it has been given by the provincial government. It has been cribbed, cabined and confined by its financial limitations and has gone as far as it can under the circumstances. Under Dr. Ross Lord, however, I think something has been accomplished.

I also have some quotations here from the report of the conservation authority, the last one, and it also, in addition to what the hon. member for High Park has said, issues a warning to this government and to the people of Ontario. This warning is along this line. I might say that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs said that the authority has been assisted by this government and by the federal government. That is true, assisted, but not enough; because this report says that:

Pollution often reaches several hundred times the levels accepted as safe by the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

This is in the rivers in Metro. It shows that Metro's standards for sewage treatment are behind those of other countries and may have to be raised. The Don and the Humber Rivers are grossly polluted, the report said, and blamed the discharge of inadequately treated sewage. Then, it goes on to say this:

But even the best Metro and outlying treatment plants operating under the best conditions do only two-thirds the treatment job demanded by some countries.

So we have a long piece to go here in Metro, and a long piece to go in other authorities, to bring up the standard of what we ought to be doing in the way of treating the effluence from industry and from the cities and towns along our streams.

But there is another matter which I want to bring before the House this afternoon in this connection. It is this: The Metro authority today needs to buy a great deal of land along our river valleys which is now available and which it cannot purchase because of its lack of funds. Subdivisions have been progressing at a great rate in this area as we all know, and those subdivisions are overreaching the financial resources of the conservation authority. So today the conservation authority would like to purchase much land and it cannot because of its financial handicaps.

I think, sir, that you, as the Minister in charge of this operation, ought to give very serious consideration to working out—I am not going to suggest how it should be done—but working out the kind of financial arrangement which will enable the Metro conservation authority, and any other conservation authority in similar circumstances, to acquire the lands that should be acquired before the overreaching subdivisions push the banks down into the streams and do all kinds of things that they are doing today because that land cannot be acquired ahead of the subdivider. So I put that before you, sir, as one of the great needs today in this realm of conservation.

Another matter of which this House should be aware is one which has recently emerged and been highlighted by the Great Lakes conference held at the University of Toronto under the auspices of the Great Lakes Institute. It was pointed out at that time that 25 per cent of all Canadians live within the Great Lakes basin and that these lakes are becoming polluted at a rate which is unprecedented in human history.

Lake Erie, according to studies made by the Great Lakes Institute, and Lake Michigan also, has only about 60 per cent of the sewage and industrial waste flowing into them treated. They point out that until we get about 80 per cent treated, that the balance between pure and impure water cannot be maintained. So they have stressed that drastic steps must be taken right away to see to it that the kind of pollution control is undertaken which will restore the balance in these lakes. We are polluting them faster than nature can look after the situation.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, today

we are turning the Great Lakes into the biggest septic tank in human history. Dr. Langford points this out, and it is reported in the *Financial Post* of April 18 that in the next ten years, if we do not check pollution on a large scale, we may not be able to restore Michigan and Erie to anything like normal conditions.

He said that there is a dead area of about 2,000 square miles at the bottom of Lake Erie where fish and other organisms cannot live, there is no oxygen. The phenol count, refuse discharged by industries, is higher than the level recommended by the international joint commission. He says also that it is doubtful whether any beach in Lake Erie is fit for swimming. The turbidity and amount of dissolved salts has increased during the past few years.

Now if this is so—and we already know the effects of pollution upon the fishery industry in Lake Erie—and if this statement is true then those fisheries as well as the great tourist industry face a very serious future. What this means for health along the bathing beaches of Lake Erie is another matter we will have to take into serious consideration.

The institute pointed out something else; that atomic power is now making possible great desalting plants using salt water as a basis and that by 1975 at the very latest, these plants can operate with sufficient capacity to bring salt water into the fresh state to handle any industry which may so wish.

The threat here is clear. As the pollution increases in the Great Lakes, then the great industrial complexes situated around these lakes may well be looking to the east coast and the west coast for future industrial sites. If they go, of course, the human beings who work in those industries must go with them.

As far back as 1909, we had a treaty, an international treaty between the United States and Canada, in connection with lake pollution and all this. But that treaty has never been taken seriously and the time is here when I think this government must push the federal government, and co-operate with the federal government and with international authorities in cleaning up the pollution in our rivers, at least those which flow into the Great Lakes; and then do our utmost to push back that pollution factor within the lakes themselves and change the emerging septic tank into lakes of pure water once more.

I do not need this afternoon, this has already been discussed at some length now and at a former time, I do not need to talk too much about what needs to be done and

the steps which need to be taken. But certainly the whole field of conservation along our streams must be looked at and the conservation processes must be speeded up immeasurably. The farm ponds that we heard so much about must be built, and built at a much more rapid rate. We must restore marginal land to forest growth. We must provide the sponges through swamp lands for the water to soak into the ground. All these measures must take place.

Then this matter of sewage disposal that the hon. member for Downsview spoke about, sir, and the pollution of our rivers caused by it, that has been discussed in this House, is desperately important. The water resources commission, when that matter comes before the House, should be discussed thoroughly. The water resources commission has a responsibility here. It must speed the process of cleaning up the effluence of industry and sewage from our towns and cities.

There is one other thing that I would like to mention at this time, and perhaps the hon. Minister has some advice about it. We have a situation developing as our subdivisions push up the river valleys. The lots are laid out so that they cross the ravines and the river valleys and those backs of lots become part and parcel of the real estate owned by the homeowner. So that forever, or until a government or an authority is willing to spend very large amounts of money, that land is lost to the public.

Then, too, the subdivider, in his enthusiasm to get more level land to build upon, pushes the earth down over the bank, buries the trees, the bushes and the grass. So instead of the original verdure which holds the slope we have a pile of mud which the first rain starts to wash down into the stream. This, of course, adds to the stream pollution. We have seen along our streams and water-courses and river valleys, in Metro and other places, this process going on. The trees die or are cut and these roots that should be holding the banks are destroyed, and the banks just slither into the rivers.

We have today, Mr. Chairman, legislation which enables a conservation authority to outline the proper banks, and to give power to the conservation authority, if it so wishes, to purchase this land between the top of a bank on the one side of a stream and the top of a bank on the other side of the stream. But this kind of legislation is only permissive, it is not mandatory. I think the time is here when this kind of legislation should be mandatory and no building should be allowed from the top of the bank down to the valley.

Not only no building, but this land should be set aside for acquisition by public authority, so that that land is held in perpetuity for the people. The banks can thus be preserved and the recreation areas in those valleys can be held for the people for years to come. I know it is not going to be easy to delineate the top of a bank, but these things are being done in many areas today and they can be done across the province.

The delineation should take place before subdivision, so any authority armed with this power could be moving ahead of development, delineating the tops of the banks and then acquiring the land. There again we come to the problem that I mentioned before, that money somehow must be made available, or credit, to buy that land at a price which is fair to the owner, but also fair to the authority which is acquiring it.

I bring these things to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and the attention of this House, because I think it is desperately important that we stop playing with this business of conservation and that we stop being satisfied with going as fast as it seems practical to go. We have to move much more rapidly, and we have to start now to face up to our responsibility of retrieving the ground we have lost, and preventing the kind of pollution and the kind of degradation of great natural resources, that we have seen in this province in the days that are gone.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, the one thing I agree with the hon. member for High Park about is that there should be—I notice too that he says he is a government member, I did not know he was in the Cabinet—but I do agree with him—

Mr. Cowling: Just to straighten my hon. friend out, I said I was a member of the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

Mr. Troy: He said he was the government member.

Mr. Cowling: The government member on that authority.

Mr. Troy: Oh, pardon me. I presume he is appointed by the government.

In any event I agree with him in one particular, that I think that this subject of conservation, because it has so much to do with our very life, should be a separate department and I have spoken on conservation before. I have brought attention to the fact that the supply of water is so important and I have repeated several times that this

government should have a conference with the federal government, with the province of Quebec, with the states that border on the Great Lakes. This problem of how we are going to replenish our water supplies and conservation, again, is very important, because of our forests and our agriculture and the land uses, the erosion of our streams, the pollution of our streams; all these are most important.

The hon. Minister mentioned the number of conservation authorities, I think by far the greater number is in southern Ontario. There are one or two, I believe, in northern Ontario. There is one in the Sudbury area and one, I believe, at the head of the lakes. But there are very few in northern Ontario.

One of the reasons that we need, as the former Minister of Lands and Forests and now the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs knows, and the northern hon. members know, is to set up conservation authorities in our section of the province. But the great problem is the fact that so many of our townships are unorganized. We in the Nipissing watershed, just as in the watersheds of the Mattagami in the vicinity of Timmins had their problems in regard to floods several years ago. We never know, in our own area, when we are going to have them again, so we should have conservation authorities in my own district.

As the federal member for Timiskaming pointed out too, at a meeting we had in my home city, there is a necessity for a conservation authority in his area. The problem, again, is that there are so many unorganized townships and very few organized townships to pay the bill. The former Minister of Economics and Development, now retired, and the former Minister of Lands and Forests, know this problem; other Ministers who have been in this department also know of the problems, but nothing has been done to set up a conservation authority in the Nipissing area.

Now, many of the townships are denuded of their forest cover. The result is that runoff in the spring is very heavy. If the water content of the snow is high, then we are faced with the possibility of floods destroying all sorts of suitable areas along the borders of Lake Nipissing. I would ask the hon. Minister if any thought has been given, not only in that area but in all other areas of northern Ontario, as to how we can possibly set up a conservation authority—when the government itself accepts no responsibility for the control dams and other projects which have to be arranged for in the unorganized townships.

I have spoken about this, time and time again. I have spoken to the former director of the branch; the present director of the branch, too, is cognizant of the problem, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is cognizant, and certainly the northern hon. members are. I wonder if anything can be done to make it at all possible for us to set up conservation authorities, because we have that watershed problem. I will read something into the record. This is from that very fine author of the letters of the Royal Bank of Canada. He points out that:

The watershed problem is one of the red letter problems of the day. Almost everything that has to do with renewable natural resources, with forestry, with farming, hunting, fishing and the economics of production, is tied up with the watershed.

I hope that some day, and some day soon, we will have from the government some indication of what they are doing to assist areas to set up conservation authorities in northern Ontario.

I notice that the hon. Minister is thinking that over and over, and I hope it goes beyond—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right; taking it under advisement.

Mr. MacDonald: Not only in the fullness of time, but in the stillness of time.

Mr. Troy: In time, at least.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I was hesitating, because I thought the question of the hon. member for Nipissing merited an answer.

Mr. Troy: They all do; all my questions do.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister sat staring at him. I would not say that the expression on his face conveyed to me the impression that there was very much cerebration going on, but the—

Mr. Troy: I hypnotized him.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member has something of a hypnotic effect—

Mr. Troy: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps the hon. member for Nipissing has discovered a new method of influencing the government. Certainly in this area we need some new devices and, unfortunately, we all too frequently encounter the kind of statement we got a few minutes

ago from the hon. member for High Park now that the hon. member for High Park and the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) are jointly the leaders of the hallelujah chorus on the benches opposite. I have no objection to hallelujahs, Mr. Chairman, but when they are a substitute for thought, policy and action they are not only inadequate but dangerous.

I would think, after what the hon. member for Yorkview had to say, the hon. member for High Park may wish to withdraw the major portion of his speech, but I want to elaborate on one phase of his remarks.

He referred to the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, referred to the fine work it is doing. I think that all of us in this House agree that the Metropolitan Toronto conservation authority has done a tremendous job and ought to be complimented on the work it has done. We regret that the funds it has at its disposal, for the very important work it has to do, are grossly inadequate; and as long as I have been a member of this House, the authority has, in my memory, been trying to put before the government the concept that much more funds are required for the work it has to do. Unfortunately, I do not know how much effect it has had on the government. I suspect that it is still as starved of financial resources as it has always been.

The hon. member for High Park referred to a report which the conservation authority issued recently. It is a report entitled: "Pollution Control and Recreation in the Metropolitan Toronto Region." It is dated June, 1963, although I think it has been circularized more recently than that. I received a copy of it only within the last month or so and I have no doubt other hon. members of the House got it at the same time.

In view of the suggestions of the hon. member for High Park and, to a lesser extent, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, that everything is under control in regard to pollution, I want to read a few extracts from this report. I think we will all note that it is couched in cautious and measured language. There is no attempt to do any rabble-rousing in this report, and it is proper that there should not be. The facts are simply stated dispassionately.

At the beginning of the report, the authority does us the service of providing us with an abstract, and I am going to read mainly from the abstract. I will start with the first two paragraphs of it:

A co-ordinated pollution control programme is needed urgently—

It does not say that it is now in operation but says it:

—is needed urgently in the Metropolitan Toronto region in order to preserve the existing and proposed outdoor recreation resource. Space and facilities for outdoor recreation are required to meet the demands of a present population of 1.8 million people which will more than double by the year 2000.

Sewage disposal facilities have been planned and partly implemented within the "suburban ring," in a manner which will safeguard the natural resources and their potential for recreation. Outside Metropolitan Toronto, pollution and recreation will clash. By 1980 approximately 55 cfs of sewage effluent will be delivered to the rivers above Metropolitan Toronto, while the mean minimum monthly flow of all streams, as they approach Metropolitan Toronto, is about 80 cfs at present.

A little later in the abstract the authority has this to say:

There are 22 sewage treatment plants within the conservation authority region. All but four discharge treated wastes to the streams of the region. In general, the condition of many streams is poor, particularly in the middle and lower reaches. Extraction of water from the streams, most of which have low summer flows, is increasing. The quantity of water available to the recreation programme is equally as important as water quality, and in certain cases and within certain limits of purity, quantity may be more important than quality depending on the specific water uses planned.

A little further in the same report:

The main purpose of this report is to propose a plan of water quality requirements for the region. It appears inevitable that a substantial volume of treated sewage will be discharged to streams north of the Metropolitan Toronto boundary. Where, and with what degree of treatment, are the questions of practical importance.

And then the abstract goes on to say that:

In this report the region has been divided into three zones:

1. Metro Zone—served by Metropolitan Toronto Works Department by lakeshore treatment plants, with recreation potential partly restricted by water quality.

2. Development Zone—served by local municipalities by upstream treatment plants, with recreation potential partly restricted by water quality.

3. Headwater Zone—served by local municipalities by upstream plants, with recreation potential unrestricted by water quality.

I think I will not read all of what is here, but I would like to read the section relating to the headwater zone:

The headwater zone is the section of the region which requires the greatest degree of control. Development above reservoir sites should be serviced by sewage disposal facilities which prevent the direct discharge of wastes to watercourses in the headwater zone.

Close co-operation between all agencies in planning and management of water use will ensure the success of conservation, recreation and pollution control schemes. The purpose of this report is to encourage and assist in the formation of a co-ordinated pollution control programme in the Metropolitan Toronto region.

I think one can say that the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority should be commended on the initiative it has taken in analyzing this problem and in suggesting solutions. I think it has done its part up till now. It has called attention to the problem and it has suggested ways through which it can be handled. But it does not follow, as the hon. member for High Park seems to think, Mr. Chairman, that because the problem has been delineated and suggestions have been made for remedying it we now have nothing to worry about. I would say that our worries start at this point. We now realize what the nature of the problem is and the question that surely faces us is: What is being done about it?

The next section of the conservation authority's report is a statement of policy and recommendations. I am going to read only two of the recommendations and I am going to read them with a view to asking the hon. Minister responsible: What is being done in relation to these recommendations? The first is item 3, under the general heading of Policy and Recommendations:

3. The authority recommends to the Ontario Water Resources Commission, the Ontario Municipal Board, The Department of Municipal Affairs, the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, and other planning boards in the region, that they consider this plan in formulating their policies on pollution abatement in the region.

The hon. member for Downsview complained about the division of authority in this field.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs pooched his suggestion. I must say that though I have a high regard for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, I could not quite see how he could take such a cavalier attitude to the problem. There is a real lack of co-ordination; there are so many people responsible in this field that nobody ever gets around to doing anything.

We heard yesterday, on another matter relating to safety, the handling of propane gas and other gases, that for 18 months the government has not done a solitary thing about urgent recommendations of a coroner's jury, because there are so many departments responsible that they still have not really settled among themselves what they are supposed to do. If that happens in one area I have no doubt it happens in every area. The more people you have responsible for the same thing, the less chance there is that anything is ever going to be done. I want to know what the government is going to do to formulate policies on pollution abatement in the region.

I would also like to read item 7, under this same heading:

7. The authority requests the province of Ontario to investigate any problems in pollution abatement posed by the general use of detergents; that is, to investigate detergents as they may interfere with sewage treatment processes, excessively enrich receiving waters, or indirectly create hazards to public health, and to take the appropriate action to solve problems which may be revealed.

I believe that the Ontario Research Council has been giving some study to this problem, I am not quite sure. But this has become a matter of major importance in the whole field of pollution abatement, and I would like to hear a statement from the government indicating that it is giving more than passing attention to the problem.

I would like to hear either now or at whatever time the hon. Ministers concerned may consider to be appropriate, not the fact that they have received this report—we have all received it and most of us have tried to understand it—but what they are doing about it, and what they are doing to develop co-ordination in this area of greatly divided responsibility.

I am also interested in the specific item regarding detergents.

There are a number of other recommendations in the conservation authority's report. I will not run through them; I will try to cover them by one further general question.

What is the government doing about the report as a whole?

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Woodbine has mentioned the member for High Park on several occasions. I do not propose to answer for the government, but I would like to answer for the member for High Park.

As usual the hon. member for Woodbine is the authority. He has all the answers on all things and I do not profess to be that good.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not deal with the issue?

Mr. Cowling: I just have a few answers on a few things.

Mr. MacDonald: Why don't you?

Mr. Cowling: All right, I am going to give you a couple right now.

In the first place I am familiar with the report that you read from—

Mr. Bryden: I did not suggest you would not be.

Mr. Cowling:—and I was reading from the annual report, in part, of the chairman of the Metropolitan conservation authority. With reference to that report he said this, and I read it:

The report has already been approved by the authority and has been presented to the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board and other area boards and councils.

They have it, they have presented it.

Mr. Bryden: Obviously, nothing ever sinks through to you.

Mr. Cowling: And I would like to comment on the other wisecrack you made about money, and what a niggardly attitude the government is taking on money.

Mr. Bryden: Those are your words, not mine.

Mr. Cowling: I would like you to listen to the words of the chairman of the Metropolitan conservation authority. This is what he says:

As you know, the 23 municipalities in our area make it possible for us to carry on our work. It is they who supply one half of the money needed for conservation.

I have often said that there is nothing sadder than a conservation authority with

work to do and without proper funds to do it. Fortunately, the municipalities and our other partner, the province of Ontario, have continued to give us the support we need to do the job.

Nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, much has been said this afternoon about the overlapping of authority in this particular branch, or the fact that it has not been clearly differentiated. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he would give his comments to the House about a situation that has built up over a number of years and is surely now ready for solution.

I refer to the fact, which I am sure will be of interest to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs as well, that there are some areas in the province where conservation is served not only by a conservation authority but by a conservation commission, which was appointed earlier and under a separate Act, and may be administered by another department.

It is true that if we were to examine the terms of reference of these two bodies as they occur in pairs across the province in at least three specific places, we would find there is a difference in their responsibilities. But I submit that it is also true that the one authority, the conservation authority, in most areas of the province is well equipped to carry on this service and that in fact, where the two bodies do work, there is a tendency for them on some occasions to work at odds to the general good of conservation. There may be personality problems involved here. But it seems to me that every time the people concerned get the ear of the Minister about this, and get him to concentrate on the problem and almost reach a decision that would be of some value in the circumstance, the branch is removed from his authority and the people concerned have to begin again.

I would like the hon. Minister to give his comments on what he feels the comparative values of the authorities and the commissions are, and what he might suggest be done to clear up this difficulty in the immediate future.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question from the hon. member for Brant, I might say that since this department has been transferred to our jurisdiction I have discussed the problem with Mr. Barnes. I have had one group in from the conservation authority discussing this particular matter. At the present time I would say that I have not talked to anyone

from the commission; but it is our hope, and the hope of some of the people in our department, that we might, after the House rises, go up and discuss things with both these authorities in the hope that we might get them together some way into one large authority.

Mr. Nixon: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the suggestion of the hon. Minister is a good one, because the men who take part in both the commission and the authority, at least in this one particular case, give a great service to the community. Therefore I feel that it would take someone with the authority of this government to sit down with them and convince them that, for the good of all, their amalgamation is essential.

I would also like to say that one of the most valuable assets this department has is the gentleman who is sitting at the advice table at the present time—Mr. Barnes—whose integrity and advice is valued by the men and women who take part in the responsibilities of the conservation authorities; certainly in any area where I have had anything to do with them. He has been a long-suffering civil servant in this regard, where his services really have not had the fullest opportunity to be used by the province simply because he has been passed from department to department. I happened, by chance, to be looking in his direction earlier in the week, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Prime Minister announced that perhaps the discussion of the conservation branch would be once again fragmented—we would suppose for the last time in this House—and I felt that the look of resignation on his face under those circumstances showed that this was really more than the gentleman should have been asked to bear.

But we have been assured that the responsibility for conservation has found its final home and that surely, in this department at long last, the action which has been recommended—certainly from the Opposition side for many years, and by those who have had the responsibility across the province—will finally be taken.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, in the course of his introductory remarks, the hon. Minister, on page 21 of the mimeographed version, had the comment:

It is expected that the general contract for the Woodstock dam will be awarded and that work will start early this spring.

Am I correct in my assumption that the hon. Minister is referring there to what is known locally as the Gordon Pittock dam?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have two comments I want to make. The first one I make, if I can do it without being personal, is that I think this is getting—what is the appropriate term?—a little ludicrous. We are naming new projects in the province of Ontario after people who are still alive—indeed in this instance, if the hon. member will forgive me for saying, even before he got into politics; and according to some in the community, because of his friends in the Conservative Party who wanted to build him up in politics. Furthermore, this kind of thing is going on at the same time as the press is drawing more and more attention to the fact that we sometimes even have objections to naming schools after the giants of the political life of Canada—like Sir John A. Macdonald and others.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, since I am dealing with this matter, we might as well get right back to your home territory where we have the Noden causeway. I understand that some of your friends up there—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, this is a conservation matter.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would like to inform the member that the people accept that name but it has not been named as yet.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this is interesting. I have not been provided with any documentation as to whether or not the people accept the name for the causeway. The fact that you happen to be the elected member, I would suggest, sir, in all humility, is not necessary proof of the fact that they think this is a good idea.

On this one point—and again I trust I can do it without it being taken as a personal comment—I suggest that we are getting—I will borrow a phrase from the hon. leader of the Opposition who whispered *sotto voce* a few moments ago—a little petty when we are naming great projects like this after living politicians; and when we continue to ignore the giants of Canadian political life who have been dead for generations.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Call it the “Oliver-MacDonald” dam.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: MacDonald House.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I do not know if anything is ever going to be called “Knox.”

Mr. Knox: Oh yes, there is a church.

Mr. MacDonald: The other point, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise in connection with the Woodstock and/or Gordon Pittock dam is that once again, apparently, there has arisen in this case what appears from the outside to be a mishandling of the purchase of the land for a very commendable project.

I have had representations made to me by people who are involved in it. Perhaps I can present it to the House in a manner which will be accepted as relatively authoritative. The basic nature of the problem is outlined in the London *Free Press* on Friday, March 13, under dateline of Woodstock:

The Upper Thames Valley Conservation Authority was charged last night with evasiveness and unfair tactics in land negotiations for the Gordon Pittock dam and lakes. A group of property owners met in the Tollgate school north of Woodstock to protest the way negotiations for sale of the land to be expropriated for the dam is being handled.

The \$4 million dam would create a lake about six miles long, stretching from just north of Woodstock to Innerkip. It would cover about 14,000 acres.

Construction of the dam is expected to start this year, but property owners said they were unable to get answers to their questions, even from the authority chairman, Gordon Pittock, MPP for Oxford.

Stanley Down said Mr. Pittock promised at an East Zorra township council meeting on March 4 that property owners would have two years to relocate after they were notified of expropriation. He said all property owners were told this winter that the authority wanted the land this summer.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if I may just interject there, I have a copy of the notice which went out from the Upper Thames Valley Conservation Authority on January 27, 1964, and the second last paragraph states:

In due course, the authority will advise you as to whether it requires possession of your land, but in order that you may make adequate preparation we might now advise you that the prospective date for acquiring possession will be May 1, 1964.

In other words, three months afterwards.

And they are talking to a group of farmers, whose farms are going to be bought, who have to buy an alternative farm, who operate, as the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) will know, on at least a 12-month cycle in farming—your seeding and your har-

vesting and what you are going to do with your land. Well, the story here states, and I understand it is correct, that they were told they would have up to two years notification for relocation. Then the notice finally comes out, and they have three months.

Let me continue with details which are produced in the London *Free Press*.

Mr. Down and other farmers said it was important to have government dates on which they would have to vacate their property so they could decide whether to plant crops. The owners decided to ask the federation of agriculture to help in getting letters from the UTRCA and in clarifying owners' rights in the expropriation proceedings. Protests against the tactics—

This is another important point—if I may interject and emphasize here—because this, as far as I have found out, is almost universal among the farmers involved.

Protests against the tactics of William George, authority land buyer, were registered by most of those at the meeting. Members claimed that he had misinformed many of them, was refusing to negotiate on land prices and was using unfair tactics to convince land owners to sell at UTRCA—

Indeed, I have been told in one instance—and I think it is time that the House was informed of it—that one person who could not get a deal closed for the sale of his land, expressed an interest in another farm that was available for sale. A deal was arranged very, very quickly when there was another real estate proposition looming on the horizon.

Gordon Harwood, an East Zorra farmer, said the authority was offering \$10,500 for a 70-acre portion of his farm. He said he could not buy land to make up that loss to the authority for less than \$500 an acre.

Jack Holmes, a farm owner, said he sold five acres of land for \$1,100 an acre for gravel, and the authority's offer was only \$200 an acre. He said the authority said it wanted half of a 50-acre parcel of land but would not permit him to sell the other half to a builder who had given him a good offer.

And if we move on to the Woodstock paper's report on the same meeting, just let me give you one or two quotes from it:

Stanley Down of Innerkip stated, "Many of the property owners are getting offers that are not reasonable and we cannot afford the cost of lawyers and appraisers." He said Mr. Pittock promised them at

least two years notice, and then they "slap us with a 60-day notice," he stated prior to the meeting.

A homeowner whose home was built under the Veterans' Land Act, Jack Newman of Woodstock, said the VLA administrator said the authority was "crazy" when he told the VLA what the authority had offered for his property. He said the VLA was handling all negotiations for him and that the authority would have to negotiate with it.

There in brief, without going into any more detail, it seems to me is a sorry tale. The tragedy of the thing is that all of the people I have talked to involved are in principle strongly in support of this project—the dam and the lake that is going to be built. All they were asking for was fair treatment, a living-up to the promise of something like two years notice. Instead they were faced with something like two to three months notice and they have to get out sometime this year.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if either the hon. Minister or conceivably the hon. member for Oxford could give us some explanation as to why these procedures have been followed this way, and specifically some explanation with regard to the short notice and to the allegations of the tactics of the man who was authorized to do the buying of the land on behalf of the authority.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, I understand it is the authority that purchased the land and if these things have happened, I would say it is unfortunate. Although we know very little about it, outside what we have heard here today, I would be glad to have Mr. Barnes check into this matter. If this is the case—I do not know if there is much we can do about it now. It is too bad to see people misinformed when it means a move like that.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am very puzzled. If the government is involved to the extent that it is in grants for this kind of development, do you mean to say that all of this has gone on for the length of time it has, with publication in the paper and protest meetings and so on, and your department has not even become aware of the situation? Is this the case?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we would not be aware of the original deals. What happens in the paper sometimes is not the actual facts. I have not heard anything about it since conservation came into my

department, nothing whatever from anyone in that area.

Mr. G. W. Pittock (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to a couple of the questions of the hon. member for York South, in connection with the dam. First I would like to say, I did not ask to have this dam named after me.

Mr. MacDonald: Did you refuse it?

Mr. Pittock: No, and I could also say that this naming of the dam took place at a meeting in March, 1962, long before I had ever given any consideration to becoming part of politics, and sometimes I wonder what the value of it is.

I do not think we can carry out conservation projects or any other projects of this kind without causing disturbance to people, which is very unfortunate. I think that many projects have been started within this province that have affected many, many people. I think too, we have to consider the overall value of the project.

In connection with the matter of the owners being promised two years notice, I was asked to attend a meeting of East Zorra township council in March 1962—the newspaper says 1963; it is one year out. At that council meeting, I was asked by an owner if I would estimate how long it would be before the land would be required. I answered the question by saying this. "I do not expect that you will be asked to give up your land in less than two years from now." That was from March, 1962, to March, 1964. We served a notice in January that we would expect to require the land for the contractors to commence work May 1, 1964. However, there was a delay in the call of tenders. As soon as we reached the point of February 28 without the approval to call tenders, we again advised them that we would not require their land until July 1, 1964, extending the two months from May 1 over to July 1 to allow the difference that we had been delayed in the tender call.

The tender call had been estimated to have been made January 1. The tender call is out now and I think the date on it is for the middle of May for the tender call to be complete. The evasive unfair tactics that are recorded in the paper—I would like to mention again, as I have to the newspapers and radio stations—arise from the fact that in a period of almost four years that this project has been talked about, I have had any number of people from that area visit me at my home and call me at the office. I have come out of the plant to go into the office

to talk to these people on many, many occasions.

I forget the exact date now, but it was the Sunday before the date of that newspaper item when I had a call at my house at 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon from one of the owners, saying, "I have a problem I would like to talk to you about." I said, "Well, Mr. So-and-So, do you realize we are building a dam in Mitchell, we are building a \$2 million project at Wildwood south of St. Mary's, we have a channel improvement in St. Mary's, we are building a new dam at Lake Victoria in Stratford, and we have a contract to remove the silt from Lake Victoria, all in addition to the Woodstock project. I do not think that you could expect me, as chairman of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, to be in touch with the details of all five of these projects and spend the last nine weeks in Toronto, five days a week, attending the Legislature."

He said, "No, I will have to agree with you." I said: "I would suggest you contact Mr. Hilts, the chairman of the Woodstock advisory board, and you will accomplish much more in discussing with him your problems than in discussing them with me." He said, "That is O.K." I also explained to him that I had promised to meet some people here in Toronto at 8 o'clock that night. This is 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon and I am due in Toronto at 8 o'clock and I have three visits to make on my way to Toronto.

This is why I am charged with being evasive, and this is why I do not give the people answers to their questions. One person in four years agreed with me that he would not expect me to have the answers to the individual problems and details.

In the matter of the purchase, we arranged with three appraisers to go in and individually appraise these properties. This has been the policy on the projects that we have carried out so far. The appraisers then met with our advisory board, which is made up of representatives of the municipalities of that local area, people who know the values of these individual properties. They sat down with the appraisers, went over everything item by item and arranged a figure to be offered for each of those properties. When we employed the appraisers, we asked them to provide us with free market value of each property and this was the basis. We then employed a negotiator to go out and make these offers.

As far as the dealings with the owners and city council were concerned, I drove to Woodstock last Tuesday night and met with the owners at a meeting organized by the

federation of agriculture, I drove back again Thursday night to meet with city council, because pressure brought to bear there had suggested a resolution to withhold the work until we would guarantee a water level in the lake. I could only answer that question by saying that under normal conditions the water level would be maintained. Nobody in the meeting could tell me how much precipitation we are going to have next year or the year after, so it is pretty difficult to tell them how well we could maintain the water level of the lake.

One of the many things I feel which was misunderstood, or was not understood, was the fact that this was a part of our 110,000 acre/feet flood control project which includes six projects: Fanshawe, Glen Gowan, Wildwood, Thamesford and two at Woodstock. We have combined the two at Woodstock into one high level dam by relocating the CPR main line. The recommendation in the Woodstock area was 12,000 acre/feet of water for flood storage. The design of this dam will contain 13,385 acre/feet of water, and is a part of that 110,000 acre/feet total which is required.

I would say that if we are to carry out these projects we are certainly going to have to disturb many owners; in this particular area we are disturbing 46 owners. Many of the people, some of them named here this afternoon, came to see me over three years ago asking me questions about this project. Today they will tell you they knew nothing about it, these same people who were quoted by the hon. member for York South a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman. They had no idea the project was going to go on. This is why it makes you wonder just how these projects can be handled and everybody be retained in a happy mood while they are being carried out.

This is a project which will have endless value to that area, in replenishment of underground supply, in flood prevention, in added dam stream flow in the summertime. It may be of information to this House to know that with our programme completed on the Thames we will increase the summer low-flow-period flow in all the streams of the Thames by ten times that of the present low-period flow. This, to us, is the greatest value of conservation—spreading water over the whole 1,325 square miles of our watershed, and making water available to all of the people of the watershed in the whole of the area. This is using the energy of the sun to return the water over the land regardless of the elevation, without cost of pumping. This is the important item.

As far as the Woodstock project is concerned, I can only say we are doing everything within our power to try to carry out that project with the least disturbance to those who are involved, and to co-operate in every manner possible. Last week at the meeting I was asked: "Do we all have to move by July 1?" My answer to this question: If the tender is completed and the contract is let we must make that area available for contractors on July 1.

However, if the contractor is going to be starting somewhere, miles from some of these people, they do not need to move. If they make arrangements with the contractor, they could continue to live there maybe for several months; in some cases, maybe for a year or more. How we can be more fair than we have been I would not know; I would like to have some answers on it.

Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. member for his statement. I hope what he has said, and some of the other meetings going on out in the locality, will resolve some of the dissatisfaction and unhappiness which certainly has existed and apparently still does exist, if he is going out twice a week to cope with the protests in the local area.

However, I will leave that matter. There is a final question I would like to ask the hon. Minister. I was a little puzzled with the statistics on his projects under The Conservation Authorities Act and The Parks Assistance Act, circulated to us just a few days ago. On the final page I note the grants available to a list of projects across the province, totalling some \$362,545; and, up until the end of April, 1963, only \$82,000. What is the explanation for such a limited amount? Are the figures in the first column the grants which were available for the year under question, and yet only \$82,000 was actually paid out; or is this a total grant to be paid out, under normal circumstances, over a number of years?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that that is right. \$82,287 has been paid out, and the grants available to April, 1963, were \$362,545.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I suspected that was right. The hon. Minister has not answered my question. My question was: It strikes me, if these are urgent projects and this money is available in this year, that only \$82,000—in other words, less than a quarter of it—was actually claimed. Is this the speed at which we are moving?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, grants under The Parks Assistance Act are made to municipalities which provide these municipal parks, and improvements to parks and so on. When these are approved for construction and acquisition of land and so on, the approval has to be done by the parks integration board, Mr. Chairman. Then, of course, the parks integration board and the department do not necessarily know when the project is going to be completed or when accounts will be sent in for payment of a grant. But we must set the funds aside so that when the accounts do come in for payment the funds are available for paying the provincial share.

I would think that you would probably find that a number of these projects may take several years to complete. The municipalities prefer to finance the whole of the expenditure themselves, and then they will send in one request for a payment of the subsidy in the year in which they complete the project.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, on the same vote, would the hon. Minister please answer me why there would be no conservation authority in the county of Essex? Is there some special reason for not having one in the area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I might say that as far as we are concerned there is no special reason; but no one in the county of Essex has asked for an authority to be set up.

Vote 604 agreed to.

On vote 605:

Mr. Chairman: Has the Minister a statement to make?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words about the operation of the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

The Act under which this commission operates gives it the authority to co-ordinate, organize and supervise the development of water supplies and to provide measures for the control of pollution in Ontario.

The policy of the commission concerning water supply is to co-operate with municipalities and industry to make water supplies available, to encourage the use of satisfactory local supplies, to assist in the development of pipelines where necessary and to protect water supplies against pollution.

In the present programme of the commission there are three main activities.

First, the supervision of all water supply

and waste treatment facilities in municipalities and industries; the issuing of approval certificates for the construction of water and sewage works; and the control of pollution in Ontario's waterways.

Second, the financing, construction and operation of waterworks and sewage works for municipalities under agreement with the Ontario Water Resources Commission. Third, the provision of assistance to municipalities and individuals in providing adequate supplies of water, the assembling of basic hydrologic data concerning ground and surface waters, and the administration of the water permit programme, for the control of water use.

Under the first item which I have just mentioned, visits by the field staff of the commission were made to the 690 waterwork systems and 401 sewage treatment facilities in the province during 1963. Seventy-two municipal pollution surveys and 487 industrial plant surveys were carried out. During 1963, 988 certificates for sewage works valued at \$81.5 million, and 698 certificates for waterworks valued at \$33.5 million, were issued.

Since the commission was formed, a total of 7,620 sewage works and 5,653 waterworks certificates have been issued with a combined total value just slightly less than \$904 million.

Special investigations included the preparation on water and sewage projects, sanitary land fills, cannery and milk plant waste disposal systems, stream and pollution surveys and a variety of miscellaneous studies. A total of 212 stream pollution surveys were carried out in 1963.

In the second activity of the programme, the commission has constructed, since its formation in 1957, 161 sewage projects and 122 water projects. It is of interest to note that sewage treatment facilities for over 178 municipalities have been built or are under way since 1957.

Under the third part of the commission's programme the commission carried out 18 hydrological surveys for municipalities, supervised ten test drilling and well construction projects, issued 403 well drillers' licences and maintained 56 observation wells. To date the commission has data on over 95,500 wells and in 1963 the drilling of 9,325 wells was supervised.

During the year a total of 2,706 water permits were issued, approving the taking of 823 million gallons per day.

In addition to the foregoing, the commission undertook on a full-time basis an extended programme of research in which a number of current studies were co-ordinated

under the new division of research. Algae control studies were carried out on Lakes Erie and Ontario and will be continued. Methods of treating cannery wastes and the use of oxidation ditches for selected applications were studied. A pilot plant to study lagoon operation for the tertiary treatment of sewage plant effluence was started and is to be continued this year.

The division of laboratories continues to serve the needs of all other divisions in analyzing samples of sewage and water, together with similar service to municipalities and individuals.

In the year 1964-65 it is the intention of the commission to maintain its surveillance over municipal water and sewage projects, adding particular emphasis to the need for greater control over industrial pollution. More pollution surveys of streams, lakes and rivers will be undertaken in conjunction with increased investigations of ground and surface waters to provide the most up-to-date information for a wide programme of water management.

It is intended that the multiple purposes for which water is needed will be considered in the planning stages of the water management programme to ensure adequate supplies of water for all present and future needs, Mr. Chairman.

The retirement of Dr. A. E. Berry as general manager and chief engineer after 40 years of service with the Ontario government sparked a major reorganization in the Ontario Water Resources Commission top administrative setup. Dr. Berry was succeeded as general manager by Mr. D. S. Caverly, the former assistant general manager, and the director of the Ontario Water Resources Commission's division of plant operations.

Another major change was the definite division of responsibility between two assistant general managers: Mr. G. M. Galimbert, who relinquished his position as director of the division of sanitary engineering to devote his full time to his new duties as supervisor and co-ordinator of the work of the division of water resources; and the other, assistant general manager L. E. Owers, previously executive engineer, who took over the supervision and co-ordination of the activities of construction and plant operations, the real estate branch and other project development activities.

Early in the past year, the commission set up a management committee, which consists of three commissioners, Mr. A. M. Snider, the chairman, and Messrs. Root and Vance, to facilitate the commission business.

In order to increase the efficiency of its programme the commission is organized into divisions and branches. These divisions are, in addition to general administration; sanitary engineering, construction, plan operations, laboratories, water resources and research.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as the population of the province increases the problem of providing clean, adequate water in all phases of personal, commercial and industrial life becomes increasingly important. As one of the major challenges facing the commission is the provision of adequate supplies of suitable water, much work has been done in developing ground waters and supplies of surface water have been brought in from distant points when required.

An example is Essex county where for both the Harrow and Union systems 30 miles of mains were laid to bring water from the lake, and at Dunnville where over eight miles of supply mains have been built. Other projects of a similar nature have been undertaken.

Water supply problems are under continual examination by the commission throughout the province and conferences are being constantly held with municipalities and industry to assess their needs and assist them in solving problems in the most economical manner.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I might re-emphasize that as the population of the province grows the need for adequate supplies of good, clean water in all phases of personal, commercial and industrial life becomes increasingly important and water supplies and waste disposal are closely linked. They both must be dealt with in any programme designed to attain that healthy environment which is desired by all. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that in this regard the OWRC may be proud of its achievements to date. Tremendous progress has been made in its programmes to ensure the maintenance of public water supplies in a safe condition for domestic consumption and to exert greater control in the pollution of the province's waterways.

I would remind the hon. members that the next item, number 606, is entitled water management programme. It is the intention of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management to speak on vote 606 and so I would ask hon. members, or suggest to them, that this may be confining in that I have the information here only as to the operation of the water resources commission and the next item will deal with the new programme which the hon. Minister wished to announce. If you wish to hear his statement now in connection with the water management programme as it

has considerable relation to vote 605, I would be guided by your advice, sir.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion? Perhaps we could be flexible in the interpretation of the rules and deal with both the votes at one time.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the Minister to make his statement at this time.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, the statement that I was trying to make before the orders of the day was in regard to projects—

Mr. Bryden: Have you missed your deadline?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Would the hon. member for Woodbine like to say something?

Mr. Bryden: I said it. I asked if you had missed your deadline?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: My statement was in regard to projects to deal with drought areas in the province of Ontario.

Our first major one is the construction of water supply reservoirs; second, the construction of farm ponds; third, emergency rural water supply for drought-stricken areas.

Specifically, the government is increasing the grant from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the cost incurred in the construction of water reservoirs. This policy is available to conservation authorities, but as well, so that the benefits of water reservoirs can be felt outside the conservation authority, the government will enter into agreement to have these constructed through municipally responsible bodies. In turn, and if the project qualified, the province would seek federal participation under some of the cost sharing programmes now in effect, such as that under The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.

The present policy of the 50-50 cost sharing arrangement between the Ontario government and the conservation authority on projects other than water reservoirs will not be affected. Likewise flood control work, with federal and provincial participation along with conservation authorities will be affected in no way.

May I say that the government is extremely interested in bringing about a speed-up in the construction of water holding reservoirs. To do this we are prepared to allow a deferred payment arrangement for a three-year period. Under this arrangement the full cost of water reservoirs initiated within the period will be borne to the full extent by the province with the payment of the local share being delayed

until January 1, 1967. By this arrangement it is hoped that a start can be made on projects which normally might have to be delayed because local financial resources have been committed at this point of time.

Following drought conditions in a large part of Ontario in 1963, the government urged farmers to construct farm ponds in order to maintain a more adequate supply of water for their needs. We wish now to proceed further and to offer to farmers in Ontario a subsidy of 50 per cent of the cost of construction up to a maximum of \$500 for each pond.

In the past the government has been participating indirectly in farm pond construction through conservation authorities and some municipal governments. This policy now extends directly to each farmer located any place in Ontario. The programme will be carried out in a joint fashion in that the administration of this will be done by The Department of Agriculture through its local offices and engineering specialists, and the financing will be done through The Department of Energy and Resources Management. The policy will be back-dated to November 1, 1963, to assist those farmers who constructed ponds during the fall and winter months at the urging of the government to help alleviate water shortages in many farms of Ontario.

Following the widespread drought last autumn it has been apparent to the government that emergency water supplies for human and livestock needs should be organized when the need arises. To this end the government is prepared to enter into a programme of financial assistance to drought-stricken areas in rural Ontario.

This offer will be on a cost sharing basis with the counties in southern Ontario. In northern Ontario, if the need arises, we are prepared to work out similar arrangements with townships or groups of townships, as the case may be. Under this policy if 50 per cent of the sources of water supplies for human and livestock purposes in one or more townships is thought to be inadequate by the county council, the council may designate the area as a drought-stricken area. Following designation, 50 per cent of the cost of the emergency water supplies programme will be borne by the province. Likewise, 50 per cent of the cost of administration for the programme can be claimed on the province with the subsidy being paid directly to the designating authority.

Under the rural emergency water supply growth programme no grants will be made by the province for any work involving what may be considered capital expenditure.

The exact cost of these programmes at this time is not known since the initiation of the programme in each case depends to a large extent on local leadership. It is estimated that for the present fiscal year in the neighbourhood of \$600,000 will be spent.

May I say again, as I have on previous occasions in the Legislature, that it is the policy of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, wherever possible, to co-ordinate its activities with other departments and agencies. An example of this is to be found whereby The Department of Agriculture will be carrying out the major responsibility of the farm pond policy throughout the province and the resources of the county council will be used to the fullest extent. On the other hand, the department will increase its staff to aid conservation authorities, particularly since, at the present time, several authorities in the province do not have provincial staff available to assist their programme.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, before going into my general comments on the water resources commission I would like to clarify a couple of points with the hon. Minister.

Is an irrigation pond considered a farm pond under your new proposal? Second, will the province pay half the cost of the water hauled in Essex and Kent counties by farmers who have been hauling water for a number of years?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say yes that we would include an irrigation pond as a farm pond. Your other question, sir, was?

Mr. Paterson: A great number of farmers in our area have been hauling water for years, they have their own tank trucks and so forth. Now do I have it correctly that the province will assume half the cost of the actual water?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right, providing the municipality will declare an area a drought area and pay 50 per cent we will go along. After it is approved we will go along and pay 50 per cent.

Mr. Paterson: Thank you very much, sir.

In reading the 1963 *Hansard*, I was interested to read where the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) mentioned that the cost of treating and delivering water was 4.79 cents per 1,000 gallons. I believe that was correct.

Back in *Hansard*, page 559, in 1956, when Bill No. 98 was introduced to establish the

OWRC, Premier Frost stated the concept of this bill, and I quote:

The conception is water and sewage disposal at cost, the provision of water on a wholesale area basis, and the provision of sewage disposal plants which might serve more than one municipality.

And on page 560:

It would not be the purpose of the commission . . . to retail water.

Now the point that I would like to make in this regard is that according to these statements water is to be produced and sold at cost to the various municipal departments; namely, approximately the figure I quoted before.

I realize that municipal commissions, or water departments, do have a lot of overhead. They have a capital cost for the erection of the water plants and pipelines, and I would ask the hon. Minister if he is concerned with the great discrepancy in the retail rates charged for water in the various services connected with the OWRC.

I would like to point out a few specific cases. The first area is in the price of water sold by meter to farmers in my particular riding: In the community of Essex, the rate is \$1 per 1,000 gallons; in Mersea township, which is a large volume user and is located miles closer to the union plant, the rate is 25 cents per 165 gallons, or almost \$2 per 1,000. I am glad that these rates will be reduced by 50 per cent to our farmers, but the difference here is 100 per cent in these two communities on the cost to the farmer; and in comparison to the spreads in Hydro costs and rates the margin is tremendous.

I recall when the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin told the House the cost of treating and delivering this water was 4.79 cents per 1,000. I would carry this point just a little further. I would like to quote the rates charged to individual householders in three municipalities served by the union system: The rate in the town of Essex is \$6 per month, or \$72 to each and every household annually—this is probably one of the highest rates in Ontario; it is a flat rate, as there are no residential meters. In the town of Leamington, which also has a flat rate, the cost per household is \$4.50 per month, or \$54 annually. In the township of Mersea, the flat rate is \$40 annually, although I believe most of their residences are metered.

This is quite a variance for water which is supposed to be supplied at cost; and certainly part of this difference must be attributed to the variance in methods and rates

charged for fire protection, Hydro charges and shares of capital costs in the various municipalities.

I believe the actual wholesale cost to our Leamington commission is approximately 26 cents per 1,000 gallons. I am told that other municipalities charge one or two mills in their assessment for fire protection and maintenance charges on a per foot frontage, and thus keep their water rates lower in this manner. In fact, I am told one community in my riding charges eight mills in the assessment over and above its regular water rate charges.

But, with all these varying methods of charging or paying for water, it is most difficult to determine just what the actual cost of water is in a municipality. In our system of Ontario Hydro, you can check on the efficiencies and the cost but not so in this maze of various water systems. It would seem to me that the OWRC should have some control over the final price for water charged to these various individuals and communities.

There is one more aspect of this water shortage which should be pointed out, and I touch briefly on this fact: Certain municipalities served by the union water system meter the residences whereas others, such as my own, have a flat rate for water. Apparently the meter system is only economically sound in an OWRC-sponsored programme where the use by a municipality is far in excess of the contracted amount from the OWRC.

At this time, major municipalities involved in the union system have contracted for far more gallonage than they have actually been utilizing, so a flat rate is acceptable in order to cover the total cost of the contract.

However, I suggest that this is wasteful to our precious water supply; at the same time this plan, to me, is discriminatory where there are pensioners and other persons on low fixed incomes. In my own case, a family of six in a large house, with a great number of facilities including lawn services, we use them possibly in excess, but I pay the same flat rate for water as does the widow down the street with the minimum of sanitary and water facilities. This does not help to conserve our valuable water supply, and is discriminatory.

I know that metering is expensive; that the cost of these meters would not be welcomed by municipal authorities, including my own. But in order to save on water and bear the cost of the use equitably, in all areas serviced through the OWRC programmes, I personally

feel that the metering of all residential water systems should be part and parcel of any programme.

Back in 1956, when the Act was passed establishing the OWRC, a statement was made and I quote:

The passage of this bill will relieve the municipalities from meeting the heavy capital costs of water and sewage and also provide them with the engineering and planning services which they would be unable to provide for themselves.

Further in *Hansard*, Mr. Frost states as follows:

The distribution of water and the elimination of pollution is essentially a municipal problem. Both are very clearly duties and responsibilities of municipal government.

Obviously the OWRC plan provides the basis of partnership which is so greatly needed in many localities and at the same time takes the burden of the immense strain of initial financing from the municipalities and will enable the payment by them, on a service basis, over long periods of years, of the cost involved. This is the principle of service and cost spread over many years.

I would suggest to this House that this Act is incomplete, that the OWRC is not fulfilling its complete obligation to the municipalities, and will only be fulfilling this complete obligation to the municipalities when it undertakes the initial financing of sewers on the same basis.

Sewer construction is an integral part of solving our pollution problem. We must have sewers first, before a disposal plant is of much use.

In last year's *Hansard* the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin made the following statement, and I quote:

I feel that one of the most important parts of our activities and our programme is getting information out to the public.

I agree with this wholeheartedly, but I do hope that the methods are functioning a little better than the information letters which are sent to the hon. members of this House. These letters usually contain this phrase:

This information will be included in a general news release later but you in the meantime may wish to inform interested media in the area.

On two occasions in the past two months I received these information letters some ten days after the projects have already been announced in the area press. However, I do

believe I can proffer a constructive suggestion to the OWRC on how they can reach the public.

In my own riding recently we had a serious dispute over the location of a proposed sewage lagoon. This situation was solved, I hope, by the offer to drive area residents to the site of other lagoons in operation to see how they worked and that there were no serious defects or devaluations of properties.

My suggestion is that the display material of the OWRC that was constructed for the Canadian National Exhibition be taken out of storage from the basement of the main office and put on display all over the province at the various home shows, trade shows, agricultural shows and fairs. In this way the great mass of our population will see the problem and how it is solved, and will be conscious of the role that they too must play in a serious matter.

Back in 1956, Prime Minister Frost on page 557 made the following statement:

This [water] can be as important and as vital to our industrial and agricultural expansion as is power.

On page 561 of the 1956 *Hansard*, our leader, the hon. member for Grey South, asked the following question during the discussion of a proposed Act to establish the union plant and pipeline, and I quote:

Would this pipeline which the hon. Prime Minister has been talking about be primarily for the purpose of irrigation?

Hon. Mr. Frost replied:

It would be, in the Essex and Harrow districts. That was part of the study. It was partially for industrial and domestic, and partially for irrigation purposes.

I wish to quote the statement made in the House at page 1584 of last year by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin in his report to the House for the commission, and I quote:

A second factor that we should keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there are no more acres of land today than there were when the population was very sparse in Ontario. If we are going to feed a rapidly expanding population, it simply means that we must produce more foodstuffs from the same number of acres—actually from less acres—

I am still quoting from further on:

One of the surest ways of increasing the production of foodstuffs is to see to it that we have water available, when water is needed, for irrigation and for an expanding livestock population—

The hon. member continued explaining about procuring ground water supplies and a number of statistics and the great number of applications that had been received for irrigation, especially in the tobacco belt.

Going back briefly to 1956, the former member for my riding, who is and was a great supporter of the commission, also commented on irrigation; but he thought we should go slow in regard to irrigation, that this is more of an agricultural problem, because there is no use in growing fruits and vegetables in this irrigated land unless we can sell them and so on.

Apparently there have been some changes in the thinking here in Toronto in this regard since 1956. I noticed in the comments of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management Monday afternoon that he did not touch on the problem of irrigation.

Mr. Chairman, I have brought you this brief background concerning the irrigation problem that is confronting southwestern Ontario in the hopes that renewed efforts will be made to supply this needed water supply.

Last summer the townships of Mersea and Gosfield South were forced to draw up an agreement to restrict the use of water for irrigation purposes to alternate days of the week during the key agricultural season, as the present capacity of the union plant was not able to supply this amount of treated water. Now this plant was only opened in November of 1960. I would suggest that there certainly was not sufficient regard paid to the aspect of irrigation when this system was originally planned, as was suggested by the statement of Mr. Frost originally, as I read today. Just recently it was announced that this union system is going to spend up to \$10,000 for a long-range study for the development of this plant.

Now we in the area are certainly grateful for the assistance this plant has given us to date, but in these past few remarks I hope I have demonstrated a shortcoming in the original planning for this, the pilot project for the province of Ontario. Water for irrigation must become a major purpose of these water systems in agricultural sections of our province.

As was mentioned here this afternoon, farm ponds and dams and other conservation authority plans will all play an important role in solving this water shortage problem in so many parts of Ontario, but I would point out to this House that the county of Essex, with flat lands of very high agricultural importance with unlimited water on three sides have a serious water problem and that we

have no great rivers or floods that would warrant the organization of a conservation authority. In fact, I know lesser officials of various departments have tended to discourage us going into a conservation authority.

These authorities receive large amounts of government monies to aid in the problem of solving this water shortage. Thus I would suggest that Essex county is unique in this water problem and should qualify for large expenditures on pipelines and plants by this government in lieu of these grants to conservation authorities. It is either that or request that the county form an authority in order that these grants be forthcoming.

Turning briefly to the annual report, I have a couple or three comments regarding the delays or problems in the engineering through the OWRC. On pages 22 and 33 there are very frank comments that there were faults and delays. On pages 42 and 47 there are faults and tough ground conditions, difficult terrain. I just wonder what is wrong with the engineering on these contracts, why soil test borings are not taken before the sites of these plants are chosen. Possibly the hon. Minister could give an answer.

Now I have a complete file here, and probably half the clippings are as this: "Council Raps Water Commission"; "Slow Start on Project Under Fire." There are dozens of articles here. I will just read a couple of quick paragraphs:

The red tape comes from the Ontario Municipal Board which has not approved the watermain project yet.

This was in regard to Grand Bend.

The only cost estimate for the project is \$600,000 and is one year old.

This one is from Puce in Essex county:

Every day of delay means a loss of \$250, said the reeve. The OWRC is ignorant. As long as its red tape is satisfied it is satisfied. I have worked feverishly for the past three months to get this project under way but have been blocked at every turn by the OWRC.

I, too, in my own riding, have had several projects under way, one of which, a water pipeline, was approved by the ratepayers on January 25, 1962. We finally arranged for a hearing on November 14, 1963, and final approval was given on February 15 to proceed to call tenders. This project, it was hoped, was going to be under the winter works project of this winter but it still is not under way. We would like some answers on the delays in these matters.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member, and his references to *Hansard* of a few years ago when this bill was presented to the House by the then leader of the government, and the comments which he made at that time.

It is quite correct to say that all through the operations of the Ontario Water Resources Commission it does supply water at cost. Our books can prove that. What the hon. member must remember is that each water producing plant is financed on its own. They are not all put into the same hat and then a general rate, or an average rate, is charged throughout the province. Of course, there are different costs in each of these different plants. That, therefore comes up with the different rate for water in each of the plants.

Actually, the government is subsidizing the production of water at the wholesale level, because of the fact we do operate the Ontario Water Resources Commission and many of the expenses are not charged to the operation of water plants, but are charged to the general expenditures of the government. You just have to look at these estimates to see what the figures are.

Ontario Water Resources Commission sells water on a wholesale basis to the municipalities. Then the municipalities distribute water at a retail price and the municipality, of course, has some operating cost in administration and distribution and so on. I would presume that every municipality attempts to charge a rate which will be sufficient to show perhaps a small profit. Water is being supplied in most cases to its own ratepayers, and if a profit does occur, then of course it goes to the benefit of the local ratepayers anyway. So it really does not matter at what price they sell water to the consumer, except with respect to the difference between an owner and a tenant of a residence, shall we say? The rate which was set in Essex and the rate which was set in Mersea township, I presume, were set bearing in mind the actual cost that these municipalities have in distributing water.

The hon. member made mention of a charge for fire protection. It is the usual practice in most municipalities that some charge is made for the fact that fire hydrants are installed on the town or city streets. A portion of the cost of supplying water to fire hydrants for fire protection is charged in the general rate. The funds so collected, if I may use that term, are credited to the operation of the waterworks system. In that way the user does get some reduction in the rate of

water, because of the service which is provided to property by the fact that a fire protection system is available.

I would say that in most municipalities, or those I have had some contact with, the municipal council sets a rate per hydrant, which perhaps is an arbitrary rate, but nevertheless it is examined quite regularly. I think that councils, in establishing their budgets for the year and rates for different services, will always pay attention to the charge made for what is known as hydrant rentals.

Insofar as the suggestion that has been made by the hon. member regarding the metering of all water is concerned, I think we have to bear in mind that the local municipality has the decision and the judgment in deciding this. I think that the cost of installing a meter in a residence runs from about \$50 to \$75. Then there is the added cost of administration, in that an employee of the public utilities commission or the waterworks department of the city or town has to call occasionally and read the meter. There is no doubt that a certain amount of water is saved when water meters are used, as against a flat rate charge for water, but I suggest to you that the municipality, being the retailer of water, would be the one that would decide whether or not it would sell water on a metered basis or on a flat rate.

In connection with the financing of sewers, the commission does finance the main trunk sewers but does not finance the lateral sewers. It is felt that is a local improvement charge that should be financed by the municipality and charged to the local users.

In connection with your comment about the information letters which go out from the commission, I am very much surprised that those that are sent to you have arrived ten days late. The intention is that those should be available before the general information is made available to newspapers. I have no explanation for your particular comment in that connection.

In reply to your comment and suggestion with respect to information availability, and comments with respect to greater use of the displays which have been placed by the commission at the Canadian National Exhibition, I might say that these are sometimes made available to other exhibitions, larger ones. But this is a very expensive type of publicity and we have had to, shall I say, restrict ourselves in that regard. At one time it was thought that perhaps a travelling trailer might be made available, but that apparently has not been found a possible solution to this matter.

I do know of some other departments that perhaps do more of this publicity work than is done by the water resources commission, but we are not quite in the same field of activity in this commission as perhaps The Department of Lands and Forests. Our concern is dealing with municipal councils basically, and not with the individual ratepayer, the resident of a municipality. Our need for publicity in the public sector therefore is perhaps much less than other departments of government. They are concerned more with all of the residents of the province, while we are restricted to dealing with municipal councils.

You made some comments about the matter of irrigation and the emergency programme which has been set up and has been explained by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. We appreciate your comments in that regard.

In the case of the union system plant in the area which you represent, I might say that the size of the plant and its potential production is pretty well governed by the finances of the users. I have often said here I would like to drive a Cadillac car, but I have never had the price. This is one of these things we have to look at in the cold light of the economics. Where a few years ago there was no facility of this nature, or comparable facility available in this area, since 1960 this service has been made available on a basis that the users could afford to pay. That, I think, is the important thing. As time goes on and a greater portion of this plant is paid for and written off, then I would suggest that there will no doubt be room for expansion of the plant and the service that it can provide to the users in that area.

In connection with pre-engineering, I am assured—and I have discussed this not only with the general manager and the engineers in the commission, but also with the members of the commission—that every effort is made to do all of the pre-engineering, soil testing, and so on and so forth, which is necessary. But in a number of cases these soil tests are not always sufficient, and after a project gets under way it is necessary to amend the specifications of the contract. That is done under the very, very closest supervision of the engineering division and the general manager of the commission.

We realize that we have a responsibility that when we go to a municipality and say that we shall build a plant of a certain size and capacity for X dollars, that we must produce that for X dollars. Occasionally the best laid plans of mice and men—something happens to them—and it does happen that

once in a while the plants do cost more than had been estimated. I think that hon. members will understand that this happens in many other fields of activity. But on the whole we stick very close to the estimates.

Insofar as the complaints regarding red tape in government administration are concerned, it has been my experience, and I have had more experience with this for the last year and a half that I have been in The Department of Municipal Affairs. I find that people will come to my office—municipal people in many cases or residents who are not members of a council—but they will come to my office with a great complaint about delays and red tape.

I will give you an example of what happened today. A man came to Toronto from the north country. He travelled, I would say, at least 600 miles to come to my office to complain about the delay in The Department of Municipal Affairs. I have known this gentleman for a considerable number of years so I took him into my office and immediately discussed his problem, then called on one of my able secretaries to get to the root of the trouble. I found that we had acted as expeditiously as we could, in February of this year, to deal with the application this man had placed before us; we had sent it to the Ontario Municipal Board, and there it was.

Why was it there that long? Unfortunately, the documents which had been sent were not in order; they were not in the form required by the law under which they were to be passed. So the municipal board had returned them to the representative of the municipality and had advised this gentleman as to where the documents were deficient. And, since that time, nothing has been heard.

Whether the gentleman who lives in the same community from which my friend came, 600 miles away, has filed these documents or has just forgotten to correct them, or has decided that the municipality should not go ahead with this particular by-law, is for him to decide and not for us. I quote you that explanation; and I could give you any number of instances of a similar nature.

I have had hon. members of the Legislature come to me with similar complaints and, upon investigation, we usually find that while there are some cases where we are at fault—and human nature being what it is I suppose we have to accept that—I think that a very honest effort is made to expedite all of these things, particularly at the level of the municipal administration and the Ontario Municipal Board, to see that they are handled as quickly as possible.

Of course, we must remember that it is bad or poor business to cut corners. I have found, any time we cut corners, that we always got into trouble, the municipalities got into trouble; and the same applies to the water resources commission. It has to be very careful in writing specifications for tender calls, specifications and agreements for contracts, and so on and so forth, agreements with the municipalities; it has to have a clear understanding as to what is meant by an agreement, so that in later years there are no difficulties.

I would suggest to the hon. member that these delays are inevitable, but I want to assure him and hon. members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that every effort is made at all times to handle these matters as quickly as we possibly can, bearing in mind the responsibility which the commission has to the ratepayers of the community and also to the municipal council involved.

I think, all in all, this commission has done a very good job; and though you may say it has been going since 1957 and could have done more, well, that is a matter of opinion. I suggest to you that it has done all it could possibly do under the circumstances, and many of its activities are really not completely covered in the annual report, for that matter—and certainly not covered in this book of estimates.

I refer particularly to the research organization. It has done a tremendous lot of work in the field we were discussing earlier this afternoon—this matter of the study of the use of detergents. That is a question which has been studied very extensively by our commission, and this work has been done in conjunction with other authorities interested and involved in the same question. Those are people in the United States, and in some of the countries of Europe, where some research work has been done in the use of these detergents.

The commission also, through the use of its various agencies and co-operating organizations, has been in touch with the detergent industry. The indications are that great progress has been made in this field of sorting out these various detergents. It is all right to say that we should only use the soft detergents—I think that is the term they apply to those which do not cause these mountains of foam after going through a sewage treatment plant. And it is quite possible by later on this year, or perhaps by next year, that in the United States there will be available for general use what is known as the soft detergent, and that the so-called hard detergents, if I as a layman may refer

to them in that way, will no longer be on the market.

We think, in about a year, or a year and a half after that, the same situation will apply in Canada. That being the case, I think we can rightly say that our commission has worked quite consistently on this programme, with the Americans and other people interested in this, and with the industry, and that we have made considerable progress.

There are also a number of other studies under way in the research branch, dealing, for instance, with the great question of the algae on the Great Lakes. That is a programme which is worked on in co-operation with other departments of government, such as The Department of Lands and Forests, with the international joint commission, and with other agencies which are also interested in this work.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that these comments have answered the questions of the hon. member.

Mr. Paterson: I thank the hon. Minister very much for his detailed answers.

Regarding two further items, one about how careful the OWRC is in its contracts, I would just like to read this press report. This is in regard to the Puce work of the OWRC on this month:

"We assumed the project would be done under the winter works incentive programme, but now it looks as though it will be the summer works."

The reeve stated that he had first started to work to get the water for Woodslea in 1950, and there had been one stumbling block after another. The last straw, he said, occurred last week when the contractor, Sartori and Sons Company Ltd., had three bonds returned to the OWRC. They are dated March 14, and the commission wanted them dated March 31. This was a two-week delay.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is understandable. The agreement probably provides that the bond shall be dated a certain date. If the bond is not dated that date and something happened, perhaps that is another argument for having some question as to whether or not the bond is in order, because the bond is part of the agreement. I do not know whether you are a solicitor or not, but I think some of the lawyers in the House here might say that that would be a reasonable return.

Mr. Paterson: The whole basis of this delay is that during the two weeks that were lost in March, plus the month of April, this

work could have been completed under the winter works programme.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I agree with you.

Mr. Paterson: The hon. Minister mentions that the construction for expanding these plants is governed by the finances of the users.

Earlier today I read about two townships having to ban the use of water for irrigation purposes on two alternate days. These persons using water are cash consumers. They pay by the thousands of gallons; they are metered. If these people could have the water, the finances would be increased and thus we would warrant an extension of the plant. It is apparent that these two things cannot be done simultaneously.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The problem there is that the person who was taking water only when he needed it really had no supply set aside for him. I think he has to sort of rise and fall with the availability of water. If the plant could only fill its primary responsibility of providing water to certain users for domestic use and so on, then it would, of necessity, have to restrict the use of water for irrigation purposes. Those are some of the problems which one has to consider when dealing with this matter of the sale of water.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 605.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I wish in the few minutes remaining to test the reaction of these two hon. Ministers to the research and the plan of a well-known citizen of my community. This is in relation to the diversion of waters that now flow into the Arctic watershed and into the Great Lakes system. I want to acquaint all the hon. members of the House with the tremendous amount of work that has been done by Mr. T. W. Kierans of Sudbury and his brother over the past four years in evaluating the economic costs and the possibilities of this scheme. I also want to draw to the attention of the House the very exciting implications of it in its fruition.

I, for one, for a long time have been persuaded by Mr. Kierans in his arguments that at some time in the history of our province and our country this scheme will become a reality.

I believe with him that indeed some day it must. Of course many hon. members will know, and especially those from northern Ontario, that the Divine Providence was not so merciful in the location of the watershed, or the height of land to be more accurate, especially in the northwestern part of the

province. As you know, Mr. Chairman, in your immediate area the height of land is not very far north of the north shore of Lake Superior. As it wends its way eastward it bends to the north and in the northeastern part of the province it is quite a distance from the shore of Lake Huron, which is found in this area. This means, of course, that a tremendous amount of water that might otherwise flow into the Great Lakes is lost in the wastes of the northern reaches of the province, and from an economic point of view is of absolutely no use at all as it tumbles down into James and Hudson bays.

Indeed, one could wish even in the north-east that the height of land were further north. One is not far into the constituency of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs when one sees the sign, which I never thought was particularly gleeful or one to create much enthusiasm, but is there and says: "From this point on all waters flow into the Arctic watershed." I never thought that was something to cheer about particularly. I had wished that the waters it refers to would be quite a considerable distance north, if the waters wended and found their way into James Bay.

It is interesting to note in that regard that the diocese of Hearst, I think it is, is divided from the diocese of Sault Ste. Marie in the Roman Catholic Church on the geographic basis of the watershed. The bishop of Hearst is responsible for the salvation of all souls to be found in lands where the waters flow north, and the bishop of Sault Ste. Marie is responsible for those where the waters flow south into Lake Huron and Georgian Bay.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: May I suggest, if you will pardon me, the Catholic Church is not consistent in that regard, because the bishop of Timmins covers an area that is on both sides on the height of land.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know which one has the more difficult task. I suppose they have in mind that if they have one straggler they can catch the heretic who is wavering between the universal faith and the rest of us who walk with the left foot.

However, to get back to more serious matters. One must take note of course, that the diversion of water into the Great Lakes is no new principle. It has been done by the Ontario government in relation to the waters of the Ogoki River, which formerly flowed from their headwaters into the Albany and thence down into James Bay. About 7,000 cubic feet per second of the Ogoki has now been diverted so that it flows into Lake

Nipigon, and thence through the Nipigon River into Lake Superior. But that to date is the only replenishment of the Great Lakes that has been either tried or has succeeded.

The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, early in his estimates, made note of the fact that he felt this was purely a federal problem. At least he was ready to slough off in a very brusque fashion, I thought, the responsibility for this problem onto the shoulders of the federal government. I am not sure that he is correct because, from a constitutional point of view certainly, the Great Lakes in some regards at least fall under the jurisdiction of this Parliament.

It is interesting to note in that regard that whereas on the southern shores of the Great Lakes there are seven or eight jurisdictions—I have not counted them, but there is Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Minnesota, Illinois and perhaps a few others—

An hon. member: Pennsylvania.

Mr. Sopha: Pennsylvania, indeed. There are all those various jurisdictions, but the northern shore of the Great Lakes proper is under the exclusive jurisdiction of one constituted authority and that is the province of Ontario. I pass over rather quickly the problems that have been posed for our country and our province by the pressure of the jurisdictions in the southern shore of the Great Lakes, notably that of Illinois to divert a substantial quantity of water for sewage purposes at Chicago. At Chicago, a good deal of water is taken from Lake Michigan and eventually finds its way down the Illinois chain, the Ohio and into the Mississippi, and so on into the Gulf of Mexico. There have been persistent and continual pressures, notably by Chicago but by other municipal jurisdictions in the United States, to draw off more water. To date these have been successfully resisted by importuning of the Canadian government to the government in Washington. The Senate of the United States has so far refused to give in to these pressures and allow Chicago and other places to draw off any more water.

However, we are met, whether from this source or from cyclical hydrological phenomena, with the fact that water levels in the Great Lakes have lowered to an extent that has become, to those who think about it, very alarming. This is a matter of conjecture. Mr. Kierans relates that studies by the United States army reveal that in the period 1905 to 1964, the mean level of the Great Lakes has been five feet lower than in the period 1860 to 1905. This, of course, has very widespread

effects for shipping, navigation in the lakes, the supply of water, and particularly in regard to shipping and navigation, the use of harbours. I am told that in the harbour of Collingwood or Midland—I forget which but one of them; my friend says Collingwood—when the wind blows offshore, in recent years the harbour has become virtually unusable. A sufficient amount of water is blown out into the lake to lower the level beyond the feasible depth to permit the movement of shipping into that harbour.

Added to that of course, there were persistent periods of drought last year. The level of the Great Lakes has great implications for the use by the residents of our province, of waters that may be taken from it to relieve the agricultural problems which drought creates.

In that regard, I remember very well, two or three years ago, that my hon. friend from Grey South had on the order paper a resolution which advocated the building of a grid in southern Ontario to bring water to hard-pressed areas, particularly urban communities, from the Great Lakes. I do well recall that the leader of the government of that day, in addressing his remarks to that resolution, rather scoffed—and he was a man capable of great scoffing when his nature led him towards that intellectual pursuit—at the idea of bringing water in by artificial conduit to areas which needed it. He said: "All you need to do, really, is to look at this province and you see that its southern part is bordered on all sides by the Great Lakes. Accordingly, it is feasible for any communities which want to use it, since they are very close to the lakes in all parts of the province, to pipe water for their own purposes out of the Great Lakes and relieve any problems which may exist in that regard."

Well, last summer and fall it did not seem such a bad idea as many areas in the hinterland of the province, in its southern part, suffered greatly from the adverse effects which shortage of water brings. But this I relate back to the main theme of my argument—which is to draw attention to the adverse effects upon the lakes themselves by the withdrawal of large amounts of water, whether for urban communities or to relieve the problems of agriculture, and the implications of drawing off that water in the use of the Great Lakes for navigation. Certainly, if one tried to point to any one asset the province of Ontario has which supersedes all other assets, one which stands out like a monument, one would be hard put to find one greater than the Great Lakes, in their strategic location, around almost every area

of our great province. From that, of course, can be seen the economic implications of their use in the taking of the resources we produce in this great province, as well as the provinces to the west of us, to the sea; and over the sea to foreign ports where we dispose of them.

Therefore, I now come to a point in my argument where I can say, without feeling the need to really convince anyone, Mr. Chairman, that the state of the Great Lakes is a matter of vital consequence to the future of our province. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with that background, as I said, I should like to test the reaction of the government to this very grandiose plan developed by Mr. Kierans, a civil engineer by profession, which he has called the great replenishment and northern development canal.

In his study he selects an area which is the watershed of the Harricanaw River, which presently rises in central Quebec near Amos and finds its way northward into James Bay. The drainage area of that great river is an area of 64,000 square miles. Mr. Kierans has studied the feasibility of reversing the flow of that river and stopping the wastage of its waters by bringing the river through mechanical means—hydro-electric energy, to be specific—over the height of land at Amos, Quebec, and emptying it into Lake Timiskaming—which, after all, is just a widening of the Ottawa River—then down the Ottawa as far as the confluence of the Mattawa and the Ottawa, through the Mattawa River, up over another small height of land, down the French River and into Georgian Bay.

This violation of the laws of nature which Mr. Kierans envisages would mean that 75,000 cubic feet of water per second—let me repeat that formula—75,000 cubic feet of water per second would be emptied into Georgian Bay by way of replenishment instead of wasting itself in the Arctic watershed as it does now.

Of course the replenishment of the Great Lakes is only one aspect of this daring plan. It is perhaps the most important one, because Mr. Kierans states it as being axiomatic; and I think it must be accepted by all that whether or not the means are idealistic the axiom remains valid that we cannot continue to draw off water from the Great Lakes in the fashion we are doing. We must do something to replenish them. That is the most important side. The other side, of course, is the navigation and shipping aspect of this plan. By this means, he would make of the Ottawa River, a navigational canal—

Mr. M. Hamilton (Renfrew North): A proposed alternative to Highway 17.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, in place of Highway 17. And that brings a look of optimism to the face of my friend, the hon. member for Renfrew North. Also, he points out the results which would accrue to such communities as Montreal and, for that matter, any harbour which is used for shipping on the Great Lakes themselves, by reason of the fact that the flow past a given point would be increased to such an extent that the river or harbour just would not freeze in the winter.

He points out that last year the harbour of Montreal had 107 days ice-free, which is not very long. It is less than a four-month navigation season—and this, of course, could be greatly increased, as it could be increased for other harbours such as, I suppose, Toronto.

Then, of course, he does not overlook the results and the benefits which would accrue to Hydro with the increased amount of water flowing over Niagara Falls, if my understanding is correct—and if it is not correct, my friend, the hon. member for Niagara Falls, who always demonstrates a very searching and retentive memory for anything which affects his community, will correct me. Is that the way that sentence should end?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: He will correct me.

I say that I think they have drawn off just about all the water from the falls that aesthetics and tourism will permit. There just is no more, and by increasing the flow of water into the Great Lakes and the upper lakes, Lake Huron, it must follow that more water must find its way down to Niagara Falls and consequently Ontario Hydro might draw off more for the generation of hydro-electric power. In that connection, Mr. Kierans points out that Ontario Hydro increased its expenditure to \$35 million in one year for the purchase of coal for the generation of electric energy in the southern part of the province. A far more expensive proposition, I must say, as all hon. members know, is the creation of electric power by steam generation than by falling water.

In that connection I look back fondly to debates we used to have in this House with the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) who, alas, as I look at his empty seat, brings a pang of remorse to my heart that he is not here any longer these days. We used to ask him, as we did every year, whether he had discovered in Ontario any more waters that flowed downhill with suffi-

cient force to generate hydro-electric energy because it was apparent on the face of it that there was always a disagreement between the man from Lindsay and the chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. This was always a disagreement about whether all of the hydro-electric resources in the province had been tapped or not. The man from Lindsay used to say they had been, there are no more.

I could show you chapter and verse where he said that we have developed every water resource. The chairman of the hydro-electric-power commission, not this one, the man from Massey-Ferguson that preceded him, he used to say, that there is at least one-third more. I think they generate something like two billion kilowatts an hour and the chairman used to aver that in the province there was always a further two million, or a third of that amount, could be found. But the hon. member for Riverdale could never seem to find where they were.

We have in many parts of the province—of course it is well known to all and hardly needs to be pointed out—that in many parts of the province these days we have turned to the generation of electricity by steam generation, a very expensive proposition.

So one can see, Mr. Chairman, that the benefits of Mr. Kierans' scheme are multiple, glamorous, daring—correction, challenging. All that really is needed to evaluate the economic feasibility of them is money, "lucre". Coin of the realm is all that is required to really assess this important project and its part in the future history of our province with our nation.

Now I do not by any means, and I hasten to add categorically, very categorically, I do not come here to beg for any money for Mr. Kierans. He does not ask me to do that and I would be remiss in my responsibilities if I were even to imply that such was my intention, but I do come here to adjure the two hon. Ministers, and perhaps we are fortunate we have two answering for water.

Very strange! We only need one to answer for whiskey, but we need two for water. Water is a much less volatile element in our society than is the other stuff I mentioned.

It may well be said of Mackenzie King that one of his epitaphs will be that it was he who started putting the water in the whiskey. It may be that the level of the waters in the province are some reflection of that diversion of water.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Are you blaming Mackenzie King for the low levels of the lakes?

Mr. Sopha: It may be!

However, I would not dare to even hazard a guess as to how much this project would cost in its ultimate fulfillment. Certainly I would judge that it is greater than the building of either the Suez or the Panama canals. It would cost more in terms of money; but after all, what is money? What is money but the purchasing power created by the great wealth in this country and the reflection of the savings that our citizens make? But I am not here to talk about the ultimate cost. That will be perhaps for other people, for a future generation.

What I am here to do, within the limitations of the presentation that I make, is to implore the two hon. Ministers, or whichever one in whose lap it falls, to make some move toward a preliminary study. I think it deserves that. I think the year 1964 deserves that, a preliminary plan. I think the results for future generations in this country are so great that Mr. Kierans' plan ought not to be dismissed out of hand as being the idealistic maunderings of an idle mind.

In point of fact, Mr. Kierans carries on a highly successful business at Sudbury. He is a good businessman. He is a well respected man in the community. He is not looked upon in any way in the light of being an Egyptian fakir or being an idealistic ne'er-do-well.

He is far from that. He is a very substantial man and a very successful businessman.

These researches Mr. Kierans has made into this problem of replenishment of the Great Lakes are done in his leisure time and at his personal expense and he has, of course, carried his message not only to the doors of government but to professional associations and indeed, to the United States government itself and to many departments of the American administration. And nowhere, really, has Mr. Kierans been dismissed as being the purveyor, the carrier, of idealistic balderdash.

I would think that at this stage in our history, seeing as we do, as we must, the stark reality of the implications for our province in falling levels in the Great Lakes, that the Treasury board, at the insistence of one of these hon. Ministers, would set aside a certain sum in order to carry on some form of preliminary survey of the feasibility and the cost of this project.

I am not saying at all that these monies need be given to Mr. Kierans, I am not saying that he be put in charge of the project.

I have not discussed that with him at all. I am not here as the steward of Mr. Kierans to advocate any such thing.

Whoever was put in charge of such a survey—that is all I am asking for, a survey—would, of course, have the advantage of the many months of work that Mr. Kierans has made in regard to the research into this very daring project.

To leave off, Mr. Chairman, where I began, I pointed out that now the geography of this province is such that a great quantity, an unimaginable quantity—I could not begin to compare it with anything or to assess the precise amount of the quantity of water, precious water. After all, it is water that gives human tissue its vigour, its vitality and its viability; it is water that does that.

Water is the base of all substance in this planet and that water is wasting itself into the Arctic watershed. There will be no benefit at this stage of our history. Perhaps some day the Hudson Bay and the James Bay area—who knows, in the nuclear age, who dares to close the door, the door of his mind on any scientific advance?—perhaps some day it will be a garden of nature growing bananas and pineapples and something else. You cannot, in the nuclear age, dismiss the possibility of it.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): How about Moosonee bananas?

Mr. Sopha: I will adopt that. Perhaps some day Moosonee, in the nuclear age, with artificial means of heating, Moosonee will be the banana capital of Canada.

Mr. Peck: How about applesauce?

Mr. Sopha: But that day is far in the future and until that day arrives when inhabitants, fellow citizens of future generations and our descendants, need that water that now wastes itself into the Hudson Bay watershed, then I say we must, out of responsibility to our people in this province, to people in the rest of the country and out of the spirit of good neighbourliness with our cousins to the south; we must begin to look into the problem of the diversion of some of those waters, as we have done in the past with the Ogoki, and in that way to replenish the Great Lakes which is our heritage as one of the greatest natural resources that was ever given by Divine Providence to mankind.

Thank you, sir, I always end right on time.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 21, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued 2295

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2327

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (continued)

On vote 605:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned we had a very lucid and cogent presentation by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), and I believe this is about the sixth time members on this side of the House have presented that project of the replenishment of the Great Lakes by diverting the waters which flow into James Bay and Hudson Bay to the Great Lakes. This should interest the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), because of his background, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). I do not see the acting chairman of the ONR (Mr. A. Johnston) here, but I see one of the members of the commission (Mr. Brunelle), the vice-chairman of Ontario Hydro (Mr. Boyer), who would be involved.

I do not know how many times we have to present something in the House to at least put it on the rails. As the hon. members know, the Minister of Mines and Technical Survey in the former federal government, the Diefenbaker government, the hon. Paul Martineau, was a supporter of that plan. I hope, from all the speeches which have been heard from this side of the House, that some of those words will drop on receptive ears and that at least we will get to a meeting of minds between the federal government of Canada and the federal government of the United States, the departments of Quebec and the departments of the states which border the Great Lakes.

As the hon. member for Sudbury has pointed out, it is a very fantastic scheme; but things which were fantastic years ago are now realities. I understand too that the engineering factors have been solved in

central California, in and around Niagara Falls, in Russia, on the Volga, where they replenished the Caspian Sea by the rivers there and I understand, too, there are other rivers which, this year, will be diverted so that they feed that same sea. Surely, in this country, we should be able to do the same.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, for two years now the Ontario Water Resources Commission has required farmers using irrigation to provide themselves with a licence if they are going to use any source of water other than their own wells. During the recent drought, in the past irrigation season, it got to the point where the water resources commission almost had to decide how the licences were going to be used to control irrigation. I had the impression that it was just by the great gift of two or three rainstorms at the last possible moment that the commission was spared the responsibility of having to move into certain areas and exert almost a policing of the irrigation.

I wonder if we could have a statement from the responsible Minister as to just what powers the commission has under the licensing regulation and how, in a drought emergency, these would be applied?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, before proceeding to answer that particular question I think I should be given a few moments to pass some remarks on the suggestion made, in very able manner, by the hon. member for Sudbury this afternoon.

Dealing with the "grand canal" proposal or the "Harricanaw diversion" or the "Kierans plan", I suppose there are some people who might say that Mr. Kierans' plan for a diversion of the waters of the Harricanaw River is premature. Others might say that it is perhaps a little fantastic. I am not one of those who would agree with that. I think that the plan has some considerable merit but I think that it is premature.

There are many problems in undertaking a programme of this kind and any authority would examine alternatives before proceeding

to get into such a highly involved proposal as is suggested by this Harricanaaw diversion or Grand Canal proposal. This scheme, as the hon. member for Sudbury has said, is a scheme for diverting water now flowing into James Bay, to have it flow into the Great Lakes.

At the present time and for some years past, the waters of the Ogoki River in north-western Ontario have been diverted to flow south instead of into the Albany River and eventually to James Bay. This was a programme undertaken by funds provided by the province of Ontario, the hydro-electric power commission, and the federal government. The water is controlled at a certain control point and it is utilized to best advantage for power and for eventual flow of water into the Great Lakes area. But there is a limit to the amount of diversion that can take place.

I would think that because of the fact that waters in this province could be used to good advantage if necessary, it would be our responsibility to attack the problem from within our own provincial boundaries instead of becoming involved in a programme such as is suggested by Mr. Kierans. It begins to deal with water which is not within our jurisdiction but is within the jurisdiction of the province of Quebec.

I might say that I have met Mr. Kierans. I have listened with a great deal of interest to his proposal. I have seen the map which he has prepared explaining his idea. I suppose some of us in this House who are younger than others may see his proposal gain considerable merit and approval in the years ahead. But at the present time, I doubt very much because of the implications of several authorities that would have to be involved in this, whether it would be possible to undertake a particular study that would be of any value.

We must remember that the present low level of the water in the Great Lakes might be described as being cyclical. It is only a comparatively few years ago that a committee of this Legislature was named to study the problem, not of low water in the Great Lakes, but of high water. I think that the level of water in the Great Lakes is affected more by nature than by us. I think we should bear in mind that perhaps the low water which exists this year and existed last year and in the last several years, and is rumoured will continue for perhaps another year or so, may be reversed so that the whole picture may change again. It may not be very long before we are worried again about high water levels.

I think the programme which we have in co-operation with municipalities, conservation authorities and conservation commissions, and which has been explained this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management to assist in this emergency, will probably be of great benefit. I think that if we can prepare and construct projects and programmes, because of this emergency, which will hold the water which nature sends us, we may find that in the next year or two this situation will be greatly alleviated.

However, we are not leaving the matter at that. We are quietly, and I say efficiently, progressing to the point where we are going to continue to make progress in the establishment of water programmes in the province of Ontario and particularly in the area of the southwestern part of the province.

Referring back to Mr. Kierans' scheme, it would be difficult and comparatively expensive at the present time to undertake even rough estimates of the cost of this programme as suggested by him. There have been some broad assumptions taken by people involved and having the knowledge of these matters, and they have concluded that the power benefit, along with the benefit of the sale of water, or of additional water to the Great Lakes municipalities, would probably not be as economic as one would suppose.

The net power benefit, because this engineering scheme as proposed by Mr. Kierans is that electricity or hydro power would be used to operate pumps which in turn will operate generators, but the net power which will be produced will be negligible as far as engineers who have looked into this matter are concerned. But I say again, it is only in a very rough way that they are able to figure out.

So that I suppose if the plan did go into operation it could produce more power at Niagara and the St. Lawrence, but then again this could be offset by certain other high costs that in the long run the programme would not be as economically feasible as one would suppose by just a cursory examination. You see one of the problems that I think has been discussed, or I know has been discussed over quite a number of years, is the fact that water is diverted from Lake Michigan at Chicago. There is a limit, because of the international agreement, to the amount of water which can be taken by Chicago. When I was Minister of Lands and Forests I went to Chicago. I met with some of the people involved in the water management of that great city and I suggested to them that the proper place to deal with this matter was

through the International Joint Commission and the federal government and that if they were of the opinion that they needed water, I suggested to them, in a very pleasant manner I hope, that they had to be prepared to pay for it.

Now I suggest to you that there is water that can be diverted in northwestern Ontario and that we already have a diversion there at the present time.

You see all these schemes may look very good on paper and they no doubt may in the years ahead have considerable merit. Here is another one in which you may be interested.

This is the Parsons Company plan or project, sir, which is known as NAWAPA. That is a good Indian name and it means North American Water and Power Alliance. Its purpose is to divert water all the way from the Yukon down through the western provinces and the western states. The people who propose this are a very reputable firm of engineers in California, I think they are in Los Angeles. They have a staff of 2,500 scientists, engineers, draftsmen, technicians and supporting staff, together with 5,000 field construction personnel, a total of 7,500 people.

In reading the report that they have prepared on this, again in a very broad general way, they have said that this construction would take 30 years, would cost \$100 billion and would employ 100,000 people. Now it may be that this type of a programme or project which would serve a much larger area of North America, may be more possible.

I mention these things because it indicates that there are some people who are paying some attention to these matters in the same way as we are through the commission, through the government of this province and our association with bodies that are involved in these matters. Of course we always consider our American friends in the eight or nine American states bordering the Great Lakes.

An hon. member: The score is Detroit 1-0.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Detroit 1-0? Well that is very interesting. It is all right, the Leafs have to have something to fight for.

Coming back to the \$100 million and the question asked by the hon. member for Brant, referring to the issuance of permits. Reading The Water Resources Commission Act I think I should perhaps mention that the commission has discretion in this matter and in an amendment in 1960-61 the Act was amended to provide that the commission may, in its discretion, issue, refuse to issue, or cancel a

permit, may impose such terms and conditions in issuing a permit as it deems proper, and may alter the terms and conditions of a permit after it is issued.

Now the taking of water is regulated, but the Act provides that the taking of water for use for domestic or farm purposes or for the watering of livestock is permitted, providing that no person shall take more than 10,000 gallons of water a day. So the water that is controlled is water which is used for irrigation of crops.

It does happen and it has happened, fortunately not very often, but it has happened when the commission had issued a permit for a certain amount of water, then it has been found that because of certain unnatural conditions that it is necessary to amend the permit by perhaps reducing the amount of water that can be taken or putting in some restrictions.

Where a few years ago, I would say three years ago, there were only a few hundred permits issued, last year there were over 2,600 or 2,700 permits issued, which indicates the great amount—yes, 2,706 permits were issued in 1963 and only 152 had been issued in the year 1962.

Mr. Nixon: That does not indicate an increase in irrigation.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, it indicates an increase in the control exercised by the commission since the amendment of 1961.

It is hoped that the commission will be able to continue to issue these permits and in some areas may have to warn the permittees that there may be some reduction in the amount of permit as conditions change from time to time.

Every effort is made to be of as much service as we possibly can to the people involved so that no one will be adversely affected, or too seriously affected, by lack of water for irrigation purposes. But it is, I think, necessary that purposes other than irrigation should have top consideration.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell us how many members of the staff of the water resources commission would be available to go out and inspect the requirements of these permits?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: We will have that for the hon. member in one second.

At least 15 men are working on this and at times when there are more demands we can put as many as over 35 on the job.

Mr. Nixon: Then the purpose of the issuance of the permits is to be sure that the water available is equitably shared among those requiring it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is correct.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister, through his inspectors in the water resources commission, would be prepared to move right into the farm and tell them to stop pumping.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is right. Over the years we have collected a considerable amount of data in the field of stream flows and matters relating to that and also the flows in wells. We have our test wells in many localities which give us the measurement of the water tables.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly the inspectors have to have the wisdom of Solomon in many instances where a stream is providing for livestock and it is also providing for irrigation. One man says he is going to use all this water for irrigation, and the livestock man says "No, you are not". Then somebody has to be on the scene, and in moments of real emergency he almost has to come with a couple of shotguns or an armed guard. It is a very serious matter.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well we hope that nobody will chase them with the—

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, have any conversations been held between the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec in regard to the replenishment scheme of Mr. Kierans?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Troy: Then has the hon. Minister got anywhere in regard to the question, at least the problem, I posed this afternoon about the unorganized townships and the possibility of conservation authorities being set up. I know that when the hon. Minister was Minister of Lands and Forests he was concerned with that. I do not know whether to ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs or the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, in my experience in The Department of Lands and Forests, I think that the very matter which you discussed this afternoon with relation to the conservation authorities in unorganized territories was dealt with by correspondence I had with you and with the municipalities in the Nipissing district.

Mr. Troy: Yes, I know, but it did not—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It did not give you any money.

Mr. Troy: The point is, sir, that the province of Ontario has gotten a great amount of wealth from the forests that were cut down in the areas of northern Ontario. It is felt that there should be some responsibility by the government to assist the organized municipalities that should have conservation authorities set up, but because there is always the argument: What about these 90 unorganized townships in my own area to which the government itself does not contribute anything to the project?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is not quite correct, Mr. Chairman. The government and The Department of Public Works and The Department of Lands and Forests have constructed hundreds of water conservation dams and water control dams throughout this province.

Mr. Troy: Maybe they have—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes, there is no doubt of that. If the hon. member would like to have the information—

Mr. Troy: There are only two that affect us—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member cannot expect to have control of nature in all its various aspects. If the good Lord, in his mercy, sends a lot of water down at one time, we just have to live with it.

You cannot control all of these things and have controlled dams that are going to control every little creek that there is in northern Ontario. I realize that in some areas they have problems, but you cannot expect to control the areas around Lake Nipissing any more than is being done, or much more than is being done at the present time.

You have what, some two or three streams that provide some difficulty?

Mr. Troy: Okay, leave it!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the hon. Minister's comments on the Kierans diversion project, but there seemed to me one element of illogic in his argument. On one hand, he said this is likely coming. Then in fact, he turned around—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, I said you never can tell because—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister never can tell! He turned around and saw some of those around him who had dark hair, they were not all grey heads, so he said in our time it may well come. This was the little enactment that took place in front of us.

If it is going to come, it seems to me that there is one elementary move that might be considered now. We have had experts suggest to us that within ten years it may well be that Ontario's greatest export to the United States might be water. The hon. Minister himself, and I think quite rightly, when he went to talk with people of the water management committee in Chicago rather quietly suggested to them that if they needed more water, they would have to pay for it. And he is right.

If there is a serious possibility that we are going to have water as a major export from the province of Ontario, surely what we need now is to sit down with all of the various jurisdictions that are involved and at least start some planning.

The hon. Minister is gambling. He says water levels have gone in cycles. Ten or 15 years ago we had high water. He is hoping, he is gambling that ten years from now we will be back to high water. Ten years from now we may be five feet lower than we are at the present time and we will be faced with a crisis and if at that point we decide we will have to move, he will then be faced with all of the time-consuming, delaying negotiations with the roughly ten jurisdictions that will be involved.

On the assumption that it is a real possibility, a considerable possibility, that this is going to come in our lifetime, it seems to me that it is only elementary common sense that some initiative be taken and I suggest Ontario is the logical jurisdiction to do it, in conjunction with the joint international committee if you wish and with the others, to sit down and discuss it and get some idea of the cost. At least get some thinking going among our American friends who are interested in getting this, as to what the cost will be so that they will be conditioned to it. I leave that thought with the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think it was yesterday or the day before that the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management read certain correspondence that has taken place with the federal people on this subject of the lake levels and so on. I suggest to you that this is a problem or programme which he will be following with the federal people and from that you will see these other things develop.

I was very much disappointed after having gone to Chicago, as a matter of fact I attended a meeting in Detroit also sometime before that at which the Governor of Michigan was present. This was at a time when the Chicago diversion deal was very much in the air in the United States. I thought that the Chicago people might decide that they would like to talk to us and that they had some money that they wanted to put into the deal, but I have not had a word from them since. Maybe they did not like my idea, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: I repeat my suggestion, either to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs or the hon. Minister of Energy, that it seems to me that it would not be out of place either on your own, or in conjunction with Ottawa, to call together all of the necessary jurisdictions at least for a preliminary discussion on it.

There is a related question for which I wanted to see if I could get some clarification.

For some years now both the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party in the Opposition have been putting forward the proposition of a grid to supply the water needs of southern Ontario, and I think it is not inaccurate to say that the reaction of the government has been to dismiss this as impractical.

The standing committee on government commissions had one very interesting morning and noon out at the water resources commission on Highway 401; we had an opportunity to throw questions at the chairman and other members on the commission. A number of us asked a question with regard to this grid.

Actually, Mr. Snider was not too explicit but I got the impression from his reply that the greater the co-ordination of all bodies involved in the control and conservation of water, the greater the co-ordination now possible in the water management programme—which has been announced by the government and which comes into the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, is going to open up the prospects of a more serious consideration of this. Perhaps I am wrong, perhaps I am interpreting his reply wrongly, but I want to ask the government and the hon. Minister whether or not it is still the feeling of the government that this is an impractical proposition?

My own brief comment would be this: I would concede that there may well be, at the moment, no need for a complete grid to cover the whole of southern Ontario. Obviously, there is no need for building pipelines if

you do not happen to have an urgent need for water in any particular area. But it seems to me that there is need for the planning of a grid, and for the building of it, so as to anticipate future needs.

If you are laying the pipe from A to B and the amount of water needed, for example—and I am only picking figures out of thin air at the moment—stipulates a 10-inch pipe, but there is a likelihood that five or ten years from now other communities along this area are going to be requiring water, then this pipe should not be a 10-inch pipe, it should be a 15- or 20-inch pipe, or whatever is needed. In other words, do your planning now and its implementation will be done in the fullness of time, as circumstances demand.

Am I right in concluding that this is a practical proposition—planning, with the implementation as the requirements dictate?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I think I can allay the fears of the hon. member, because the water resources commission has done a considerable amount of work in these very fields. I have here a report of a number of pipelines where preliminary studies have been made. If you would like to have that information I will be glad to give it to you. It describes some of the problems inherent in this type of project.

This work—the preliminary studies I refer to—was done in 1962, some of it perhaps prior to that time. They made preliminary investigations as to the cost of pipelines required to pipe water from the Great Lakes to areas in Ontario which appear to require water from other than local sources.

The line from Lake Huron to London—the estimated cost is \$16.5 million; an alternative line from Lake Erie to Port Stanley, St. Thomas and London, is a little over \$20 million. Lake Erie to Grand Valley—that is the Lake Erie, Simcoe, Waterford, Brantford, Kitchener, Paris, Preston, Galt, Guelph, Waterloo, Hespeler area—\$30 million. Lake Huron to Grand Valley—Clinton, Seaforth, Dublin, Mitchell, Stratford, New Hamburg, Baden, Waterloo, Kitchener, Ayr, Galt, Guelph, Brantford—over \$38 million. Port Dover, Jarvis, Hagersville, Cayuga, Caledonia—approximately \$2.5 million. Cedar Springs—that is Lake Erie, Chatham, Blenheim, Ridgetown—over \$4.5 million.

These studies were initial studies only, with limited feasibility studies. The cost of a complete study, for instance, of constructing a line from Lake Huron to London, is in the neighbourhood of \$100,000. It will be easily seen that it is not possible for us to under-

take a complete study of all of these lines, because the economics of it, the feasibility, have to be taken into consideration; and these lines have to be within the financial capabilities of the municipalities which would be drawing water from the projected pipeline.

These lines were examined in this latter respect; that is the feasibility that the city of London has decided to build a line from Grand Bend on Lake Huron to London; and this project has now been undertaken by the city of London through its public utilities commission.

The Ontario Water Resources Commission has not yet held the public hearings with respect to the implications, if I may refer to them in that manner, or the possibility of water being supplied to users along the line, so I am not in a position to answer your question. Only the water resources commission can answer that, when they have had the public hearings and have seen how much interest there is among the municipalities which could be served along this pipeline.

With respect to the alternative line—which was the line from Lake Erie through to London, through Port Stanley and St. Thomas—the cities of London and St. Thomas looked into this and found that it was beyond their financial capacity. The city of St. Thomas decided not to proceed with the line from Grand Bend to London, and then St. Thomas decided to continue using its present water supply which, I believe, is Kettle Creek. Is that correct, is that part of their supply?

In connection with the lines from Lake Erie to Grand Valley and Lake Huron to Grand Valley, from investigations made it appears that Brantford, which is the largest city in that area, now has an adequate supply in quantity and will improve in quality with the elimination of pollution. Kitchener-Waterloo has a new supply of two million gallons a day which ensures sufficient capacity for many years. Galt has an adequate supply for many years and two capped wells not in use at present. Guelph has an adequate supply and, with the erection of the Arkell dam on the Eramosa, they have a suitable supply for the future.

While the present water used by these municipalities is quite hard, the use of detergents has made it more acceptable to householders. It would thus appear that the installation of a pipeline to the Grand River area, from either Lake Huron or Lake Erie, is premature.

The line from Port Dover, Jarvis, Hagersville, and so on: investigations have disclosed

that while this pipeline is desirable because of the quality of the waters at Caledonia and Hagersville, it is beyond the economic capacities of the two municipalities concerned.

Lake Erie, Cedar Springs area through Chatham, Blenheim, Ridgetown, and so on: due to a large commitment for sewage works by the city of Chatham, this municipality decided to defer any participation in a pipeline.

Now, since this is the largest municipality which would be required to bear the greatest financial responsibility, it becomes unfeasible to construct this pipeline with the smaller municipalities only participating.

Line to serve Corunna, Cartwright, Bridgen, Moore townships supply: the report is that there is some possibility that this system may go forward in part and further negotiations and studies are being conducted to determine whether this is financially feasible for the municipalities involved.

Regarding the line from Lake Ontario to Brantford and Kitchener: this pipeline was not considered as the static head from Lake Ontario to Brantford is 459 feet whereas the static head from Lake Erie to Brantford is 278 feet. This difference in static head rules out the Lake Ontario route from the power cost standpoint.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that these matters are kept under close observation and as developments take place in the areas or change occurs in the financial situation of the municipalities involved, that more detailed studies will be conducted so that they will be available through the water resources commission and made available to the municipalities concerned.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. Was the water plant that was built for the mentally retarded children at Cedar Springs designed to supply water to other communities in that area?

Another thing, while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister an article of March 27, 1964, where there was a zone meeting of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. Representatives of four counties, Essex, Kent, Lambton and Middlesex asked, or recommended, to the water resources commission to make a study of the feasibility of supplying a lake pipeline grid in southwestern Ontario. They were urging for a hydro-type water pipeline grid. Now, will anything be done in that request? Will there be a study made?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, insofar as the water plant at the Cedar Springs hospital is concerned, it was built by The Department of Public Works and is not to supply any municipalities but is to supply the Cedar Springs hospital.

With respect to the next item, I understand from the general manager of the commission that this request is being given very serious consideration and in due course of time contact will be made with the counties involved and their municipalities.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, some four or five years ago the former Minister of Planning and Development, Mr. Nickle, was up in the Long Beach area and they opened a park there. The present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was also at that meeting and when we opened the park at Long Beach some three or four years ago.

Mr. Nickle at that time looked at the feasibility of bringing water though an area that originates in my hon. friend's riding in Welland, from Lorraine Creek down through into the Niagara river again. There is a village there that they call Douglastown that puts up with a filtration system of their own that does not adequately supply fresh water. At that time the Minister from Kingston, Mr. Nickle, said that they would make a survey of this area. They did that for us and from that day to this we have yet to see the plans, or know whether it is feasible or not. I hear by the "grapevine" that it can be done.

Now my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management: This afternoon I think he made a statement that there has been an increase in the amount given to municipalities or counties which cared to go into the possibility of obtaining fresh water and opening up areas and developing ponds. Did I get that information correct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Seventy-five per cent for reservoirs or farm ponds.

Mr. Bukator: Farm ponds only.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Or reservoirs.

Mr. Bukator: Or reservoirs.

Well, I would like the project I speak of, Mr. Chairman, to a reservoir. I think that to bring fresh water from Lake Erie through Lorraine Creek, down into the Black Creek area and back into the Niagara River, is not only feasible but I understand there are plans in one of the departments now which indicate it can be done. It could be done by four or

five hon. Ministers in the front benches. I would just like to be put on the right track. I have brought this issue up annually.

Now, the Minister of Planning and Development—Mr. Macaulay I think, at that time, was Economics and Lord knows what; and then, from that particular group, I believe now it has gone to water resources; and from water resources I understand the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) will look at this kindly because it will assist farmers. It will assist farmers for irrigation. It will help the farmers throughout that whole area. It will help them in their gardening.

What I am trying to find out is: Since that meeting we had a month or so ago in Niagara Falls—and I am addressing the hon. Minister of Agriculture—has it changed now? Should I consult the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, or do I go to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) for this project? The Niagara regional development group feel this can be done, and should have been done, many years ago. There is not a man in that particular organization who does not believe that this could be done, and will help a lot of people, as far as irrigation is concerned, as far as farming is concerned, as far as conservation is concerned.

I hate to do this every time I get to my feet, but the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) has had representations made to him and I have had the county council group talking with me, and at the moment I am going to let you in on a little secret. He is supposed to make an appointment with some department, and I am supposed to join him, and we are going to talk over this project again.

I do not know a better place to find out who in heaven's name to talk to—do we talk to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs or do we go to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests? Mind you, only five years in the Legislature does not enlighten one to know in what direction to head. But if I can get this now—

An hon. member: Try the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman).

Mr. Bukator: Yes, that might be the answer to my problem. We should go to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions.

To get back to the subject I think is very important to that area, I am asking the hon. Minister, by way of a question: Which Minister do we talk to about this project, and the feasibility of it? I understand a survey

has been made. We would like to get our hands on that and find out whether it can be done.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, if the hon. member would give me an opportunity, I would be glad to answer him.

Mr. Bukator: I did not want to quit because I get so few opportunities to speak.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The project to which the hon. member refers, or to which the hon. member has referred, is a project under The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, which is a joint programme of Ontario and the federal government. The gentleman the hon. member should see is the director of ARDA for Ontario, Mr. Crown, whose office is in The Department of Agriculture. I understand from the hon. Minister of Agriculture that an appointment date has already been set.

Mr. Bukator: This is where the government does not let the Opposition in on what goes on.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, may I respectfully suggest that sometimes a four-cent stamp—and it does not cost you four cents writing these days—could get all that information in due course of time. We pay a lot of attention to the requests which come from the hon. members of the Opposition because we do not want any criticism, at least not in the House. This project, to which the hon. member has made reference, is in the hands of the ARDA director. Once the hon. member gets this appointment and attends at this appointment with the representatives of the municipalities or the counties, whatever it is, and the director then approves this project, it still will require approval from Ottawa.

Once it is approved here, it has to go to Ottawa; then it comes back. But in the past the experience has been that these projects are handled quite fast. I would suggest to the hon. member that it is being taken care of, and will be taken care of in due course of time—which will be soon.

Mr. Bukator: I would just like to make one point, Mr. Chairman. "A four-cent stamp," the hon. Minister said, and then "in due course of time." I think if I were to look into my records, I would find maybe I have spent 16 cents for stamps, and the due course of time has not been completed as yet. Now then, I am pleased that Mr. Crown is handling this because he was the executive secretary at that time for Mr. Nickle. I am very pleased that you have put me on the

right track; and you can rest assured that I will not miss the opportunity of which you spoke. I feel that this is good for more than the few people along that creek.

You talk about your water table, in bringing water to areas where you can have ponds and control dams. You will no doubt re-elect the hon. member for Welland for ever, if he gets this project through. And I would like to see him in there.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, this is something—

Mr. MacDonald: This is the last word.

Mr. Morningstar: —that the hon. member for Niagara Falls and myself, Mr. Chairman, have been interested in for a number of years—the getting of fresh water through this Black Creek area. When it is possible to do this it will create recreation centres, and so on and so forth; but in connection with this, as the hon. member knows, there is also a drainage problem in the township of Humberstone.

I have been attending meetings of the Niagara Regional Development Association. It was asking for this report from The Department of Lands and Forests; a survey was supposed to have been made. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests advises me that this survey is not completed, Mr. Chairman, that the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority is asking for a report on the whole area there and the department is making a report on the Chippawa creek, which is holding up the survey. I was also advised, as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs informed the House, that it really should come under the ARDA, which is connected with the federal government. So you see, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, it is quite a complicated project. But I am sure that we will get this ironed out eventually, or get it finalized one way or another.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question of the hon. Minister regarding the sewage disposal plant being constructed in Ottawa? First, I would like to know whether grants are available from the provincial government for the construction of that sewage disposal plant. Second, I would like to know whether there is any agreement with the province of Quebec; because if we install this sewage disposal plant in Ottawa, and the province of Quebec does not co-operate in order to clean up the river and do the same thing on their side of the river, the money being spent now on this sewage disposal plant will be lost.

Is there any agreement of any kind in the case of an interprovincial river like the Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Did I understand the hon. member to say that this plant was under construction now?

Mr. Racine: The sewage disposal plant? Well, so I understand.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I thought it was completed and officially opened some time last year. Is there only one plant?

An hon. member: It is completed.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, I will accept then that it is completed. Offhand, I do not know what grants were paid under it. There are different types of grants available, depending on the time of the year the construction takes place. I am sorry, we just could not have all our books here. Could we get the information for the hon. member in the next few days?

Mr. Racine: Yes, surely. Now, what about the other question?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not know what the other question was.

Mr. Racine: The question of some reciprocity between the provinces. Is there any agreement? I understand that there are a number of municipalities, perhaps even in Ontario, that have no sewage disposal plant. Naturally we have done our share in the Ottawa area; what happens in the other areas?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member has asked a rather embarrassing question. Embarrassing insofar as Quebec is concerned, because unfortunately it appears that there is not the same effort being put forth by the municipalities on the Quebec side as there is by the municipalities on the Ontario side. We have to live with these things and do the best we can with our neighbours, do our best to live with them.

I know that a number of municipalities on the Ottawa river on our side, on the Ontario side, have projects underway at the present time and others planned for the near future which will greatly alleviate the matter of pollution in the Ottawa. Just how far we can go in influencing Quebec, I think, would depend on the example that we set by doing our best to control the pollution so far as we are responsible for it.

Mr. Racine: I had no intention, Mr. Chairman, of embarrassing the hon. Minister, but I was just wondering whether there was any agreement. I think possibly there might be a possibility of getting together with the authorities in Quebec in order to arrive at some agreement regarding this problem.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I have one problem concerning a development that may take place on the Detroit River. It is across the international boundary, it is the filling in of approximately 34 acres as an extension to Peche Island.

Now, it is under study by the Michigan State Legislature as to permission being granted to the development company for putting this fill into the Detroit River. Because this is fairly close to the intake of Windsor's water supply, the fill that may be used might have some harmful effect on the water that is being supplied to the local municipalities.

Now this is across an international boundary line. More than likely, it would entail some type of negotiation between the province of Ontario and the state of Michigan. Is the department in contact with the state of Michigan as to this development and could the hon. Minister give us some assurance that the type of fill that may be used, according to any agreement with the state of Michigan, would not have any harmful effect on the water supply coming into the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is in the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission. I also understand from the general manager of the OWRC that this matter was on the agenda for the IJC meeting which was held in Buffalo a month or so ago and I am advised that every effort will be made, that any material that is placed in that river in this particular area will have no bad effects on water supply going to anyone.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister.

Vote 605 agreed to.

Vote 606 agreed to.

Vote 607 agreed to.

Vote 608 agreed to.

Vote 609 agreed to.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, the statutory item listed in The Department of Energy and Resources Management estimates provides for a grant-in-aid of rural hydro-electric services in northern Ontario. The statute concerned is called The Rural

Hydro-Electric Distribution Act, under which, formerly, all of Ontario benefited, until the day came a few years ago when all major needs for extensions had been met in the south and the programme was limited to the northeastern and northwestern regions of Ontario Hydro. For some years this item has been used for the purpose of introducing a statement to this honourable House on Hydro matters generally.

Therefore, as a representative of the Legislature on the Ontario Hydro Commission, it is a privilege to be able to outline Hydro's operations during 1963 and some of the more important developments of the past three months. I cannot deal at great length, nor to any depth, with many aspects of Hydro's numerous services, projects and plans, yet I hope I may be able to leave you with a comprehensive picture. If there are areas of the commission's activities which seem to need more detailed explanation, and hon. members have questions, I will try to furnish further details.

May I also mention to the House that the standing committee on government commissions will be meeting tomorrow morning at ten o'clock when the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission will be the authority that will be before that committee. The chairman and commissioners and senior management of Hydro will be present in order to answer questions from the members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, a good indicator of economic growth in Ontario is the continuing rise in electric power requirements and the increasing uses of this form of energy. The year 1963 illustrates this well. After some levelling in power demands in the first quarter, there was a steady upward trend which continued to the end of the year. The climax was reached in mid-December when we recorded an unprecedented demand of 6,797,000 kilowatts. This compared to the 1962 peak was greater by eight per cent, or expressed in kilowatts, an increase of 504,000 kilowatts.

The net revenue from the sale of primary power and energy in 1963 was approximately \$270,000,000 compared with \$249,300,000 in 1962 for an increase of about eight per cent. It is reassuring to note that primary energy provided in March, 1964, last month, increased over March of last year by 8.1 per cent, and that the rate of increase of the first three months of the current year over last year's first quarter has been of almost similar proportions.

Let me describe our power resources. At present, Ontario Hydro has 65 hydraulic

plants throughout the province, with a combined total dependable capacity of 5,031,000 kilowatts. We also have four major thermal plants with a combined capacity of 2,108,000 kilowatts, and contracts for purchased power, chiefly with Quebec, totalling 617,000 kilowatts. The total capability of the provincial system has now reached 7,756,000 kilowatts.

In addition to this, the nuclear power demonstration plant at Rolphton is now operating and is rated at 20,000 kilowatts. Comparing the total supply capability with the mid-December peak demand leaves us a power reserve of approximately 14 per cent under normal operating conditions.

It is interesting to observe that thermal generation in 1963 approached 25 per cent of the output from all of the commission's plants.

In the House today we have heard of low water levels. I would add that much below normal water levels on Lakes Erie and Ontario during almost two years, coupled with low river flows in most of the province, have continued to emphasize the importance of thermal-electric generation to Hydro's east system in southern and northeastern Ontario. In October, for example, the flow of the Niagara River was the lowest in 103 years of record for that month.

Ice conditions which plagued us in past years presented further problems to our Niagara generating complex. In January and February of 1963, as a result of these conditions which restricted river flow, thermal generation reached 35 per cent of all generation in the east system. Again in 1964, ice conditions on the Niagara hampered production.

I should note that continuing studies have been made by the authorities interested in the important role of the Niagara River into ways and means of reducing the serious annual ice problem. Ontario Hydro and the power authority of the state of New York have submitted a proposal through the Canadian and United States governments to the International Joint Commission requesting approval of the construction and operation of a boom designed to prevent or at least limit the sporadic but massive discharges of ice from Lake Erie into the Niagara River. This ice boom would be about two miles long and would be placed in Lake Erie above the water intake for the city of Buffalo where the velocities are less than 1.5 feet per second. If the ice boom is successful, as is anticipated, great benefits will accrue to the communities along the Niagara River.

It is important to note, that the combined

effect of ice conditions and low water levels—on the Niagara River alone—caused an energy loss of 800 million kilowatt-hours in the first three months of 1964. In other words, approximately 320,000 tons of coal had to be burned by our thermal plants to make up this deficit.

The ever-increasing reliance on thermal generation has focused attention on the importance of having adequate supplies of coal. While, of necessity, the greater part of our coal has been purchased from the United States, I am happy to say that we were able to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with Nova Scotia coal mining interests to supply us with a total of 2,850,000 tons of coal to be delivered between 1963 and 1967. This amount is the maximum that Nova Scotia can supply us in that period.

This coal contract is undoubtedly of great significance to the future of coal-mining operations in Cape Breton, as it is to Canada's overall economy. To give some idea of the quantities of coal we have been purchasing, I will give the figures for the past three years. In 1961, we bought about half a million tons; the following year, around a million and a half tons, and in 1963 our coal purchases reached 3.5 million tons.

As more coal-fired plants are built and our present ones expanded, coal will become an even greater item in our purchasing.

Earlier in this session, I endeavoured to answer certain unfounded statements which became current in the province over the past few months to the effect that in our sale of energy, particularly in respect to residential electric heating, Hydro's rates were not sufficient to pay the cost of fuel used at our generating stations. The implication seemed to have been that Hydro was providing unfair competition in this field.

Sir, I assert again that this type of statement is completely at variance with fact. I emphasize that all costs, including purchase of coal, are met in the attractive rates offered for electric heating. Further, even if all the electric heating power requirements were met by generation at our coal-burning stations—and this is not the case—the cost of coal still would represent only one-third of the electric heating rate. I stress this, since I wish all hon. members to be informed on this point.

As an interesting sidelight, I may say that our coal purchases in Nova Scotia have influenced the Ontario economy in another direction. So that these larger tonnages from Nova Scotia may be delivered directly to our Lake Ontario sites, a shipyard at Port Weller,

near St. Catharines, has constructed on behalf of a leading Canadian shipping company a self-unloading coal carrier which will be used to make these deliveries. The firm which has had the ship built is the one which has obtained the contract from Nova Scotia interests for coal movement to Ontario. This ship is 680 feet in length and will have capacity for more than 22,000 tons of coal each trip. It will be among the largest ocean-going ships to use the St. Lawrence Seaway and the largest ocean-going vessel built on the Great Lakes. In May last year, at a significant ceremony at Port Weller, the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Roberts) officially laid the keel at the start of construction.

On April 25, that is this coming Saturday, at the shipyard of Port Weller Dry Docks Limited, the christening and commissioning of this splendid craft, which will bear the name S.S. Cape Breton Miner, will take place under the gracious sponsorship of Mrs. John Roberts.

While, as I have indicated, our thermal-electric generation was much in the limelight during 1963, there was no slackening in our continuing programme to harness those remaining hydraulic sites which are capable of economic development.

In the James Bay watershed, workmen carried on with the development of water power resources in the rock, muskeg and bush in the area some 500 miles north of this capital city. By the year's end, we brought four new generating units into service with a combined total capacity of 209,000 kilowatts at Little Long and Otter Rapids.

These locations are in the interesting riding represented by the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle). Several hon. members have in recent years had opportunity to visit Otter Rapids, on the Abitibi River. Late last summer an official opening ceremony took place at this plant. Little Long generating station is 30 miles west of Otter Rapids, 42 miles north of Kapuskasing. Within 15 miles of Little Long two additional plants are under development, the Harmon and Kipling stations, which when completed by 1966 will raise the total output from this new northeastern power complex to 560,000 kilowatts.

This work has not been easy, and we do well to pay tribute to the men who so diligently work summer and winter, often when the temperature is many degrees below zero, through muskeg and rock, through black flies and mosquitoes in the early summer, distant from the amenities of towns and cities, and yet maintaining a good morale and an interesting community life. It is to

the credit of Ontario Hydro that we have such large numbers of employees who work so hard for the commission and in turn for all the people of this great province. I hope we shall never become too immersed and impressed with facts and figures which emerge after all the work is done, and thereby overlook the individual people who have worked together loyally and hard, since it is they who have been responsible for the very progress which I am now endeavouring to describe.

The pivotal point of the \$200 million hydro-electric complex on the James Bay watershed, together with the EHV transmission line, is the Pinard transformer station. Power from the Little Long and Otter Rapids generating stations is now being transmitted to the Sudbury area on EHV lines at 230,000 volts. The second half of this link will be extended to Toronto by 1966.

At that time, sir, the entire line will be carrying power at 500,000 volts. This is the first major line of this voltage and length on the North American continent. Good progress is being made in clearing the right-of-way and erecting the structures which will carry this line in the sections between the Severn River and the French River.

I wish to make known to the House that the possibilities of further hydro-electric sites are being carefully considered. Engineering studies are to be completed within several weeks on the feasibility of the development of a site at Mountain Chute on the Madawaska River. It will be some time before all engineering and economic considerations are firmly established, but this is one of a quite limited number of sites where it may be possible to add to our hydraulic power resources.

In 1963 Hydro's thermal-electric capacity reached 2,108,000 kilowatts. This includes the Thunder Bay generating station, which officially was accepted for service at the end of July. For the present, this station at Fort William serves as standby to provide security of service to northwestern Ontario in the event of low stream flows or a sharp increase in energy demands from our customers in that area who have the capacity to absorb large blocks of power on short notice.

Good progress continued on Units 3 and 4 at our Lakeview generating station, just to the west of Metropolitan Toronto. To bring Lakeview to its full potential, another four units are to be added. When completed by 1968, the Lakeview development, with eight units, will have a total capacity of 2,400,000 kilowatts, making it the largest

thermal-electric power plant in Canada, and among the largest in the world.

Following thorough investigation of several sites in the London-Windsor-Sarnia area, the commission recently announced approval for the construction of a new coal-fired, thermal-electric station on the St. Clair River, two miles south of Courtright. Initially, the new plant will comprise two 500,000-kilowatt units, both of which will be in service by 1969. It might be added that the site will permit further expansion if required in the more distant future. I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the largest coal-fired units now operated by Hydro are 300,000 kilowatts, and the decision to increase the size to 500,000 kilowatt units at this plant is yet another step in closing the cost gap between coal-fired and hydraulic generating stations. The need for a plant in this area has developed because of the rapid growth of power demands throughout southwestern Ontario.

Canada's first full-scale nuclear power station at Douglas Point, between Kincardine and Port Elgin on Lake Huron, continues on its course to completion. Last summer the 60-ton reactor vessel or calandria in which the nuclear reaction takes place, arrived at the site, having been shipped entirely by water from Montreal. The Douglas Point project is to be completed by 1965 and it will give us 200,000 kilowatts.

As you already know, Mr. Chairman, the nuclear power demonstration station at Rolphton on the Ottawa River has been successfully operated for over a year and a half. A great deal of operating experience was gained from this station and scientists have developed technical knowledge that is invaluable to future development of nuclear power stations.

So much is this so, that we are prepared to undertake the development of a one million kilowatt nuclear-electric station, in co-operation with others. Negotiations are underway between the Ontario government, the Canadian government and Ontario Hydro as to the basis upon which initial financing and its subsequent recovery will be shared. Operation of this new plant is scheduled for 1970. Its location will be at a site to be approved by the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada.

Even as new electric power generating sources are being developed, Hydro has continued to seek other methods of generation which can economically cope with peak capacities.

One of these methods is the pumped-storage scheme which permits energy, pro-

duced by conventional generating stations during low demand hours of the day, to be converted to a large amount of short-term peak capacity. As will be remembered, Hydro completed the first such plant at Niagara in 1958.

You will also recall, Mr. Chairman, from information given to the House, in the previous Parliament, that in May of 1961 Hydro took out one-year options of land near Delphi Point, about eight miles west of Collingwood on the Georgian Bay. Since that time, we have virtually completed buying 1,000 acres of land.

The purchase of land at Delphi Point is part of our long-term planning to meet the province's future electric power requirements. Although actual construction of this project may not proceed for some time, we have purchased this land now to avoid disruption to future commercial and residential developments which otherwise would likely take place in the area.

I should emphasize, for the benefit of those concerned, that neither the water level of Georgian Bay nor skiing activities will be interfered with. While it is too early to go into details, we anticipate that the hydraulic plant at this site can produce one million kilowatts or more.

In planning for the power needs of an ever-developing province, it is essential to use our resources to the fullest degree economically possible, and Delphi Point, in due course, will illustrate the same.

We passed a significant milestone in our rural electrification programme when, a year ago, we gained our 500,000th rural customer, despite losses of some 85,000 customers from the rural system to urban commissions since 1949 through municipal annexations. The rural electrification programme launched in 1912 by Hydro's first chairman, Sir Adam Beck, is reaching the saturation point with more than 97 per cent of the rural population now supplied with electricity, including 137,000 farms. Our total of 49,000 miles of rural distribution line is enough to girdle the globe twice.

Extension of service to rural areas has been a paramount objective in our overall programme to provide low-cost electricity to all parts of Ontario. The contributions electricity has made to the social and economic progress in rural Ontario over the past half-century are immeasurable.

Originally, rural hydro service supplied power to farms only but now it embraces commercial establishments, hamlets, summer

residences and fringe areas of towns and cities.

The greatest expansion of our rural systems has occurred since 1945. Between 1953 and 1963, the number of hamlet customers increased by 49 per cent to a total of 224,000, while farm customers rose by 2.5 per cent to 137,000. Farm and hamlet customers nearly doubled their average consumption of power in this decade.

Also in this ten-year period, summer cottagers increased by 87 per cent to 108,000, indicating the importance of electricity in supporting the province's tourist trade. I can testify to the great importance of rural hydro in my own part of the province in enhancing the attractiveness of our lakeland areas where the advantages of modern living are welcomed during vacations as in any other time of the year.

Electricity has helped to revolutionize farming in Ontario over the years, by introducing a host of labour-saving devices. Today we have approximately 400 electrical applications available to farms, narrowing the difference between farm and city services almost to the vanishing point.

In the decade up to 1963, Ontario's farm cash income has been increased by 32 per cent despite a decrease in acreage under cultivation and a 22 per cent reduction in the agricultural labour force.

In the same decade Ontario farmers nearly doubled their use of electricity, and the average cost per kilowatt-hour declined by 17 per cent. Meanwhile, and this comparison is significant, the price index of services and commodities used by farmers rose 22 per cent.

Due to the phenomenal growth of our province, power demands in Ontario have been doubling every ten to twelve years, giving us an average yearly increase of 6.5 per cent of an ever-increasing total. In order that Hydro shall keep ahead of demands, we must estimate well into the future and take steps to make certain that they are met. This is not always an easy thing, as you will agree, especially when you realize that it takes around four years from the moment of decision until a major plant is in service.

In projecting estimates to the end of this decade, we see an interesting growth pattern emerging. May I take time briefly to review steps we are taking today to be ready for 1970.

I would like to place on record a percentage breakdown of what we expect to be our generation sources in the year 1970.

Hydro-electric stations will account for nearly 50 per cent of system capacity, which

is a decline from its present 65 per cent. Conventional thermal-electric will rise to 42 per cent, and nuclear will account for around six per cent. The remainder of our resources will consist of purchased power.

I may assure the House that should our provincial economy spurt forward to such an extent that we need even greater generating capacity than now estimated, we have additional means of providing for this. We can increase capacity in some of our present plants, or develop entirely new sites. The sum of these statistics is that we need never fear being unable to cope with the growth of our province. We deem it our duty to ensure that Ontario is never hampered in the future by reason of power shortages.

This brings me to another very important development which has been continuing for a number of years. It is that of power interchanges and interconnections with other neighbouring electrical utilities.

These interconnections are growing in importance, both from the standpoint of economics and security. Although our total purchases of power from other utilities declined in 1963, this outside source of energy did benefit us directly when we could buy substantial amounts of power as required.

In September of last year, our east system began operating in electrical synchronism with Hydro-Quebec, improving security for both utilities. Through a system of these interconnections we are now in a position where we can operate in parallel with a growing electrical grid system which has a combined capacity of 150 million kilowatts and stretches across more than half of the North American continent. Eventually, this grid will be extended to encompass the greater part of North America.

I come now to the matter of rates. Ontario enjoys a unique distinction in that the per capita consumption of electricity in our province is one of the highest in the world. Although statistics are not yet available for 1963, the 1962 figures show the annual per capita energy consumption, expressed in kilowatt-hours, to be as follows: Ontario, 6,300; Canada, 6,200; United States, 5,100; United Kingdom, 2,850; and France, 1,750.

And while we are one of the largest consumers of electric energy in the world, we also enjoy the distinction of paying one of the lowest rates anywhere. Let me illustrate this by way of some examples: average costs per kilowatt-hour to householders in Ontario in 1962 were 1.32 cents; compare this with the residential and farm average cost per

kilowatt-hour in the United States, which is 2.41 cents, or the United Kingdom where it is 1.96 cents.

The commercial average cost per kilowatt-hour has decreased in the decade up to 1962, by 2.8 per cent—now standing at 1.41 cents as compared to the United States with 2.37 cents.

I will give one more comparison and that is the average cost per kilowatt-hour for total power consumed; that is to say, for residential, commercial, farm and industrial requirements. The Ontario average is .91 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with 1.68 cents per kilowatt-hour in the United States.

So, it can be seen, we have achieved a record in Ontario that is the envy of the world. This is something of which not everyone in Ontario is aware; but then too many people are inclined to take their blessings for granted.

There are many reasons why Ontario should enjoy this significant general advantage, ranging from effective administration to economical operation and to large consumption. Modern living, with more wage-earners in each household, has contributed to a greater diversification of electrical uses. Peaks have been spread out; more appliances are now in use. Increased diversification of the power load is our aim as much as high consumption. The more energy we use the lower the average cost.

Today Ontario Hydro is continuing its efforts to maintain rates at their present levels. This is the prime reason why we carry out the extensive load-building operation of which I wish to speak.

A point often mentioned to me is that we are paying more for electricity today than we were, say, 20 or 30 years ago. It is true that our total bills may be higher, yet in actual fact we are paying less per kilowatt-hour. The difference lies in our increased uses of electric energy. As early as the 1940's there were only about 40 appliances available for the average home. Today the number of appliances and labour-saving devices number more than 100.

In our load-building programme for 1963, in common with other electrical utility organizations across the continent, we used the theme "make your comfort complete with electric heat." As a result, electric heating made a major breakthrough into the mass heating market with the establishment of three electrically-heated housing subdivisions in the province. By the year-end, we had 7,600 electrically-heated homes and numer-

ous churches, motels, schools and apartment buildings. The target for this year is another 5,000 homes.

Electric water-heating shared the load-building limelight and an estimated 100,000 electric water heaters were installed in Ontario homes during the year. This includes the customers of the municipal utilities as well as those served directly by Hydro.

There are a number of ideas for extending the load-building campaign this year. One is the continued emphasis on upgrading the service available to Ontario farmers so that the most efficient use may be made of their equipment. Last year we upgraded 3,010 farms to 100 or 200 ampere services. This year we expect to upgrade 3,000 more farms to 100 ampere service and 500 farms to 200 ampere service.

Mr. Chairman, may I observe that a surprisingly large number of people believe that Ontario Hydro does not pay taxes. Now it is true that we supply power at cost and do not operate on a profit basis, therefore we do not make any profits and have no tax to pay on profits. Hydro's municipal tax payments and grants in lieu of taxes last year amounted to \$4,400,000.

We also pay for the water we borrow to produce electricity. Last year, even with river flows below normal, we paid more than \$6,000,000 in water rental charges to the provincial and federal governments.

That comes to ten and a half million dollars to all three levels of government. I should also say that the local utilities commissions paid another \$1,800,000 to their municipalities in taxes.

Something more. Hydro is subject to the same sales taxes as any other organization.

In 1963, we paid over \$2,500,000 in provincial sales tax, gasoline tax and federal custom duties.

It is estimated that the extended federal sales tax on building materials and production equipment, which will be fully in effect in 1965, will add something like \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 annually to our costs.

One important aspect of the commission's function towards fulfilling our obligation of supplying electric power at the lowest possible cost is to ensure that all its operations are performed both efficiently and economically.

The management of the commission continues to give top priority to using the most up-to-date management methods and practices in use in the business world, and welcomes expert comparison of its record in this

regard with any of the leading private organizations in the western world. Our programmes in this connection include: electronic data processing; work measurement and performance standards; system and methods analysis; work simplification training; aggressive utilization of plant automation; complete budgeting and control techniques, and load and cost trend forecasting. As an added check, our methods and organization and financial matters have been closely analyzed by independent firms to ensure that they are efficient and up to date.

Constantly we are seeking more efficient and less costly ways of providing service without sacrificing its quality. Our research aids in this cause. For example, I was interested to learn lately that by taking advantage of modern technology, engineers can get more than two and a half times more electricity from a ton of coal than was possible 35 years ago.

In the past half-century, Ontario Hydro's research division has contributed greatly to the commission's numerous pioneering advances in the electrical utility field. This important group provides research and testing services for most technical phases of the commission's operations. The varied activities of our research staff, carried out in a modern laboratory, as well as in the field, are of great significance in the task of economically meeting the constantly increasing demands for electric power in the province. These research services help to ensure that the most advanced engineering practices, consistent with sound economy, are applied throughout the Hydro system.

Savings are also being undertaken in administrative work wherever possible without reducing the service expected. Good business practices are required and these are regularly reviewed. We are very conscious of the need to reduce the pressure of costs on our rate structures.

Mr. Chairman, as has been evident from previous debates in the House, we are all conscious of the forthcoming centenary of Confederation. It is an acknowledged fact that massive generation and distribution of low-cost electricity has been a most significant factor in the growth of Ontario and its emergence as the foremost province of Canada. Ontario Hydro's pioneering role in public utility operation and in many fields of engineering has won the commission international recognition as one of the largest and most outstanding electrical organizations of the world.

It was appropriate, therefore, to give con-

sideration to establishing an electrical museum to commemorate these years of progress. Besides saluting the centennial, such a museum would serve as well to provide a permanent home for various representative pieces of electrical equipment now in storage at numerous locations. Preliminary work has begun under the direction of a planning committee on this interesting work, and Ontario Hydro's efforts will proceed in collaboration with the government's committee on the science and industry museum.

Also of historical interest, may I note that in 1963, in co-operation with local municipal authorities and others, Ontario Hydro erected plaques marking historic electric generation sites. Further, I would report that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) in August unveiled an Ontario historic site marker at Wasdell Falls on the Severn River in the presence of a gathering of representatives of Hydro, nearby municipalities and historical organizations. This was the first generating station built by Ontario Hydro.

I was grateful at that time that Dr. Otto Holden, now retired from the service of Ontario Hydro, was able to be present, for the Wasdell Falls station was his first engineering project and he carried through the construction of that first generating station built by Ontario Hydro at that location in central Ontario.

It is interesting that other countries of the world also have a high regard for the hydro-electric know-how achieved by commission personnel. Hydro is sending a twelve-man team to commission and be responsible for the initial operation of Ghana's hydro-electric scheme, scheduled for operation next year.

Ghana is the most recent developing country to seek the aid of experienced Hydro engineers and administrators. A ten-man Hydro team is now on a similar assignment in Iran at the Dez River hydro-electric project. Pakistan, Lebanon, Brazil, Trinidad and Tobago are among countries which also have drawn on the experience of Ontario Hydro personnel.

I hope now to answer a few questions as to Hydro which have arisen already in the House and elsewhere. Before doing so, I would like to pay tribute to the work of the present hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, who entered on his new duties a few months ago and already has demonstrated his abilities as a good administrator. I wish also to refer to his predecessor, the hon. member for Riverdale, with whom I was associated not only in his position as Minister of Energy Resources but also as a

fellow-member of the Ontario Hydro Commission.

My hon. friend from Riverdale became a member of the Ontario Hydro Commission and second vice-chairman in 1958 and first vice-chairman in 1961. He relinquished the latter position later the same year but retained a seat on the Commission until his retirement from the executive council last October. His five years of association with Hydro will be remembered by the commission personnel because of his deep interest in Hydro affairs and the many valuable proposals he put forward touching on the administration of the commission's business. I think it may be said that the hon. member for Riverdale strove to keep the members of the House as fully informed on Hydro affairs as was feasible—an aim which any representative of the House serving on the Hydro commission should, in my view, follow in the most ample form possible.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I really do not know where to start after the speech just made by the vice-chairman of Hydro. This information that I have before me just came into my hands within the last week. I have the brief on the proposed ice boom in Lake Erie and I think the only thing I might say about that is, to quote the mayor of Niagara Falls:

You have interfered with the Niagara River and Niagara Falls long enough and it is about time you quit interfering with God's creation.

Those were his words. I think that is sufficient on the boom question until it goes further.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am very upset about a letter I received.

It says: "Ontario Hydro Regional News Release." Now let me show you just how they go about taking more water off the Niagara River without telling you they are doing it.

Plans to deepen the Chippawa power canal in conjunction with work now underway to clean and rehabilitate the 43-year-old waterway, were announced today by Ontario Hydro. The Hydro spokesman emphasized the deepening of the canal will not affect the amount of water passing over Niagara Falls, which is regulated by an international treaty between Canada and the United States.

The additional water will be diverted from Hydro's Cascade plant, which the Ontario power and the Toronto power built in 1905 and 1906, by the enlarged

canal and used in the more modern Beck generating station downstream.

Deepening of the canal will increase its capacity by 6,500 cubic feet a second, representing an 11 per cent increase in electrical output in the Beck plant. The canal will be deepened over a five-mile section downstream from the Montrose gate with cages and ducts varying up to a maximum of 12 feet. Further downstream, another mile and a half section will be widened to a total width varying from 75 to 90 feet. The original plan to rehabilitate the Chippawa canal was made necessary by debris which has reduced the flow of water to the Beck plant.

Hydro informed the city of Niagara Falls on January 21 that it was considering the proposal to deepen the waterway in conjunction with the rehabilitation job. The decision to proceed this year was made because of potential savings in completing both jobs simultaneously and also to minimize losses on the proposed proposition of electricity while Niagara River flows are below normal.

Primary estimates indicated the combined project will cost approximately \$11 million. Additional construction workers needed will be hired through the National Employment Services in Niagara Falls.

The only good feature in that letter is that a total of 400 men are expected to be hired locally.

The canal is now scheduled to close about May 1. It will be reopened later this year, then closed again in 1965, to complete the project. The Beck plant will continue to operate during the shutdown. Temporary facilities being built by Ontario Hydro will assure an adequate supply of fresh water for Niagara Falls and dispose of discharges from the city sewage treatment plant when the canal is closed.

Then the last three lines of this letter state:

After the canal deepening project is complete the Ontario power and the Toronto power plants will continue to operate when water is available for power production.

First they say they are going to deepen the Welland Canal, or the Chippawa Creek. Second, they are going to take off 6,500 cubic feet per second at the Chippawa Creek. They are going to divert this water into the Chippawa Creek, because naturally your canal will be deepened. You are not going to let that water go through your control gates because it is going the other way now

and it will further deteriorate the beauty of the Niagara River.

There is no other way to explain it. The water goes into these tunnels and into Toronto power at Dufferin Island, or in about that vicinity, and enters the Ontario power at about that point and it will naturally not go over the falls, because it goes to the new cut in the deepening.

Now correct me at this point, if you like, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I cannot see it any other way and I would like an answer to this one. When the time comes, no doubt you will explain it.

They talk about changing and deepening the old canal by about 12 feet and widening the outlet from 75 to 90 feet. You are, naturally, going to take advantage of this water, because you say you are going to increase your power output by taking the 6,500 cubic feet per second by 11 per cent in the Adam Beck stations—and that is in the letter—that you are going to increase your power output by 11 per cent using the 6,500 cubic feet per second. Then in the final analysis, when this project is finished, you say in the last three lines of your letter after the canal deepening project is complete the Ontario power and the Toronto power plants will continue to operate when water is available for power production.

As I see it, six and a half times two is 13,000 cubic feet per second. Now this is your own information that you submitted to me through mail by a news letter. As I said before, the people of Niagara Falls have been rooked for many years. You were telling us a few minutes ago that you pay taxes. You went on to tell us the figure of the money that you pay. This is good. But let me tell you something, you pay to the city of Niagara Falls approximately, you can correct me by a few thousand one way or another, \$300,000 a year. Mr. Vice-Chairman, if you were paying your taxes the same as the Canadian Niagara Power Company pays, because they are private enterprise, you would be paying to the city of Niagara Falls \$1.3 million. Canadian Niagara, a private enterprise, pays within a few thousand dollars of what Hydro pays, for 111 acres with one small plant. Hydro utilizes some 3,500 acres for their many projects and their many plants, and only pay the same amount of money as Canadian Niagara does.

We were talking this afternoon about transmission lines and the gas companies—

An hon. member: The score is two to nothing.

Mr. Bukator: In favour of Detroit? The power in the Toronto hockey team is taking quite a beating tonight.

An hon. member: It is good for Niagara Falls, of course.

Mr. Bukator: It is not good for Niagara Falls.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): This is a good one, the Tories are defending public enterprise and the Liberals private enterprise.

Mr. MacDonald: This is not the first time that argument has been advanced.

Mr. Bukator: I do not know about the Liberals, but I do believe this, that I think with respect to Niagara Falls and that particular riding that I represent, I do believe the Hydro has been taking them long enough and it is about time they faced the facts of life. I think it is about time the government started to treat us the way we should be treated.

Now I am going to tell you something. You can take *Hansard* tomorrow if you will and correct me, and I will say within a few thousand dollars you are taking the city of Niagara Falls for about \$1 million, and you stand up before us here tonight and say you are paying taxes. You might be paying into the federal government and you might be paying into the provincial government, but I can assure you you are not paying into the municipalities which are entitled to it; because at the Soo they have a power plant and they pay full taxes, as private enterprise does. And I might say this about the Canadian Niagara: They not only pay full taxes but their rates are no higher than Hydro. This means that the administration by private enterprise is a lot better than Hydro as I see it from where I stand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, that is all right. I do not mind putting up with this pair of hecklers. They have to get their nickel's worth in sooner or later, they might as well take it out on me as anybody.

I will go back to my original argument. The vice-chairman of Hydro cannot stand on his feet here and tell us that they are paying their just dues, because I am going to give you another comparison. If you have a one-storey garage, your assessment according to the provincial manual is about \$1.95 per square foot; and this is all the assessment you charge to Hydro on their structures. No matter

how big or how high, on a one-floor basis at about \$1.95 a square foot—that is what they pay their grants in lieu of taxes on. Now show me again, Mr. Vice-Chairman, if you will, where I am wrong.

It was a nice speech he made this afternoon. As a matter of fact I was almost about to applaud him when he was talking about the millions they pay, and how they pay sales tax. Why should they not pay sales tax?

Let us take the canal for example. You are deepening it, and are taking 6,500 cubic feet per second through that canal, which makes it much more treacherous. You are going to deepen it; you are going to widen it in some areas; it is about time you decided! I will tell the vice-chairman: It will not be as pleasant for you people in the Niagara riding when I get back there and tell them what you are up to now.

This letter indicates to me that you are taking them for the third or fourth time, in not paying your just dues. I can assure you that every association in the Niagara riding will know what you are up to. You are diverting water again off the Niagara river, some 6,500 cubic feet according to your own figures, and I can assure you again that when you reopen those plants and put the new project into existence you will take another 6,500 cubic feet according to your own admission—

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): That helps the employment situation in Niagara Falls.

An hon. member: It kills the tourist business.

Mr. Bukator: Have fun, boys!

An hon. member: The Tory government is good to Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: The Tory government is good to everybody but Niagara Falls.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): And Windsor. Just the Tory ridings.

An hon. member: George said it.

Mr. Bukator: George not only said it, he is going to tell it again and again. When you people come into Niagara Falls you had better be prepared to tell the Niagara Falls council that the least you will do for them is cap that canal.

I get a kick out of the hon. vice-chairman of Hydro. I understand the hon. vice-chairman of Hydro gets quite a chunk of money

for the position he holds, and he makes one speech here a year on Hydro. My hon. colleague here read it in last year's *Hansard*; it was almost the same thing. The only difference is that Mrs. Roberts is going to christen the ship. A year ago, the hon. Prime Minister was there at the laying of the keel. But, over and above that, there is no change in this particular speech from what we got a year ago.

An hon. member: That is more progress than usual.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, they have built another boat. You know, it is a funny thing; I will give you people a little lecture in grammar or spelling. "B-u" spells "Bu", and "k-a-t" spells "kat", and "o-r" makes Bukator. Try that in your book. I have been getting "Dekator", "Buekator", "Buckator" and "Buckatory"; and if you cannot handle that one, just call me "George", I do not mind. But let me tell the hon. vice-chairman this is not a laughing matter.

Mr. Boyer: I am not laughing.

Mr. Bukator: I know he is not. And I want to tell him something: I can assure him that if the papers will give me half a break I will make speech after speech to every organization in the city of Niagara Falls until we bring it to their attention that you are again taking them—taking more water off Niagara Falls—and you are not paying them any more in grants in lieu of taxes.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): The mayor is happy.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, the mayor is happy—except once he was not happy.

An hon. member: When was that?

Mr. Bukator: The odd part of it, and I told this to the hon. vice-chairman in the hall, and I might as well tell him now, is that I play a lone hand. And I can assure you that the mayor of the city of Niagara Falls, and the council of the city of Niagara Falls, should respect their member to this point, at least, to invite me in to do their footwork for them in the Legislature.

Mr. Peck: They know the hon. member better than we do, though.

Mr. Bukator: Is that right? I think maybe the mayor might be accused of playing a little politics. He is good to you. But, being the rebel I have been for many years—and I am

going to continue to be—you are going to hear from me. I speak on behalf of my riding and I can assure you that if you would like to get into the political scheme—I think you had a member run down there too; I think he won one poll, I believe, out of 130-odd.

I tell you I am very upset to get this heckling from this left wing group. Did I get the impression from them that one cannot speak on behalf of his riding when it is not being treated right, without having to belong to some particular party or group? If that is so, then I might just as well go home because I sometimes do not agree with my own party.

But fair is fair, and I can assure you that Hydro has not been fair. So, to draw it to your attention again, and you can correct me if I am wrong, the Canadian Niagara Power plant owns 111 acres and only one unit and they pay as much in taxes, because they are private enterprise, as Hydro does for 3,500 acres with its many structures. All I am asking from this government, and all I am asking from the hon. Minister of whatever he might be—I cannot remember all the positions they hand out in this government from year to year, the hon. Minister of Energy and whatever it might be, Resources Management—is that he—with his clean linen, because he is new at this time and, as you know, you cannot get tainted too quickly—take a good look at this and tell me where I am wrong, if I am wrong.

I think I have covered the ground pretty well. This is like playing the record over from a year ago because I found out what the vice-chairman did.

Mr. Peck: Is that the same speech as last year?

Mr. Bukator: Pretty well. But I did not read it out of the book. Let me tell you something, gentlemen: The gas company comes and puts a transmission line—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: The gas company puts in a transmission line along the road. On the powerhouse, the Hydro puts this pole line, with an ugly mess along our streets, parallel to its competitor. The gas company pays taxes for the business they do through that line. All you do is make an ugly mess and cut a swathe through every town, village, township and city in the province, and you pay not one red cent for that privilege. You can correct me there if I am wrong.

I think there has been enough said on the

subject, but I tell you this: As long as you are in competition with private enterprise you should do the same thing as they do, and that is pay your taxes.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Niagara Falls can always be depended upon to give the House interesting material, particularly when he is speaking of affairs in his own riding. He presents the same in a rather novel manner which attracts our attention. Out of what he has said tonight, I would like to give him and the House certain assurances. The first I should mention is that we in Hydro are very conscious of the tourist attractions of Niagara Falls city, and the river and the great cataract there; and it is our purpose to maintain, as far as nature permits, a good flow of water which can be seen, particularly during the tourist season in the daytime hours.

I want to assure the hon. member, in connection with the important work of cleaning the power canal and deepening it, that the water over the falls is not going to be affected. When there is an abundance of water, the older plants which are often called the Cascade plants, may be operated. But when this is not the case, more efficient use is made of water through Sir Adam Beck No. 2 plant. I would point out that this work is being done, sir, in these present times of low water levels. This is a favourable period, so far as work of this type goes, to proceed with this important renovation and deepening work. The work will mean much to the city of Niagara Falls in employment, as somebody did mention.

I want to say that we were most particular to consult with the municipal authorities, with industrial concerns along the banks of the canal and with all concerned, before beginning this work in order that we should maintain good relations with everyone in the city. Accordingly, we have been able to make provision for a number of special public services and I think we have met with the satisfaction of the authorities in the city.

Now as to Hydro's taxes. May I point out, sir, that it was this government which some years ago established the principle of paying a tax grant for hydro plants. This has been paid for a matter, I think, of eight or ten years. What I am referring to has been done in the time I have been in Parliament, and then the far more extensive arrangement and plan of paying grants in lieu of taxes was brought about in 1960 or thereabouts. I will just take time to review what Hydro is called upon under The Power Commission Act to pay.

On land that we hold, we pay an amount equivalent to what would be paid if the land were taxed in a normal manner by the municipality. What is paid on buildings depends on the use of the building. Those used exclusively for executive or administrative purposes require payment of taxes levied in the usual manner by the municipality. Then, on buildings which are used in connection with generating, transforming or auxiliary equipment or machinery, the assessment is based—as the hon. member for Niagara Falls mentioned—on \$2 a square foot of inside area at ground level, multiplied by the equalization factor used in that particular year by The Department of Municipal Affairs. Occasionally as well there are voluntary payments to municipalities for loss of revenue from former tax paying private power companies whose assets have been acquired by Hydro. This applies to a certain extent in Niagara Falls. There is then business assessment taxation. An additional assessment of 60 per cent of the assessed value already established for lands and buildings is what is paid. To this is applied the local business tax rate and the amount owing is paid at the same time as property taxes. No business taxes are paid on properties used for residential purposes, that is understood, or on properties rented by Hydro, because of course in the latter case the tenant would pay.

I want to refer, if I may, directly to the beautiful and great city of Niagara Falls. I draw to the attention of my hon. friend the great admiration there exists on every hand for his home riding.

The hon. member has given a figure of what he estimates the taxes paid by Hydro to be in his city. He mentioned a figure of \$300,000.

Mr. Bukator: A few thousand one way or the other.

Mr. Boyer: Well, Mr. Chairman, the new or enlarged city of Niagara Falls received from Ontario Hydro in 1963, almost \$400,000, grants in lieu of taxes. I suggest this is a very sizeable sum indeed, in the fiscal picture of any municipality. This is as provided in The Power Commission Act, excepting that the city of Niagara Falls at present receives a special grant of \$75,000, this latter having had its origin many years ago when Hydro first took over private power companies at the Falls. I referred to that a moment ago.

Hydro pays normal realty taxes on all its holdings, except the basic installations which form the power system itself.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out

that there was a comparison made earlier today as to the generating stations of Hydro and installations of natural gas companies. I think that all will agree that there is a difference in the location and the use of the land on which generating stations sit. You would not find any other industry locating over the side of a cliff or in the midst of a stream. Anything that is paid on a generating station in such a location, is extra money for that municipality, because you would not find any other factory or business locating in those particular places. Good land, on the other hand, is used by other people and brings in its own form of municipal revenue.

Mr. Bukator: How about the Port Credit plant?

An hon. member: That is not your riding.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I say just in conclusion of this matter that the system of Hydro grants as it has developed over the years and is now embodied in The Power Commission Act is designed to meet the interests of all concerned in an equitable manner, without undue benefit or sacrifice on the part of anyone, as seems fitting in the operation of a public enterprise such as Hydro.

Mr. Morningstar: Mr. Chairman, just one question to the vice-chairman. I was wondering if the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission is considering putting a steam plant in Welland county. I see you have spread them throughout the province and I did hear there was some talk of locating a steam plant, probably in the town of Port Colborne. There are great facilities there for a plant of that nature.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to answer the question from my hon. friend from Welland. I must say that a number of officials from Welland county came to the Ontario Hydro offices one day to present a brief on this question. I have heard it said that we now have enough briefs from various localities in the province to choke a horse, but I do not say that with any disrespect for Port Colborne. I say that we have this week had two groups present briefs. We are receiving a number each month.

The decision of the location of the new plant to which I referred has not yet been made. I might say it is not a steam plant but rather the location of the new nuclear reactor plant with which we are concerned, but we are not yet in a position to make a decision as to the location. But certainly

Port Colborne will be given fullest consideration by the commission.

Mr. Morningstar: I thank the hon. vice-chairman very much.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three relatively brief points I would like to raise with the hon. Minister.

One, I do not hail from Cape Breton, but I have a soft spot in my heart for all the MacDonalds down there and I understand that a growing number of them are becoming unemployed because of the persistent closing of mines and therefore I was puzzled by the comment of the hon. vice-chairman to the effect that the amount of coal that you are getting from Cape Breton is all that can be delivered and that presumably you would get more if more could be delivered.

Could the hon. vice-chairman solve that little mystery for me? Is it a shortage of bottoms?

Mr. Boyer: We have made a contract with the coal interests in Nova Scotia and we understand that this is the limit of what is able to be supplied under the arrangements made between ourselves, public bodies, and the coal interests of Cape Breton.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, unless there is a shortage of boats for bringing it up, it does not add up. However, I will not pursue the matter; it is primarily a Nova Scotian problem.

The vice-chairman referred to the Lakehead plant still being a standby. I recall a great deal of politicking over this plant two or three years ago, when it was discovered that upon completion it was not going to be used because of overestimates in requirements. Overestimates had been gleaned from the various industries because of a change in the whole market relationship.

This was all right for a year or so but I am puzzled by the fact that now when two years have gone by—one year, I am corrected—and there still is not even a normal growth to bring the plant into production. I wonder if the hon. vice-chairman might comment on this. Has there not been a normal growth, the usual normal growth in the consumption of power which might bring this plant into use?

Second, in that connection, on a number of occasions when I have gone to northwestern Ontario I have run into considerable public discussion on the advisability of exporting power to the United States. Admittedly it would have to be on a short-term basis, so that if our needs ever developed this power

would be available to meet them; but if it is power developed from water, and if there is a possibility of export, it seems to me that one is just missing a good bet. Because every hour, every day, every week that goes by is an hour or a day or a week lost in terms of production which might be exported to help our balance of trade with the United States. In short, what is the picture in this connection, and has there been any consideration of the possibility of short-term export of power to get that plant into operation?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, may I first say that the hon. member appears to refer to me as the "Minister", and I know he did not mean to give me that much higher rank.

I say, sir, that in the northwest region we are exporting power to the United States; but what is exported depends upon the market there. I am sure if there is a requirement, or a request for further power to be supplied, this will be a matter of negotiation and very welcome to us.

There has been a growth, of course, over the past several years in the primary peak requirements in the northwest system. The demand in 1960 was 433,300 kilowatts; this has risen now to 445,500. There is something in what the hon. member for York South has said as to the market expected at the time the decision was made. That would have been, of course, years before the plant was ready for commissioning. Yet withal, I say that this puts the northwest region of our great province in a very favourable position with adequate power resources for many years ahead.

This plant will be in operation, it is expected, within the next year; and I think that all hon. members from the northwest will realize that when they are going out to sell that region as a good location for industry or commercial enterprise, this is one of the great things which they may offer to the world.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the underlying argument of the last comments of the vice-chairman. This is obviously a point to plug if you are promoting northwestern Ontario. But it is getting to be too much of a luxury when you have a plant, which costs a considerable number of millions of dollars, sitting idle. I would hope, if I conclude correctly from the comments of the hon. vice-chairman, that they would be glad to enter into an agreement if somebody from the American side asked; but does this not mean that you have not done some looking around for the possibility of short-term

sales if you have a plant sitting idle? I would also hope—and I am wondering if the hon. vice-chairman would comment on this: Is the prospective expansion of some of the pulp and paper companies at the Lakehead the kind of development which is going to use up a sizeable proportion of the production of this plant?

Mr. Boyer: That is correct, certainly.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me turn to a third point I want to raise. This is one which was alluded to earlier. I am a little surprised that the hon. vice-chairman, with his usual efficiency, had not included it in his report. It is the public discussion, which has gone on once again in the Sarnia area, as to the possibility of using natural gas, in that new plant, rather than coal. I understand that we are going to be using something like \$8 million worth of coal, all of it imported, in this plant. I would like to have some rather convincing argument and statistics as to why there was not a possibility of using natural gas and perhaps pre-empting, as has been suggested by some of the people locally, the Sombra township storage area for a storage basin to meet the requirements of this plant. What is the picture there?

Mr. Boyer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did remember that the hon. member for York South spoke of this proposal earlier in the session. At that time, of course, the new thermal generating station which has just lately been announced for the Courtright location on the St. Clair river was only a matter of conjecture; but the hon. member spoke then of the possibilities of a new natural gas pipeline from western Canada coming into Ontario near Sarnia. Of course in that area there are great underground storage areas for natural gas. I take it that the hon. member had representations made to him on behalf of those who are interested in these storage areas. We have also heard from them and this matter has been given study. I may say, too, that we have also held discussions with representatives of the natural gas industry.

In this connection may I say that when preparation was being made, when plans were going ahead for the Courtright plant, Hydro did review the possibilities of using fuels other than coal in this particular plant. Indeed Hydro has done so for all its conventional thermal plants. Accordingly the possibility of using natural gas was considered for this particular plant.

During the last quarter of 1963, in particular, there were discussions with gas suppliers. At that time the conclusion was

that the proposal would be uneconomical even for a base load plant. It may be, sir, that further information will become available as to a possible supply of natural gas at a sufficiently low price, yet I can only refer to what is known today.

In Ontario Hydro's planning of thermal generation, it is expected that in the future a large fraction of the energy load growth will be supplied from nuclear generating stations. If this condition obtains, the fossil-fired thermal plants will be used principally to supply peak loads with corresponding reductions in fuel consumption.

I am told, sir, that for technical reasons this type of operation would tend to make gas fueling of such plants even less desirable from the economic standpoint.

Another consideration is probably this: A one-million kilowatt plant would take approximately one-half of the capacity of the Trans-Canada pipeline. As I recall what the hon. member said here in January, he spoke of the prospect of a new line coming from western Canada, through the United States and crossing into Canada at Sarnia. We have not any information about this. We have no idea as to the possibilities of a price that can compete with coal. Nevertheless, I am going to say that as in the past Ontario Hydro will review this matter with the intention of taking any economic advantage should it become available.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, will the vice-chairman state the cost of the generation of electricity by water, by coal and, lastly by atomic energy; the cost of generation per kilowatt hour?

Mr. Boyer: I wonder if I might just say to the hon. member that if he would care to come to the government commissions committee tomorrow morning, there are technical people who will be present who will be able to provide an answer very easily to his question.

Mr. Newman: I prefer to get the information in the House because I asked for information once before from the same hon. member and I did not receive it so I would prefer to have the answer in the House.

Mr. Boyer: I wonder what that information might be?

Mr. Newman: I did not hear the hon. member, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Boyer: I wonder if I might ask the hon. member what that information was that he did not obtain.

Mr. Newman: One year ago I asked a question concerning scholarships that were given to students attending various universities, and the University of Windsor had been left out. I asked the hon. member if he was going to consider seeing that Hydro scholarships were also available at the University of Windsor. At no time did I receive a reply and I thought I was entitled to the courtesy of a reply.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is entitled to the courtesy of a reply and I will give it now. At the time he made this inquiry it had happened that the personnel department of Ontario Hydro was making a study of the scholarship awards of Ontario Hydro to a certain number of universities in the province and it was realized that the list of universities had grown. The whole subject was a matter for review and accordingly we have decided upon an entirely different plan.

I will not take the time of the House at this hour to go into this exhaustively, but I want to say that we have decided, with the advice of The Ontario Department of Education, to change the system. Instead of scholarships to the same limited number of universities, we will make available a bursary in the amount of \$500 each to nine universities, commencing with the academic year of 1964 and 1965. These universities are: University of Toronto, Queen's University, University of Western Ontario, University of Windsor, McMaster University, University of Guelph—which is to be established, University of Waterloo, Carleton University and the University of Ottawa.

Each bursary is to be identified as having been given by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and is to be awarded to a second-year student in applied science and engineering, in commerce and business administration, or in mathematics and physics at the discretion of the university student aid committee. Each of these universities has been advised of the change and they have accepted this as an arrangement which they prefer and which they think will probably aid young students in their second year to a greater extent than the scholarships plan of the past.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. member for his reply. He could have sent that to me in a letter the same way as every other Minister replies to questions that are asked in the House and are not answered during the course of the debates. This is important. After all we have

a university in Windsor and we are entitled to the same consideration that is given to any other university in the province.

An hon. member: What about Laurentian University?

Mr. Newman: Laurentian did not ask. I did ask for it.

Mr. Chairman, the next question of the hon. member is: During the studies for sites of the new thermal electrical plant, I am fairly certain that the community from which I come did not submit any brief, but I noticed that we were turned down. Would the hon. member care to give a reason why they were turned down, because directly across the lake from us is a fairly large American installation—that is the reactor plant at Monroe, Michigan—for the manufacture of electricity by atomic energy.

Now the Essex county area had been turned—

Mr. Boyer: May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that Windsor already has a steam plant?

Mr. Newman: I am not mentioning that. I am simply asking why were they turned down. Was there something wrong with the area? Were they—

Mr. Boyer: I do not follow the hon. member. Who turned who down?

Mr. Newman: The hon. member called it a site for a thermal electrical plant. Now he mentioned earlier in the evening that Windsor was studied as a possible site for that plant and mentioned that it was—

Mr. Boyer: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that.

Mr. Newman: The hon. member did not say that? I will apologize to him, because I understood that he did and wrote it down during the course of his comments.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if the hon. member misunderstood what I tried to say, but as I recall my statement, I mentioned that there had been a survey of the requirements of the London-Sarnia-Windsor area as to power and arising out of this there was a decision to install a generating station in that part of the province. The present location that has been decided upon at Courtright meets all the engineering requirements and really, the decision has been made on the basis of recommendations by our engineering department.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not argue with the location of the present site. The only thing is I understood, wrongly so, that the hon. member had mentioned that Windsor is being studied.

Mr. Troy: The chairman said it was being studied, the chairman of Hydro.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): You can study anything, you do not have to build—

Mr. Newman: I did not say you had to build a plant at all. I simply tried to point out to you that directly across the lake there is a thermal electrical plant.

The next point, Mr. Chairman, concerns the electrical historical sites. Apparently Hydro is setting up plaques in various parts of the province. May I suggest to the hon. member that he consider one in the Windsor area as the first electrical street railway in the world, if I am not mistaken, was located along the Detroit river in the city of Windsor.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to learn of this and I would invite the hon. member to get what information he can about the history of the railway. I would ask him if he would be good enough to write me a letter and tell me about it. We are interested in these matters and I already mentioned the museum and, if nothing else, we certainly could include references in the museum to this. But the matter of placing a plaque is also being considered.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I assume the hon. member will provide me with staff to look into this item?

The next, Mr. Chairman, is the importation of inferior electrical appliances into the province. What control is Hydro exercising over this vast flood of electronic equipment that is now plaguing or entering the Canadian market? Much of it is fairly good, but some of it is sub-standard and I doubt if it would pass CSA regulations.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of much concern to Hydro. The hon. members may have read in the newspapers just lately statements by Ontario Hydro as to the concern we have as to the dangerous appliances which are now coming into Ontario and being sold in our stores. I think I should make the hon. members acquainted with the terms of part of our release.

We have noted that wholesalers who ignore Ontario Electric Safety Regulations are flooding this province with sub-standard radios and other small electric appliances.

Now, this is what the hon. member has said.

Our electrical inspection department has noted that thousands of unapproved appliances are now in use or available at retail outlets. The problem is one which is, perhaps, general in the province. Foreign radio and television sets probably make up the bulk of the appliances which are potentially dangerous, but unapproved toasters, percolators and plug-in bath warmers are also being distributed.

Although all electrical goods displayed, advertised, sold or operated in Ontario must have a seal of approval from the Canadian Standards Association or Ontario Hydro, there are no federal regulations governing safety standards for imported appliances. To assist Hydro's approvals group in coping with the flood of unapproved appliances, 160 inspectors who normally check wiring installations, are devoting part of their time now to checking retail outlets. Store owners are being asked to remove unapproved appliances from their shelves and their co-operation is being asked by Hydro to trace appliances. Reputable foreign manufacturers obtain CSA approval before their appliances are exported. Unapproved appliances, which often do not even bear the name of the manufacturer, are imported by wholesalers who operate from any number of custom bonded warehouses.

I am very glad to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. members and I would ask the co-operation of all hon. members of the House in acquainting the public with the dangers that there may be in using appliances which do not have the proper CSA seal of approval.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue this one step further.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You have been pursuing it for quite a while.

Mr. Newman: I have only been on my feet for the last three or four questions. You have had all day to speak if you wish. You could have spoken earlier. Mr. Chairman, has the hon. member ever approached the authorities in Ottawa?

Mr. Boyer: No, I do not think I should be the one to approach the authorities in Ottawa.

Mr. Newman: Well, has the hon. member's government attempted to approach the authorities in Ottawa with the hope of putting some type of restrictions on the import of some of this electronic equipment; requiring

it as it first enters the country to have a Hydro seal or a CSA seal before it be permitted for sale to the public?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the hon. member advocate that. I invite him as a citizen of Canada to write a letter to the authorities himself and draw this to the attention of the people at Ottawa. We will do our part, do not ever worry.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, how juvenile can a member get? If the vice-chairman will not come along and undertake to do a thing like that, I think he should step aside and let someone else do it for him.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. vice-chairman a question in regard to what programme Hydro has in regard to enlarging areas a Hydro office will service. Now, in the riding I have the honour to represent, two years ago they closed the Hydro office in the town of Bothwell. Just lately they have notified the town of Ridgetown that their office will be closed in October. Now this programme, if it is a plan by Hydro, strikes a severe blow to these towns that have been notified.

In the town of Ridgetown, which has been notified that their office will be closed in October, it will mean 30 families in that town will maybe move to another area from which the Ridgetown area will be served. Is this a programme of Hydro to continually increase the area in which one Hydro office will service, or has the Ontario Hydro a plan to gradually bring the Hydro offices into the cities of southwestern Ontario? This strikes a severe blow to these towns, to lose their Hydro office, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has suggested that perhaps the intention is to centralize the area offices in cities. I must say that perhaps the contrary is more exact. These rural operating area offices are for the rural people, really, of the province and I have heard it said that sometimes when it is necessary to make reorganizations that a town, which is under a local commission, feels that somehow or other their service will be reduced. This is not the case, of course. I am very glad to reassure the hon. member for Kent East, that in the adjustments that are made from time to time in the organization of area offices and regions, that every recognition is given to the fact that personnel located in certain places do add to the local economy. I might say this: That in my own part of the country I remember reading—I think it was 24 years ago—where 4 or 5 areas

were amalgamated into one with one fell swoop. These days are quite different from that. We have, today, much improved highways. We have communications systems between our trucks—two-way radios. We have far better ways for notifying people of service breakdowns and can have a staff there quickly.

We sometimes have situations where construction work has been completed, in a section of the county, or in some county where they have the very best of electrical service, and then there is not the same need for staff. Consequently, in the interests of good business, we have to look at the possibilities of drawing together a couple of areas.

I want to say that if anything of this sort is done at Ridgetown that this will not mean a removal of the personnel from that area entirely, because it will be necessary to leave there an electrical inspector, the forestry crew and probably a service truck. These will operate under whatever place is chosen to take in a slightly larger area.

I think that all hon. members of the House will realize that we are the same as other utilities—the railways, the telephone company and so on—which have to make their arrangements in the most economical way possible. Hence the matter that the hon. member has raised here tonight. I want to assure him that we want to do our very best for his part of the country.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to ask if we would get a reduced rate if these areas are consolidated.

Mr. Boyer: I think I can say, sir, that these matters will lead to the maintenance of the present low rates we have in this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to revert to the matter which was raised in a preliminary way by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. The answer of the vice-chairman of the commission was simply to read a press statement that the commission issued recently and which, I think, most of us have read. I did not hear him indicate anything that either the commission or the government planned to do about this problem of dangerous appliances, as he calls them, which have been imported into the country and put on to the market illegally in Ontario. The hon. member has referred to them as "dangerous" appliances and I think that is an understatement. I would like to quote an

article which appeared recently in the Toronto *Telegram* referring to an interview, or a press conference, with George Milne of the Hydro's inspection department. Mr. Milne is quoted as saying:

—a state of emergency existed with regard to public safety.

He went on to say, with regard to the radios which are illegally on the market, and which I think are considered to be the most dangerous and also the most numerous product:

They have a live chassis and zero safety precautions.

He then went on to say:

If a child were to pull the knobs off this and touch the spindle he would be playing with death, and a person removing tubes for inspection would be electrocuted if he were in contact with a metal sink, radiator or any grounded object.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the situation is much more serious than the hon. member's answer would seem to indicate. Mr. Milne is also quoted as saying that the fines of \$25 and \$50 which have been levied so far are only a licence to operate. I think that comes to the crux of the problem. As I understand the present law, the penalty for displaying or selling appliances which do not carry the CSA or Hydro seal of approval is a fine of between \$10 and \$50, yet people can make small fortunes out of selling these very dangerous appliances. Naturally they can sell them cheaply but the reason they can sell them cheaply is because they are so dangerous; and a fine of \$10 to \$50 seems absolutely ridiculous in view of the kind of public danger which these unscrupulous operators create.

Mr. Milne is quoted in the Toronto *Telegram* as saying: "Jail is the only penalty stiff enough for those who knowingly sell appliances which could kill innocent children or the teenagers likely to buy cheap radios." And I would agree with him if that is an accurate summary of what he said. I think a jail sentence is quite in order for a person who would do this sort of thing, especially for more than one offence; but if these fellows can sell these dangerous appliances illegally, then go down to court and pay \$50 and come back and start doing it all over again, I think we will have considerable trouble clearing the situation up. As Mr. Milne also pointed out in a story in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*:

With electrical appliances sold in almost all types of retail outlets from drug stores

to grocerias, it has become impossible to police the sales adequately.

That being so, the one way to discourage unscrupulous people from trying to make a quick buck this way is to make it very dangerous for them to operate.

I had hoped that when the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville first raised the question, the vice-chairman of the commission would have announced some sort of policy the government planned to take; but all he did was just read a press release from Hydro calling attention to the seriousness of the problem.

Does the government plan to do anything about it or not? If so, Mr. Chairman, what do they plan to do?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member started off by saying that nothing was being done. The government did not seem to have any policy, and Ontario Hydro did not seem to have any policy, and so forth—and then, at the end of his remarks, he advised the House that evidently there are fines being imposed on these people—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I did not say any of those things.

Mr. Boyer: I am going to point out—

Mr. Bryden: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I really would suggest to the hon. member that he contributes nothing to the discussion by his deliberate misquotation of what I said. I did not make any of the statements he attributed to me. I stated merely that his answer was to quote from a press release from Hydro, and that was not an adequate answer.

Mr. Boyer: I do not think that is a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: I did not say that Hydro was not doing anything. I did not say that anybody was not doing anything. I was asking what they were doing, and I would suggest the hon. member take it from there and indicate if you are doing anything.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member is rather excited and, in making his speech, he overlooked the fact that I had advised the House what Hydro was doing. I called attention to the fact that he indicated to us that nothing was being done and we had no policy; and then he came down at the end of his address and referred to fines which had already been imposed.

I suggest that we are on the trail of people

who are bringing these unapproved articles into our province. I have already said that 160 inspectors who normally check wiring installations are devoting part of their time to checking retail outlets.

The hon. member for Woodbine, Mr. Chairman, has also read to us an item about live-chassis radio sets and so forth. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that an endeavour is being made, in connection with some of these articles, to prosecute people who are supplying them under the Criminal Code of Canada. We regard this as a very serious matter but I would point out that Ontario is the province which has adopted the Canadian Standards Association requirements in approving appliances. As far as I know, we are the only province which has done this, and this is intended for the safety of our people. That is the type of thing we are doing, and we are following this up with inspections and are on the trail of these people.

Who called attention to this matter? It was Ontario Hydro, because we were concerned about it in the province today.

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, after all that diversion, we can get to the question I asked. I will try to put it in the simplest possible terms for the benefit of the hon. vice-chairman of the commission.

I quoted an officer of Hydro's own inspection department, who said that the penalties are not adequate. I quite concede, I did not deny, I did not even suggest, that Hydro was not doing what it can within the terms of existing law. It has put a large number of inspectors to work on this job. I realize that. The hon. vice-chairman has already said it; I did not think it was necessary to repeat it. They have taken people to court; they have secured convictions; but, as Mr. Milne, who I take it is the man in charge of this operation has said, the fines of \$25 and \$50 which have been levied so far are only a licence to operate. This is the point, and I would suggest that until the hon. vice-chairman is prepared to give us an answer on this point he is just evading the whole issue.

Is the government prepared to do anything? Has it any plans to impose penalties or to provide for penalties that will genuinely discourage this sort of thing? I have no doubt that the Hydro inspectors are doing everything possible. It is a difficult job apparently, but are you going to change the law so that when they get the evidence on somebody they will get a conviction which means something?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I was promised I would be asked a very simple question, but I think there was so much embroidery added to it that I could follow all of what may be in the hon. member's mind.

I say that this matter involves customs, regulations and so forth. It involves law, the law of our country. I do not think that I am the appropriate person to stand in this House and deal with matters having to do with law enforcement in this province. But I can tell you what we are trying to do in Ontario Hydro, is to call to the attention of the public the dangers that are in these unauthorized appliances. We are following it up in the courts of the land. As I mentioned already, Mr. Chairman, we are endeavouring to prosecute under the Criminal Code in certain instances.

I do not think it is required of me to say more than that.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that it is and I will put the question again. The penalties provided in our laws are stated to be inadequate. Now this surely is not a great, deep, metaphysical problem; the penalties are inadequate. The government has it within its power to bring in amendments to the law to make the penalties adequate, so is it prepared to do that or is it not? Or is it just going to let this situation carry on?

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, it is too bad we do not have some of these appliances around here tonight, we might put a plug in some of these people.

Now, the hon. vice-chairman of Hydro said, in an answer to a question of the hon. member for Woodbine, that he could not answer it; we have the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) here tonight—

Mr. Bryden: And the hon. Prime Minister—is he unconcerned about this?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, if we knew whether this was the Criminal Code where the penalty is too small, or if it is a statute of Ontario over which one has control—

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Prime Minister not know the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not know.

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Prime Minister mean to say that you people over there have not been paying any attention to this problem that your Hydro people have been up against?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I have sat and listened to this entire debate, if you may dignify it by such a term.

Mr. Bryden: I will venture a suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister, who is a lawyer, and to his hon. Attorney General beside him. If they take a look at it they will find it is a matter provided for in the laws of Ontario. I would suggest that they might at least take a look at it and see if it is. If it is then consider remedies that can be taken in this House.

I really cannot understand why we have this evasion of an issue. Why can the government not just come in with a bill to tighten the law up?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I listened to the hon. member for Woodbine, and as he read the article from which he quoted, it seemed to me that what he said was that the penalties which were being imposed by the courts were inadequate. Now I must confess that having no notice of this question, I have not had an opportunity to look up the section under which these charges are laid. They may be Ontario law, they may very possibly be the Criminal Code. But what very often happens, and we are often faced with this situation, is that a magistrate in a court and magistrates in various courts have different ideas of penalties. I think the article which the hon. member read said that the penalties which the courts were imposing were inadequate—

Mr. Bryden: The maximum penalty under the law is \$50.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Fifty dollars! And the penalties which the hon. member read were being imposed were \$20 and \$25.

Mr. Bryden: Twenty-five dollars and \$50.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: So that at least the magistrate could have gone considerably higher.

Mr. Bryden: They have gone to \$50 which is as far as they can go. The problem should be studied with a view to providing a heavier penalty.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would be glad to do that. I would suggest to the hon. member that a \$50 penalty may not be adequate and I think it is well to be brought to the attention of the House so that legislation may be brought about to increase it. But quite often you have a \$50 maximum and a magistrate imposes a \$20, or \$5 or \$10 penalty. This is a situation you face quite often.

Mr. Bryden: I realize that, but I do not think this is the problem here, Mr. Chairman. However, I would be very happy if the hon. Attorney General would look into it. He has the facilities to do that and if he could see fit to make a statement at a later time I think everyone would be satisfied.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions.

I refer to the question of the hon. member for Windsor - Walkerville of the hon. vice-chairman, in which he said that they had not considered sites in the Windsor area. I notice that the Ontario Hydro chairman, in his report to the district taken from *Hydro News*, that Mr. Strike revealed that a number of sites in the Windsor, London, Sarnia areas have been investigated. Arrangements are under way, he said, for studies and soil investigation tests in an area near Courtright and he also announced that London Public Utilities Commission indicated a site at Port Stanley was available. So I presume that the Windsor area was also considered.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to a contract, clearing of wooded lands in the townships of Conger, Freeman, Gibson and Baxter, the successful tender for this contract was the Fowler Construction Company Limited of Bracebridge, at slightly over \$200 per acre. It just happens that the successful tenderer comes from the home town of the vice-chairman, but I do not say that fact has anything to do with the awarding of the contract.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): No, no, the hon. member did not even think of it.

Mr. Troy: No, I said I did not think so. But I wanted to ask this question: It says of the total number of 15 tenders received this was the lowest meeting tendering conditions. Might I ask how many of the 15 tenderers met the tendering conditions and what was their price breakdown? I do not need them now, I can get them later.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I would not know how many met the tendering conditions, but I think there were two firms which evidently did not meet them. I remember in particular about this matter, that one group that tendered did not submit any list of equipment, any financial statement, any record of experience and so forth.

But I am not able to answer a question as to how many of the others might not have met the tendering requirements. The main thing is that they all quoted above the firm that was successful in tendering. I might

say it is a firm that quite often bids on public works, and performs satisfactorily and indeed in this area had experience in clearing the right-of-way for Highway 103 through exactly the same country involved in the bid on the work of clearing through Conger, Freeman, Gibson and Baxter.

I think that is all I need to say. I assure you, if you need any assurance, that it was entirely coincidence—

Mr. Troy: Oh I know that!

Mr. Boyer: —that this firm was located in the same area in which I live.

Mr. Troy: The press have recognized that too. May I ask the vice-chairman what you spend annually on this programme you have advertising "Live Better Electrically" on radio and TV and through the press?

Mr. Boyer: I do not believe that I am able to give the figure at the moment, sir. Perhaps that is one of the questions we might deal with tomorrow. In any event, I do not know that I am too anxious to reveal to our committee the monetary extent of our programme.

Mr. Troy: The reason that I ask, is that you are using this advertising programme and as you get more and more that subscribe to it and then become users because of that programme, it means more and more plants have to be developed, more and more costly plants. As I pointed out this afternoon, on another subject, as you come in the buildings, you find that it says—

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberals once again, they want Hydro to go down rather than up.

Mr. Troy: —that coal is very expensive and Hydro is not available, so then possibly some other—well you talked about gas yourself, you were promoting it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: You were discussing it, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Does Hydro tender its capital work, or does Hydro do all its own construction?

Mr. Boyer: I take it that the hon. member wants me to speak on the matter of tendering, or contracting out?

Mr. Troy: Yes, because Public Works say they save money by contracting out.

Mr. Boyer: Well, we think that there should be, perhaps, a combination of the two methods. It is quite often asked—in fact there have been articles in the daily press this

winter—as to our policy in this respect. Some people think that Ontario Hydro does not contract out enough of its work. But on the other hand, our non-management employees, through their unions, have often requested that there be no contracting out clauses in their contract. Now, I can summarize our policy.

It is a judicious combination of contractors and our own forces to achieve Ontario Hydro's construction programme objectives with the maximum economy. The percentage of work assigned to contractors varies from time to time as the nature and extent of the work load changes. On a current project, over 40 per cent of direct construction work has been contracted. All conventional construction work, such as office buildings, service centres, operators' houses, colony community buildings and the like are carried out under contract.

Tenders are also called for certain construction elements associated with transformer and distributing stations. A major transmission line has been built under contract in the past year. I might also add that, generally, road construction and earth-moving work required by Ontario Hydro is performed under contract. Hydro does not manufacture any equipment and the installation of all major equipment is on a contract basis.

In 1963, of all projects about one-third was contracted out. This figure applies to the total work programme, including substantial amounts of specialized line and station work which would be found impractical to contract in a programme so complex. Ontario Hydro's experience bears out that its policy is very satisfactory. Hydro does not agree with those who say that it would be more economical to have all construction work done by outside people. In fact, in a programme that is as varied and as large as Ontario Hydro's, it would be most undesirable and uneconomic to follow such a course. It is believed that many of the contractors who say Ontario Hydro should not do its own work lack an understanding of the nature of the programme. That is not to say that the other extreme of a total do-it-yourself approach would be economical either since Ontario Hydro is aware that certain work is more economically provided by contractors during periods of strong competition.

Mr. Troy: May I ask the vice-chairman what is the basic wage per hour for a common labourer at Hydro?

Mr. Boyer: I wonder if I might ask the hon. member for Nipissing if he would care

to put that question at the government commissions committee meeting in the morning?

Mr. Troy: And I will also ask about the difference in wage levels of your engineering staff compared to the engineers in other branches of the civil service.

Now, one final question. Has the Atomic Energy Control Board yet given approval to Ontario Hydro to erect an atomic powered plant, similar to the Douglas Point plant, on Lake Ontario near Frenchman's Bay or Clarkson? Did you get that approval?

Mr. Boyer: Well, sir, I do not think we have made application for that as yet.

Mr. Troy: Well, it is rather strange that the chairman—

Mr. Boyer: I think that perhaps there was a misunderstanding of the chairman's statement. I think perhaps the chairman's views, as expressed at the time they appeared in the paper, were actually not properly presented in the article that subsequently appeared. I think what the chairman was trying to do was to explain the different attitudes there may be to the location of a plant of this nature close to a settled community as compared with earlier thoughts on this subject. Therefore he mentioned a particular location. That is not to say we have made any application for approval of this site.

Mr. Troy: It was discussed at length all over the province six or seven months ago. Do you mean to tell me you have not even applied yet?

Mr. Boyer: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, back at the beginning of the session, I put a question on the order paper to which an answer was provided on March 3. Since the answer, in my opinion, leaves much to be desired, I would like to pursue the matter a little further now. The question was as follows:

1. Has the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario acquired title to the lands described as the "remaining lands" in the agreement between Dimensional Investments Limited and the commission, dated March 11, 1959?

2. If so, (a) what amounts were paid for the said land, (b) when and (c) to whom?

3. If not, what steps are being or have been taken to acquire title to these lands?

Now the answer to the first question, asking if Hydro has acquired title, was "not yet".

This is only five years later, but the answer is "not yet."

The second question, asking amounts and so on is answered as follows: "Answered by 1."

The third question, asking what steps are being or have been taken to acquire title to these lands, was answered as follows:

The action in the Supreme Court of Ontario by Ontario Hydro against Dimensional Investments is not yet concluded.

Now, I am going to suggest to the vice-chairman of the commission, that that answer has nothing to do with my question at all. I believe that Hydro did launch an action against Dimensional Investments—for what purpose I am not sure—at least two years ago. I think it may have been even longer than that.

Now, sir, I am surprised that nothing has come of the action yet. But in any case, the action could not possibly produce the lands concerned for Hydro because Dimensional Investments does not own the lands, and never did own them. Hydro paid Dimensional Investments for them, but Dimensional Investments never at any time had title to these lands. Thus this reference to an action in the Supreme Court of Ontario has no relevance to the question that I asked.

The question that I asked is, what are you doing to get these lands? A large sum of money was paid—I cannot remember now how much it was—five years ago, for a substantial amount of property on an Indian reserve near Sarnia. The Hydro never did get all of the land involved. There are two small parcels extending across two of the—well, one of them across an existing power line which cannot, therefore, be developed beyond its present level. The other extends across a strip of land that was bought for the purpose of a new power line, but no power line can be built there because there is a strip 100 yards wide or so that goes right across it and the Hydro has no right of way or anything else over this land now.

This is certainly a serious situation. I would like to know if Hydro has any prospect of ever getting those two strips across two of these legs in the packages of land they bought. Certainly a court action against Dimensional will not get the land since Dimensional never did have it.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I think I can say nothing more beyond the reply which has already been given and which was placed on the order paper and answered accordingly. As to whether we think we have a prospect

of getting this land, I think we have. We certainly trust that this is the case.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, could the hon. member explain how he hopes to get land from somebody who does not have it?

Mr. Boyer: The hon. member has taken the opportunity to place on the record his thoughts on this subject and I think that we will have to leave it at that. I cannot answer any more than has been answered already in this House.

Mr. Bryden: What he means is that he is not going to get this land.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): How do you know?

Mr. Bryden: I spent a great deal of time studying the Dimensional deal.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: How do you know?

Mr. Bryden: I know—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Did they buy it?

Mr. Bryden: They did not buy it, no.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They might, though.

Mr. Bryden: On what basis are they going to buy it? The whole reason why Dimensional did not get title and did not hand over title to Hydro was that the Indian who was the locatee on the land was holding them up and will hold them up until the cows come home. They are never going to get it from him.

An hon. member: There are no cows down there.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. MacDonald: Are we having ONR tomorrow? We have not had the ONR as yet.

Mr. Chairman: I am advised that there is no vote for the ONR and I was not given—

Mr. MacDonald: Now just a minute, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: —anything other than Hydro, besides the votes, to be considered.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I thought it was clearly understood that details with regard to ONR were going to be considered under the estimates of this department.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think if the hon. members want to debate the report that was tabled in the House last week, we will ask the committee on government commissions to give us a date and we can go back there and debate it at that time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is a deliberate violation of the understanding of what was going to be the order of business in this House. We have been before the committee twice already and as far as I am concerned I had all of the report that the hon. Minister has now got at that time.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: So that this is not the case. It is a case of debating this in the House. It was our clear understanding; I spoke of it in the introduction. As a matter of fact, the hon. member, the acting chairman, was going to comment at that time but I left the detailed questions till later.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, all sorts of things have happened since this report. This is to December 31, 1963. We are having a complete change in the operation of the ONR.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister has made a statement and I do not see any place in any of the votes—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Prime Minister said so. He said we could debate the ONR—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, we can find a place if this is to be discussed in the House. I was not here when this procedure was established.

In any event we have always been able to find an opportunity to debate anything we think needs debating in the House. Now, it may be if there is nothing in the estimates covering Ontario Northland Railway, we can very easily list on the order paper the report that is here in the House and call it for debate and debate it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, debate is not what we are looking for. We have many chances to debate. What we are looking for is an opportunity to question and get some answers in view of the fast developing situation with the ONR. I thought we had an understanding that all of these agencies were going to be reporting through certain of the estimates and certainly my recollection is that the hon. Prime Minister indicated that both the ONR and Hydro would be reporting to

The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If I made such an undertaking, of course I will carry it out. In any event, I suggest that the committee now rise and report progress.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to go to the order paper for second readings that need to be dealt with in order that those bills may go to committee. There are a good many second readings and also there are

some second readings of other public bills and orders with which we may deal. I assume most of these have been on the order paper for some time and you are ready to deal with them. There are some resolutions as well. I have marked here number two, number nine and number ten in the resolutions with which we might deal. Number seven, I would say, has been dealt with today. Some of these have been dealt with in the general debates and in the estimates that have taken place.

In any event, among the other motions under part three of the order paper notices, I would say we will call number two, number nine and number ten. We will feel free to call any of the second readings that are on the order paper and then I will arrange with you, if we can do both, to hold the debate on the Ontario Northland Railway.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.20 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Sixth report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans	2331
Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	2331
Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, 1955, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	2331
Department of University Affairs, bill to establish, Mr. Robarts, first reading	2332
Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Robarts, first reading	2332
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	2336
Tabling report, Mr. Robarts	2338
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	2338
Ontario Food Terminal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	2338
Law Society Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2338
Juvenile and Family Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2341
Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2341
Short Forms of Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2341
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	2341
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	2341
Race Tracks Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	2341
Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. Allan, second reading	2341
Industrial Farms Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading	2341
Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading	2341
Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading	2341
Establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization, bill to provide for, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading	2341
Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	2342
Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	2342
Homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care, bill to provide, Mr. Dymond, second reading	2342
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	2342
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	2343
Fatal Accidents Act, bill to amend, Mr. Sopha, on second reading	2343
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	2345
Meetings of the board of directors of the Canadian National Exhibition Association, bill respecting, on second reading, Mr. Bryden,	2345
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Price, agreed to	2351
Statute Labour Act, bill to amend, Mr. Sopha, on second reading	2351
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	2355
On Ontario Northland Transportation Commission	2355
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Allan, agreed to	2367

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests in the west gallery, students from School Area No. 2, Waterloo township.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's sixth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 64, An Act to set aside a certain tax sale of land in the township of Herschel for the relief of Wallace Bullied and Norah Bullied.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of these amendments is to strengthen the administration of the Ontario Water Resources Commission. A complete explanation will be given on later readings.

THE ONTARIO HURRICANE RELIEF FUND ACT, 1955

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, 1955.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, every hon. member of this House will recall with sorrow the disastrous results of Hurricane Hazel which devastated this area for two days in October of 1954. My constituency of York West was particularly hard hit by the hurricane and I vividly remember the astounding loss of life and property damage which was left in its wake.

As a result of this disaster, a public fund was subscribed and a portion of this fund was subsequently turned over to the Workmen's Compensation Board to be administered under The Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, which was passed in the Legislature in 1955. These funds, in the amount of \$169,470, were to be used by the board for the purpose of providing assistance to the widows, orphans, and dependent children of those who lost their lives as a result of Hurricane Hazel. The Act stipulated that the relief and assistance was to be paid in accordance with the terms of The Workmen's Compensation Act as it then was.

In accordance with the agreement, entered into between the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund, which was a corporation set up for the purpose of administering donations received, periodic revaluations of the funds on hand have been carried out. Certain of the widows have remarried and are thus no longer in receipt of pensions. The situation has therefore been created where the assets in the fund are somewhat in excess of liabilities.

There is presently sufficient money in the fund to permit all pensions to orphans and dependent children to be increased to the present standard under existing legislation contained in The Workmen's Compensation

Act. Under the legislation passed in the last session, pensions were increased for children to \$40 per month. This bill is designed to bring the pensions of children receiving benefits under this special fund up to this amount.

This bill further gives the Workmen's Compensation Board the power to continue payments to these children so long as they remain in school or in some educational institute. It must be emphasized that the funds with which this bill deals are not the regular funds handled by the Workmen's Compensation Board, but rather are funds received through donations made at the time of Hurricane Hazel.

THE DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish The Department of University Affairs.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce another bill and then I will comment on both of them at once.

ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL AID CORPORATION

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is with some pleasure that I introduce these two bills concerning the universities of our province. As there is a change in government policy here, I will make a fairly full statement. I am going to table this afternoon the report of the advisory committee on university affairs. Next week we will be dealing with the estimates of The Department of Education and I think we might at that time debate what is in these bills. It will fall within the context of those estimates and the sums which are being voted for the universities. Between now and then hon. members will have an opportunity to examine these bills.

As all hon. members of the House are aware, the interest and involvement of the government of Ontario in university matters dates back to our beginnings as a province. Over this 170-year period the nature of the

relationship between the government and the universities has varied considerably. Through the greater part of the period it has been customary for the universities, through their officials, to deal directly with the Prime Minister and/or the Minister of Education in their relationships with the government. At some times, particularly during the last century and the early part of this century, it was a common practice to appoint special committees, and indeed Royal commissions were appointed on occasion, to handle specific questions and suggest courses of action and particular plans and programmes in regard to the affairs of our universities. The last such commission reported on university finances in 1921.

In more recent times, it has become apparent that with the complexities of university education, emphasized by the rapid growth in enrolments, the government, in order to deal adequately and equitably with our institutions of higher learning, required sound, experienced advice on a more continuous basis than the previous basis of appointing various *ad hoc* committees and commissions when they were required.

As early as the 1940s, Dr. R. C. Wallace, a retired principal of Queen's University, and following him, Dr. J. G. Althouse, chief director of education for the province, were asked to undertake the work of co-ordinating our university efforts and the task of advising the government on the appropriate forms of action the government should take in regard to the universities.

As the university question grew beyond that, a technical committee was the next organization. It was made up of senior civil servants, and undertook similar responsibilities. As a result of their efforts, a more detailed procedure for gathering and analyzing the relevant information, was developed as a basis for the allocation of grants. At the same time the universities were encouraged to undertake a very considerable programme of expansion in order to provide for the young people who, it was evident then, were going to be knocking at the doors.

Early in 1961, it was felt that the committee would benefit from the provision of representation from outside the government, and the advisory committee on university affairs was established. I might say that this committee has rendered some remarkable service, and has overseen the most dramatic increases in government assistance to universities in the history of our province.

It has met on a regular basis with the senior officials and governors of each univer-

sity to whom we make grants, to review their requests for operating grants, for capital grants and for special grants and its recommendations to the government concerning these matters have been the result of careful analysis and study, all of which is related to these factors I mention.

This committee, in the course of its deliberations and duties, has taken the unprecedented step of calling together the presidents of all the provincially assisted universities to discuss matters of common concern and to discuss with them areas where there was a particular need. During the past few months, the committee has also conducted a similar meeting with the chairmen of the boards of governors of the universities, and with the members of those boards who are handling finance for the universities.

Very important questions have been examined carefully by this committee and, as a result, specific forms of action have been recommended to the government. To give you some examples of what these areas have been: The extended graduate programme, the Ontario new universities library project and the Ontario graduate fellowship programme are cases in point.

These are but a few of the notable accomplishments which this committee has carried out in the relatively brief period of time in which it has functioned and not too many words of praise can be said on behalf of the very dedicated citizens of our province who have rendered service as members of this committee.

During the period of time in which this advisory committee has operated, as in the preceding years, the officials of The Department of Education have carried out the necessary administrative tasks required. Here, too, exceptional service has been given. But it has become increasingly clear in the light of the rapidly expanding enrolments at our universities, the truly fantastic developments in higher education, and the significant increases in both the actual and relative contributions of the province to our universities that the current organization could only be regarded as another step in the evolution of government-university relationships.

Over the last four years, for instance, total provincial grants to our universities have risen from \$29 million to over \$100 million. Questions and issues related to university growth have increased not only in number of problems, but in the complexity of the problems themselves. Problems, which not long ago could be adequately dealt with by an annual review, now require continuous

liaison and more frequent discussion. They must be dealt with on a continuing basis rather than being gathered together and dealt with at one time in the year.

Increasingly in recent months, the advisory committee has found itself in a position that required it to undertake executive functions, a responsibility which the members were reluctant to assume and a responsibility which really could not, in all fairness, be given to them. At the same time, once its recommendations were made and accepted by the government, it found that it lacked in many instances, the necessary staff to implement them effectively.

Therefore, it has become evident, that what is required is a full-time organization that can deal adequately with the numerous and complex problems associated with higher education—and deal with it on a continuous basis. The advisory committee was the first body to draw the matter to our attention and we concur with their observations in this regard. It is our feeling that a full-time Department of University Affairs will meet the needs of this situation, as I have sketched them here, and it is the next logical step in the development of our university-government relations. We are encouraged in this attitude by the favourable response we have received from university officials across the province since the government's decision to establish such a department was announced in the Speech from the Throne.

It is also our feeling, in the light of the already large and significant contributions it has rendered, we must continue to derive the benefit of the experience, the insight and the wise counsel of the advisory committee on university affairs. It is our decision, therefore, that this organization will continue to function and to advise the government on university matters. In order that the heavy load of responsibility befalling individual members may be somewhat reduced, we have decided to increase the size of the committee's membership. This will allow us not only to draw on the services of other outstanding persons, but will allow us to avail ourselves of a greater totality, if I may put it that way, of the knowledge within our community in dealing with university matters. In continuing to function, of course, the advisory committee will have available all the facilities of this new Department of University Affairs, which will serve as its administrative arm.

Now, I would repeat here, Mr. Speaker, what I have said on many other occasions in this House, that in no way is it our intention

as a government to interfere with the traditional areas of academic freedom that are possessed by our universities, or the freedoms in which they have grown up and developed over the years. The creation of this new department will not change that fundamental policy of government in any way whatsoever. However, there are areas of common concern, especially as they relate to university expansion and financing. It is only through the fullest type of co-operative effort that the solution to the problems related to these matters will be found. The duties of The Department of University Affairs, as I shall presently outline them, will be carried out in the full spirit of such co-operation.

The new department will, of course, be required to undertake a number of very important responsibilities. It will be the agency of government through which we shall maintain day-to-day communication with our universities. At the same time the department will be asked to **work closely** with the universities in finding answers to some of the important problems which we face in the years ahead. For example, we must undertake some very fundamental studies as to per student costs, both as they relate to operating and capital requirements, and as they apply to the various faculties and schools of our universities.

We need further analysis of university enrolments and we need continued projections of enrolments so that we are at all times aware of the extent of our future needs. We need an examination of the whole field of student aid, so that we may be assured that we have the most effective programmes and that no deserving student lacks the financial resources to continue in higher education if he is able. It is contemplated that a very careful look will be taken at possible areas of co-ordination and co-operation among our universities. In addition, attempts will be made to determine the needs for residential accommodation on the various campuses of our province. We must also give thought as to the methods by which both private citizens and industry might be encouraged to give greater support to our universities.

We must do research, investigation and study into the relationship between the work of the universities in regard to all other forms of higher education. At the same time, on a continuing basis, we must pay attention to developments in other jurisdictions so that we may benefit, not only from ideas developed ourselves, but from ideas that are being developed in this field in other countries, in other states and in other parts of the world.

As a result of these studies and the extensive experience gained from past relationships with our universities, consideration will be given by the department to devising new procedures for the payment of grants to our universities. We wish to develop here procedures which will be recognized as equitable by all concerned.

At the same time the department will be asked to develop, in co-operation with the universities, methods of ensuring that full value in terms of higher education and in terms of services provided to students will be derived from the vast amounts of public money that will be required to be spent in this area in the next few years. The new department will administer all provincial grants paid to the universities and will maintain a constant scrutiny of the procedures and administrative methods by which this is carried out so that necessary changes in approach can be made when they are required.

Further, in relation to assistance for capital projects, the new department will work in close co-operation with the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation, which is established by the other bill introduced this afternoon. All submissions for capital assistance will be made to The Department of University Affairs and on the recommendation of the Minister the capital aid corporation will purchase debentures in amounts approved for each project. Procedures will be developed to allow detailed discussion between officials of the department and each university regarding proposed building plans on an individual and year-round basis.

In other words, we will have a continuing process whereas in the past it tended to develop into an annual matter dealt with just prior to budget time. With these arrangements, the financing, the capitalizing of construction and so on, can be planned month to month and year to year on a year-round basis.

It is contemplated that the new department, making use of findings from previously mentioned studies, will work with the university officials in developing sound plans for the co-ordination of future expansion in the various faculties, schools and courses. In this way we will be able to eliminate unnecessary duplication of facilities and at the same time we will be able to ensure that no particular area of need is left without provision or no area of education is left undeveloped. We hope, too, that we can develop programmes of co-operation in the purchase and use of various teaching materials

and equipment and in this way we can spread the benefits further and at the same time, also spread the cost also on a more realistic basis.

The Department of University Affairs will administer all major programmes of government aid to students thus ensuring that these programmes are fully co-ordinated. At the same time it will work in co-operation with other agencies and institutions which conduct programmes in this field in an attempt, once again, to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. The department will review all proposed legislation regarding universities, will make recommendations regarding same and from time to time, as the situation requires it, the department will devise and recommend to the government special programmes to meet particular needs.

In this regard I would once again mention to hon. members the Ontario graduate fellowship programme, the Ontario new universities library project and the special fund for temporary accommodation, all of which are special programmes designed to meet certain special needs. All of these have originated within the present organization as I have sketched it, and all of them are functioning successfully. We certainly believe there will be need for similar special functions in the future.

Finally, as I have already mentioned, the department will be asked to serve as the administrative agency for the advisory committee on university affairs and will carry out such other duties as are necessary and as the government may decide are required.

To carry out this extensive list of responsibilities it is planned that the most capable staff we can find will be acquired and organized into a tight but effective organization. Immediately this department is approved in the House, the acquisition of personnel will commence.

Now I can only say that education, as I think we are all aware, is one of the most important areas of responsibility befalling this province. In the last 20 years we have worked very successfully to meet the demands of increased numbers, and changes in programmes brought about population shifts, as a result of changes in our society and our economic life. Our efforts to date in meeting the demands created by this situation have been successful. It is our desire and our wish that we should face the future requirements of the universities with confidence in the knowledge that we are building upon the foundation of the past and that is why I have sketched for hon. members today how

this is really an evolutionary process culminating at this time in this department. We believe that it will be an effective organization to carry on adequately for all of our young people.

In regard to the second bill, The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, this bill authorizes the establishment of a Crown corporation under this name whose purpose will be to assist Ontario universities in the financing of an extensive capital construction programme to accommodate the anticipated influx of young people seeking higher education. I am not going to mention the magnitude of this expansion, this will be debated later. I think it is sufficient to say this afternoon that we do face a very, very large increase in the enrolment of our universities and this naturally entails that we must face also extensive expansion of facilities in order to accommodate them, not only on the campuses of our established universities, but on universities yet to be built.

From the point of view of finances, I could just say this: by the estimates of the universities themselves, the provincially assisted universities in the province will spend in excess of \$260 million on capital construction during the period 1964 to 1967, and of course we may expect that the assistance of this government will be required to finance a very substantial part of that programme. Thus it becomes apparent that the former system of providing capital construction grants out of current tax revenue on the basis I have sketched here, cannot and should not be continued.

What we really need is a sound method which will spread the cost over a period of years so that we may meet the emergency when we have to really spend a great deal of money in a short time. In addition we need some method of financing this construction which will permit these projects to be spread over a period of time, to be spread, as I have already said, throughout the whole period of the year rather than be dealt with once a year. The methods we have devised will take the form of this corporation.

The objects of the corporation will be to purchase from the universities, bonds and debentures issued by them for capital construction projects that have been approved and have been processed through The Department of University Affairs as I have outlined. Also subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in council, the corporation will be empowered to borrow, or raise by way of loan, such sums as the corporation deems requisite in carrying out its purposes. It will consist of five members appointed by

the Lieutenant-Governor in council and subject to the regulations, it will be under the management and control of its members, and it will function and be responsible to the Provincial Treasurer of the province.

Mr. Speaker, that is in essence the broad purpose of these two pieces of legislation which I am introducing this afternoon.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the hon. Prime Minister if this is to be a new portfolio of government or a department within a department?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, it is a new department.

Mr. Oliver: Within an existing department?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, not within an existing department. It is a completely new department.

Mr. Oliver: Will it have a Minister of its own?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It will have a Minister, yes.

Mr. Oliver: Who is the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will announce who the Minister will be in due course.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Prime Minister a question, particularly for our guidance in handling this aspect of university affairs during the debate on the estimates? My question is: How much of post-secondary education is going to come within the jurisdiction of The Department of University Affairs or, more specifically, will institutions such as OCE and Ryerson come under this department?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the intent is that this will deal exclusively with the universities as we understand them. In other words, we do not intend to disturb the existing relationship between OCE and The Department of Education, and the development of our institutes of technology.

As I said in regard to the procedure of this, we can have a complete debate rather than—I can call second reading of these bills if this is necessary to observe the formalities during the estimates of The Department of Education, but because the matters are so closely interlocked I think they would be more efficiently debated during the estimates of the department.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, *An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act*.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to authorize the making of loans for construction of hospitals or additions thereto, and to permit of the drawing of regulations to govern the conditions, amounts, terms, and so on.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman). He has had notice of it. Would the hon. Minister comment on the fight which occurred recently in a dormitory of the Guelph Reformatory, when approximately ten inmates were admitted to the reformatory hospital for treatment—the word “admitted” of course being in the sense of entered.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to accommodate the hon. member in commenting on an alleged incident at the Guelph Reformatory.

I have with me a statement from the superintendent, Mr. Charles Sanderson, which reads as follows:

During the eight years I have been superintendent at the Guelph Reformatory, there has never been a fight in a dormitory or elsewhere in the institution which has necessitated the hospitalization of ten inmates or even as many as three.

Of recent months, fights have been very infrequent. Upon no occasion have there been more than two or three inmates involved and upon no occasion has more than one inmate required medical attention.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is not a tittle of truth in the allegation which is inherent in the question the hon. member has asked.

However, having been invited by the hon. member to make some comment, I would like to take this opportunity to appeal to him to be more circumspect in the future in the use of allegations which could do a great deal of harm to the corrective work in our institutions. I appreciate that the hon. member has been assigned by his party to be their critic of my department, and I also recognize that it is his right—indeed his duty, as it is of all hon. members of this House—to probe the administration of the govern-

ment and to criticize, where they feel such criticism is warranted. Nevertheless, there is a great degree of responsibility attached to that right and that duty.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member state his point of order?

Mr. Young: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is an answer to the question. He is commenting on the question of my duties!

Mr. Speaker: I might inform the member that he asked the Minister to comment and did not ask a specific question. He asked him to comment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To proceed, Mr. Speaker.

Nevertheless, there is a great degree of responsibility attached to that right and that duty. It seems to me that, unless an hon. member has good reason to believe that the government or any of its officials has been derelict in their responsibilities in a specific situation, he should be most careful in making such allegations. May I suggest to the hon. member that there are many deleterious side-effects which could result from spreading unconfirmed reports about correctional institutions.

Mr. MacDonald: He sounds like the former Attorney General in reference to Dr. Shulman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For example, there is some evidence that publicity about fights in one institution has a tendency to create a chain reaction and cause unrest in some of the other institutions. Such rumours also are unfair to a dedicated staff which is doing a very able job.

We must also concern ourselves with the effects such rumours have upon the citizens of the areas in which the various institutions are located. For example, just to mention a few citizens of Guelph, Brampton, Sudbury, Brantford and so on, could be given the impression, by such allegations as those made by the hon. member, that there is a great lack of control within the institutions in their areas, and they would have every reason to be concerned.

I am sure the hon. member for Yorkview, who earlier showed such an interest in the work of our department, would not want to engage in a practice which would have the effect of making our work of correction much

more difficult, and I would appeal to the hon. member again to make sure of his facts before making public charges.

I have before, and I again, offer him the facilities of our department and the co-operation of all our officials to ascertain the facts in any given situation at any time.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, having listened to the wisdom from across the floor, may I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: You may ask the Minister if he wishes to answer a supplementary question.

Mr. Young: Could I ask the hon. Minister then if he would answer a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, he only asked me to comment originally. Does he want me to make a supplementary comment?

Mr. Young: All right.

Mr. Speaker: No, I am afraid there will be no supplementary comments either. If the member wishes to ask the Minister a supplementary question, I shall allow it if the Minister cares to answer it.

Mr. Young: The question I would ask then in regard to this incident is: Were some people on this occasion treated by the hospital concerned?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, how can I answer, in any case, as the hon. member has not even told me which incidents? He said "recent". If he will be a little more specific, on a specific date or something, I will be glad to get that information for him.

Mr. Young: Does the hon. Minister wish that information at this time, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I think if the member has a particular date, perhaps the Minister would have to find out if, on that particular date, there was an incident.

Mr. Young: It was April 10.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the civil service—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, we have another question.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, has the hon. Minister of Health any further report to make on the hospitalization of workers at the

Allied Chemical plant, near Sarnia because of the effects of phosgene gas? And what is the explanation for the fact that these health problems were not reported to the government at the time of their occurrence?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is exactly the same as I made on April 14. I repeat there have been no incidents of health problems related to phosgene gas. Having listened to the information the hon. member put before you, sir, on a point of order a few days ago, I was rather concerned at the irreconcilability of the answer I gave with the report in the newspapers. I asked for a further investigation and I find that there has been misunderstanding on the part of the hon. member; and in my great zeal to be sure that I answered this question correctly, it made me take a rather narrow view of it.

There have been people hospitalized, but not as a result of exposure to toluene diisocyanate. A number of maintenance workers—the hon. member asked, on April 14, about employees of Allied Chemical—the people involved, sir, were not employees of Allied Chemical but employees of a contractor doing certain maintenance work in cleaning out pipes or some equipment used in the process there.

A number of maintenance workers employed at Allied Chemical were affected by exposure to toluene diisocyanate, which I explained the other day is a plastic chemical used in the operation. The main exposure occurred on March 10 in cleaning out the pipes containing this substance, TDI. Five of these men were hospitalized for periods of from four to 16 days and one is still in hospital, believed to be allergic to this substance.

Now, sir, I am advised that these cases were reported to the workmen's compensation board by the physicians of the companies concerned. This is proper procedure and in keeping with usual custom, my department was advised of these. But frankly, I did not associate that with exposure to phosgene gas because they are totally unrelated.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I beg leave to table a report of the advisory committee on university affairs.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the civil service commission for 1963.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, in connection with Bill No. 100, I think that most of the provisions in there make a fund of good sense, but I notice that the suggestion is that judges emeritus, if you can call them that, be no longer allowed to be benchers or honorary benchers of the law society. I am in favour of that suggestion, but I wonder why Attorneys General emeritus should continue to be honorary benchers of the law society.

I think while you are making the change you could deal with Attorneys General emeritus, or however the plural goes, in the same way as you are dealing with judges. It is conceivable, for instance, Mr. Speaker, that in the crisis that occurred in the last few weeks that we might have had three or four acting Attorneys General for a short period of time and as the changes took place from one to the other, the government could conceivably have ended up with five or six, or whatever number you want, of honorary benchers who could have taken over control of the law society.

I think while you are making the change you could perhaps extend the principle to the whole field.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): The suggestion is very worthy, perhaps, of consideration. I recall that one of the hon. member's colleagues likened the Attorneys General to the wives of King Henry VIII; they might be beheaded from time to time and divorced, and it could be that you could build up quite a society of benchers.

There is a difference, of course, in the functions and tenure of office of judges and Attorneys General and we will take the suggestion under consideration.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to make comments about the revision of this Act as a matter of principle. I would say by way of introduction that my hon. colleague, the

hon. member for Downsview, myself and my friend the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) are all members of this society by virtue of the fact that we carry on practice within the province. In making any observations about it, of course we have to be very circumspect if we value the respect and esteem of our colleagues at the bar. We have to take care in what we say that we do not appear to be mavericks or to be advocating any measures which do not find favour with the benchers of the law society who, for these many years, have had the responsibility of governing our great and noble and honoured profession, one of the oldest professions, of course, within society—

An hon. member: Not the oldest!

Mr. Sopha: Not the oldest—but one of the oldest. I always rue the fact that the legal profession use the name "Law Society of Upper Canada," which is out of date and archaic and no longer reflects the geographic and constitutional entity which the law society covers.

In respect of the principle in section one, I note that in a recent issue of the *Ontario Weekly Notes* there was reported a meeting of the convocation of the society and the convocation apparently at that meeting dealt at great length with the principle of geographic representation among the benchers.

I want to say at this point that from the democratic point of view the Law Society of Upper Canada is rather unique and, if I may put it, atypical organization in that the law society, so long as I have been a member these ten years, has never held a meeting of the shareholders or the members. The benchers rule and govern the society within the confines of Osgoode Hall in the rooms provided there for their use. Indeed, I think they own a goodly portion of the real estate upon which the administration of justice is carried on. But unlike other corporate bodies in our society, whether they be statutory bodies or whether they be bodies created by letters patent or otherwise, this one never holds a meeting of the shareholders.

There is only one time, so far as I am aware, that in any sense the pluralistic group known as the law society gets together. That is annually, when at the midwinter meeting of the Canadian Bar Association, its Ontario section, the Law Society of Upper Canada tenders a luncheon to the members of the profession for which it pays and at which meeting, the treasurer of the law society—some hon. members will not appreciate, of course, that we lawyers are circumspect and

shrewd and astute enough, to make the head man in our society, the treasurer. That shows the basic and innate intelligence of lawyers, the recognition of the fact that the man who controls the money ought to be the head man, and he is.

But it is at that meeting that some form of report is made by the law society to the shareholders.

Now to get back to this recent meeting of convocation, I read very carefully the report of the proceedings in the *Ontario Weekly Notes* and it seems that the benchers at that time took up the consideration of the geographic distribution of representation on the benchers, the governing body of the society. I think they came to the conclusion that the benchers ought to be divided with something like 50 per cent of them coming from the Metropolitan area of Toronto and 50 per cent coming from elsewhere in the province.

Well, if that has been decided by the benchers as a matter of principle, I say to the hon. Attorney General, through you, Mr. Speaker, that one queries why the statute is now presented in the House and that principle is not embodied in it.

Indeed, it is a strange thing, it always seems strange and anomalous to me, a matter of some paradox that arises from conjecture, that it is the lawyers who write the statutes governing the medical and the dental professions, to name two. The lawyers write those statutes and in those statutes, the lawyers have decreed that enshrined in the statute will be the principle of geographic representation. The doctors and the dentists have no choice about it. They divide the province in those statutes into various areas and they say so many of the governing body of the profession vis-à-vis doctors and dentists shall come from each one of these areas. But as is apparently the case, whereas that principle might be held valid for doctors and dentists, it has never occurred to lawyers that the principle might be valid for them.

For these many decades, the great majority of the governing body of the legal profession has come from the Metropolitan area, with but a few elected from elsewhere in the province. I myself have seen, in the short time that I have been at the bar, that many good men from elsewhere in the province have offered themselves to serve on the benchers but they have been deprived and denied that opportunity by reason of the fact that the great majority vote is here in Metropolitan Toronto. Therefore, a candidate from Metropolitan Toronto is favoured by

that circumstance in the result that the great majority of the benchers have been from this area.

Now, I do not really know, not having spoken to many benchers, I cannot recall that many benchers speak to me. Well, I am not suggesting by that that they are not friendly with me. I have, indeed, many good friends who are benchers. But I cannot recall whether the benchers have arrived at a point in their thinking that they have decided that the geographical representation that I have outlined shall be the way the profession shall be governed in the future. But I would think that the hon. Attorney General—I suspect he has read that report of the convocation—might at this time ask the benchers of the law society whether they found that principle to be such an inviting one that he is ready to enshrine it in statutory form. Therefore the amendment to section 5 that is proposed in section one of this, the amending statute, might go further than it already goes.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the denying of “judges emeritus” was the phrase of my hon. friend from Downsview, denying them the opportunity to sit, as a right, as *ex-officio* benchers of the law society, is a good democratic principle. It is a good democratic principle, at least in an enlightened age of democracy. They really have no right by virtue of the fact that they were formerly judges of the High Court, any more than ex-Attorneys General have the right. It is a matter of democratic principle. They do not have the right, especially when we are getting so many ex-Attorneys General alive at the one time. They might some time be able to sway the deliberations of the governing body of the profession.

I am not even sure, and I run the risk of the displeasure of my older and wiser and more experienced brethren in the profession, when I say that as a matter of democratic principle I am not at all sure that a person who is elected at three succeeding quinquennial elections ought to be a lifetime bencher. It rather puts an undue emphasis on age, on status, and on inflexibility of outlook. It does not encourage the prevalence of the point of view of the younger man. Like the Senate of Canada, it is inclined to become a nice place for retirement. And many, of course, of the benchers who presently govern the profession, are there by virtue of the fact that they have been elected for three succeeding five-year terms.

As a matter of principle, I am not even certain that the election to the governing body of the profession ought not to be more frequent than every five years. The Amer-

icans, I notice, with the presidency have an election every four. By practice we have one every four, where we have the opportunity at least, of changing those who govern us. Most corporate bodies have one every year, when the shareholders meet and they have an opportunity to toss out those in charge of affairs. I do not know that as a matter of democracy the benchers of the law society should be in the unique position of being there for five years.

But of all of these things, if any of the benchers read the words I have said, I hope they will at least vouchsafe to me that I have tried to make the comments moderate and intelligent and directed toward a reform in the best interests, not only of the members of the profession, but in the interests of the public generally.

I have no other axe to grind, save that. But in putting these things forward, as a mere matter of principle, I also want to remind the governing body of our profession that in many ways, as never before, our profession—great and noble and honoured and esteemed as it is—is under a certain measure of review by the public. I would be blind and I would ask my hearers to put their heads in the sand, if I did not direct their attention to the fact that there has been much adverse publicity about the legal profession in recent years. I can blame part of it on my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Whicher), who used the opportunity at one time in the House, to make some rather adroit and direct remarks—penetrating remarks—about the legal profession and what ought to be done in respect of it.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Give them the needle.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, one might adopt those words.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is a medical term.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is a medical term, is it not? So, for all of those reasons, I say in closing that the Act is not apparently up to date with the thinking of the benchers, because since the Act has been moved in the House, this convocation has come out and the benchers appear to be willing to go further than this Act envisages in its amending section. Therefore, I say that we would be willing, on this side, if the benchers want to put another section in here to provide for geographic representation on that body then, speaking for myself and I am sure for many others, it would be a very welcome change.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member and I am not going to comment at any length at this time due to the fact that the report from the convocation of the benchers was produced after this bill was introduced. I am not sure that it went firmly forward into idea of geographic representation. And my hon. friend is aware that the election of benchers is democratic, at least to this extent that they are elected by all qualified members of the legal profession. However, the suggestion is one well worthy of consideration and we will take it under consideration.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SHORT FORMS OF MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Short Forms of Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-61

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill No. 112, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-61.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE RACE TRACKS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Race Tracks Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 115, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INDUSTRIAL FARMS ACT

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves second reading of Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PENAL AND REFORM INSTITUTIONS INSPECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways) moves second reading of Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this. I am very pleased that the government has finally seen the light of day and paid attention to the resolution passed by the city council in the city of Windsor and endorsed by the town of Riverside. This is something we have been fighting for for two years, and I think it is just the thing we have asked for—the suburban roads commission's assessment to be on an equalized provincial basis.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

LOCAL ROADS BOARDS

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill No. 123, An Act to provide for the establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief comment on this bill.

As I have stated before, this government is following a policy of modernizing, as time and circumstances permit, the financial and administrative methods available to the many road authorities in the province which provide the day-to-day management for a very essential part of the transportation network on which the social and economic well-being of the province depends.

This Act provides for the formation of local roads areas and election of local roads boards to administer the local roads within these areas and is a further indication of that policy of modernization. It provides a more efficient and equitable method of administering some 5,000 miles of public roads in those parts of Ontario without municipal organization, most of which are now under the administration of statute labour boards.

In comparing this Act with The Statute Labour Act the hon. members will note the principles of local participation in the cost of local roads, and local direction of work on local roads have been maintained.

The major changes and improvements are:

1. The Department of Highways forces will perform the work laid out by the elected representatives of the local people. This will allow full use of the department's specialized equipment and trained technical staff, thereby increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the operations.

2. The department will provide a higher level of financial aid, varying from "2-for-1", or 66% per cent, to "4-for-1" or 80 per cent, depending on the frontage of Crown lots. This is in keeping with the increase in subsidy given to certain of the townships last year, though on a different basis.

3. This Act provides three alternative methods of assessing the lands within the local roads areas by the boards. If all the property is assessed under The Provincial Land Tax Act, this assessment will be used by the boards. If this assessment is not complete, but all the lands in the area are assessed in one school section under The Public Schools Act, then such assessment will be used by the boards. Finally, if neither of these assessments are available, provision is made for the boards to assess the lands under a simple schedule established in the Act.

It is not the intention of this government to repeal The Statute Labour Act at this time, nor to force the present statute labour boards to use this new Act. However, I am

certain that when the advantages of this new system are understood by the people in unorganized areas, they will abandon statute labour for this new and more efficient system.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-62

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL AND SHELTERED CARE

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 118, An Act to provide homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 120, I wonder if the hon. Minister could advise us if the government has any intention of bringing in a further amendment to the Metropolitan Toronto Act this year regarding the Metropolitan Toronto licensing commission? As I understood a position earlier taken by the hon. Minister, there was to be no amendments at all in the Metro Toronto bill this year. And if there had been, the government was going to at least take under serious consideration the question of appeals from the decisions of the Metropolitan Toronto licensing commission, and the sections in the Metro Toronto Act which relate thereto.

Is the hon. Minister in a position to advise the House today if there will be any further amending bill later this year?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the Metro government in this area is under review by Mr. Goldenberg and I have no intention to present any additional amendments, particularly any amendment dealing with the licensing commission for Metro.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. George raises a good point. I do not know that it was within really the terms of reference addressed to Mr. Goldenberg dealing with licensing commissions—that sort of thing—and the hon. member for St. George—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I was just wondering, Mr. Speaker, how is this relevant to the principle of this bill?

Mr. Singer: Well, the principle of the bill deals with the unique municipal organization called Metropolitan Toronto and this is about the only opportunity—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am quite patient but that is a long stretch, a very long stretch.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: This Bill No. 121 will go to the committee on municipal law and will be completely—or a very careful, detailed examination will be made there.

Mr. Singer: And Bill No. 120, too?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, is it necessary that Bill No. 120 should go to the committee?

Mr. Singer: It is the one I am concerned about.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: If the hon. member wants to make a speech about the licensing commission, why it is quite all right with me. We will have both of them go to the committee on municipal law, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT

Mr. Sopha moves second reading of Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Fatal Accidents Act.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the opportunity of speaking against this bill at this particular point?

The reason I rise, sir, is because I suggest that the bill as proposed by the hon. member for Sudbury is an unnecessary piece of legislation. I am going to say as a start in my very brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, that in the result I disagree with the hon. member for Sudbury on grounds of principle as well as on legal grounds. Having said that I disagree with him on legal grounds, this might be an appropriate point in our discussion to congratulate him upon his recent elevation to the position of Queen's Counsel, learned in the law. I hope that nothing I will say will in any way reflect upon that distinction.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill itself were dealing only with matters of small technicalities or small cost and if in the result they bore in some way upon widows and children, I think that all of us in this House, myself and the hon. member for Sudbury, would all be agreed that this Act was well founded. But the basic suggestion I would like to put before you, Mr. Speaker, and before the hon. member for Sudbury, is that his bill is essentially misconceived in that it expresses, it is an amending Act but it expresses, what I with deference submit is the law as it presently exists. The amendment which the hon. member proposes in his bill reads:

It is not necessary to obtain letters probate or letters of administration in order to bring an action under this section.

The essence of my submission, Mr. Speaker, is that this is exactly what the law is at this time. In other words, as a matter of law it is not necessary to obtain letters probate or letters of administration in order to bring an action under the section referred to, the section being section seven of the present Fatal Accidents Act. And briefly, that section says, Mr. Speaker, section seven of the present Act:

If there is no executor or administrator of the deceased, the action may be brought by all or any of the persons for whose benefit the action would have been if it had been brought by such executor or administrator.

In other words, if there is no executor or administrator then the people who are beneficially entitled, a widow, orphans, the beneficiaries themselves, can bring the action.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a brief look at the law on the point and I will not burden the House as one would in court with a long

list of cases, but for the purposes of the record I would like to mention four of them if I might.

Going back to 1898, we have a case in which the courts have held that it was not necessary to have an administrator under the circumstances. In 1922 we have another case following the same line. In 1924 another case. In 1937 another case, and a leading one, *Male vs. Silverwoods Dairies*, which held that administration or appointment of executors was not necessary.

In 1957 the point was followed up again in a case in which the judge said, briefly, that he, the presiding judge of the court, could not override the plain wording of the section, the plain wording of the section that I have quoted, Mr. Speaker.

This being the fact, with respect—in some 42 years one cannot find a recorded case saying that it is necessary to appoint an administrator or executor under these circumstances. So I repeat, sir, that it appears that the proposed legislation is redundant.

The answer that might be brought is: If there is any question why not pass a bill, it will not do any harm? I think the hon. member for Sudbury would be the first to agree with me that futile legislation is certainly not something we would wish. Perhaps more important, there is always the possibility that if we were to pass a bill such as, in fact Bill No. 22, the courts themselves and the legal profession involved with circumstances pertinent to this point, might assume that this was in some way changing the law and that some present rights—some existing rights—were thereby affected. Conceivably the rights existing under limitations in the law themselves could be affected.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that there are some circumstances when obviously, without propounding a thesis, an amendment of this kind or general amendments of standing legislation would be well founded.

The first obviously is at a time when the circumstances involving this particular legislation show that it is out of date. I would submit that is not the case today.

The second obvious example would be where the operation of a particular statute, as we sometimes find in our taxing legislation, the operation by the civil service itself produces results which none of the hon. members of this House would have intended, Mr. Speaker.

Another situation would be where the interpretation by the courts has produced

results which neither the government nor hon. members of the House had intended.

A fourth would be where you had a series of confusing cases going in different directions and appeals which show that the wording was in fact obscure.

Finally a situation in which there was some consensus of opinion in the legal profession, or among judges or in the Attorney General's office or with the public, as to the fact the law might be obscure.

So far as I can see, sir, none of these more obvious and basic qualifications are met under the present circumstances. I submit again that the case law is in fact consistent and has been for nearly 50 years that the wording of the present section seven of the Act is clear, and, that therefore there is no need for the passage of a bill such as Bill No. 22.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my hon. friend from Russell. He and I, I am sure, will share the belief that it would ill behove ourselves to burden the House for long with a discussion of an extremely technical point that really concerns only lawyers. In all that he has said I would say to him in the spirit of utmost friendliness that he may be closer to the mark than he was in his last speech when he advocated the endorsement of the Ontario pension plan.

The length of his remarks gives me some measure of support that this bill may be needed. I put it forward for the sole purpose of clearing up what I felt to be an obscurity in the statute. It is true that there is judicial interpretation that supports the point of view that he takes. I, sir, went to a law officer of the Crown and I suggested that the government bring forward a bill to add the section that is proposed to be added in Bill No. 22. That plea fell on deaf ears.

Then I was moved to introduce this bill myself. And I was moved to do so because only three or four months ago, when I appeared on behalf of a widow in the high court before a learned judge of that court, with an action under *The Fatal Accidents Act*, among the first things that the judge said to me was: "Mr. Sopha, where are the letters of administration upon which this action is founded?" Now, an action under *The Fatal Accidents Act*, of course, is a statutory action, one that did not exist at common law. The *Fatal Accidents Act* is known in Britain as *Lord Campbell's Act*, having been suggested or written by a very learned lord of his day and time; I think perhaps a half a century ago.

Section seven of the Act as it now stands seems to have in it an inherent ambiguity and it seems on a plain reading that an interpretation may be attributed to it that it is necessary for a person who sues under that statute—usually a widow or widower, and sometimes dependent children if both parents have been killed—it seems to be capable of an interpretation that it is necessary to have letters of administration or letters probate if the action is brought before six months have expired from the date of the death of the deceased. Of course that is what led to the learned judge's comments to me, the action having been started within six months. But if the person who brings the action waits more than six months, then the statute seems to say that an action may be brought by dependents.

This section is quite a lengthy one and any reading of it, as has been done by my hon. friend from Russell, lends itself to that possible interpretation. He cites three cases. I am familiar with those cases. I will pay this compliment of appreciation to him. I was familiar with two of them and he brought the third one, the Silverwood case, to my attention, for which I am grateful. Those are cases in the High Court, the most inferior of the supreme courts of judicature. It may well be that those cases, having been decided in the High Court, at some future time an appellate tribunal or the Supreme Court of Canada might decide upon a different interpretation. It would be a disastrous thing if the widow brought an action under The Fatal Accidents Act, not having secured letters of administration, a year having gone by since the death of her spouse, and then to have it ruled that her action was a nullity. That would be disastrous.

There would be no repair for that situation because, the year having gone by under The Highway Traffic Act, she would then be out of court with no relief or compensation for her injury, loss or damage or for any dependent children. That is another one of the reasons that I tender this amendment, for, sadly, it is very frequently the case that a widow who comes to consult a lawyer—her husband having been killed on one of our highways or as a result of the tortious act of a third person otherwise—that there is no estate that required taking out letters of administration otherwise. Her husband, in many, many cases that have come to me, leaves nothing other than, perhaps an insurance policy, perhaps some furniture, perhaps a very small balance in the bank. Otherwise he leaves nothing for the sustenance of his wife and children.

Then, sir, the lawyer does not want to go through the expense of taking out letters of administration at all. He accordingly prepares an application to the Surrogate Court to dispense with a bond and to allow the grant of letters of administration to go without the necessity of filing a bond.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in one fell swoop by the adoption of this reasoned amendment—a reasoned amendment I say because it is in the words of the law officers of the Crown who very kindly drafted it for me. It is their language and it is what I want to put forward. By this adoption of this amendment it would take away from the mind of the judge who questioned me in that case where he said: "Mr. Sopha, where are the letters of administration?" and I said: "My lord, I have not got them, I have not got any". So he said: "Oh, well, this case is not defended anyway so we will just overlook that." It was very kind of him, very kind of him. Had he taken the contrary position I could well have been in trouble. I might not even be here if I had got into that kind of trouble. But that is the way he disposed of it.

I want to take away that query from that judge's mind. So that hereafter, when one of the 22 or 23 judges of the High Court—and I say to my hon. friend from Russell it may be that there are a number of the 23 learned men in jurisprudence who are not familiar with those three cases that he and I are familiar with. I want to take away from them all or any of them any doubt about the necessity of taking out letters probate or letters of administration by saying that in an action brought under The Fatal Accidents Act in the clearest possible terms it is not necessary to have them in order to pursue the action. That is the reason the amendments were put forward and I hope that it finds favour from all corners of the House.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves second reading of Bill No. 28, An Act respecting the meetings of the board of directors of the Canadian National Exhibition Association.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments in support of the second reading of this bill. I think the arguments in favour of its adoption

are overwhelming and I feel confident that it will be approved.

This bill relates, as its title indicates, to meetings of the board of directors of the Canadian National Exhibition Association. It is a subject that was dear to the heart of the late Mayor Summerville of Toronto. He believed, as I believe and as I think most of the city council of Toronto believes, that the meetings of the board of directors of the CNE Association ought to be open to the public in the same way as meetings of local boards, of municipal councils and so on.

The bill is in much the same terms. In fact, I think it is in identical terms *mutatis mutandis* with municipal legislation. The normal procedure would be, if this bill were passed, that the meetings would be open to the public. But if some matter affecting private negotiations, where disclosure would obviously be disadvantageous to the association should occur, there is a provision whereby the public could be excluded from those meetings. It is the same principle exactly as applies to municipal councils, boards of education and other local boards.

The city of Toronto, last year I think it was, or it may have been the year before last, but at any rate, during the last session of the Legislature, the city brought in a bill to amend the private statute under which the Canadian National Exhibition Association is incorporated. This bill had as its purpose the same purpose as in Bill No. 28, now before you. It was brought in, however, as a private bill from the city of Toronto. That is the only way the city of Toronto could bring legislation of this kind before the House. Members of the private bills committee, by no means unanimously but by majority vote, turned down the bill, but not on its merits. In fact, several of the hon. members at that time who stated that they planned to vote against the bill, indicated that they favoured its principle. The same thing happened when the matter came to the House. I moved an amendment to the report of the private bills committee, to instruct the committee to reconsider this bill. We had a division in the House on that vote and then we heard the same sort of speeches from several hon. members on all sides of the House.

There were a great many hon. members, of course, including all the members of this group, who voted in favour of the principle of the bill. There were many others who said they had nothing against the principle, but technically it was out of order. What was this technicality, Mr. Speaker? The technicality was that it is not in order for one

private group to bring in a bill to amend a statute which relates to another private organization. That may not be the best method of expression technically, but I think it gets the substance across.

It was objected that the city of Toronto as a private organization, or an organization bringing in a private bill, could not amend another private statute which was not its own. That was the statute of the Canadian National Exhibition Association. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that was a very small technicality, and without too much merit.

As a matter of fact, the standing orders committee solicited a memorandum from Mr. Silk, who was then assistant deputy Attorney General. The memorandum was placed before the private bills committee on this technicality, and Mr. Silk did say that he did not think the bill brought in by the city of Toronto was truly a private bill in that it was not a bill for the particular interest or benefit of any person or persons. So, I suppose—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. member is discussing that bill, or the bill now before the House?

Mr. Bryden: Well, I think, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is there some measure of relevancy?

Mr. Bryden: This is all background to the bill before the House. As a matter of fact, the bill I am talking about is in identical terms to the—

Mr. Speaker: The principle of both bills is identical?

Mr. Bryden: The principle is absolutely identical. I am just trying to explain how it came about that I have seen fit to bring in a public bill on this issue. At any rate, I only have about one more comment on the background, Mr. Speaker.

As I say, Mr. Silk indicated that the bill was not a bill for the particular interest or benefit of any person or persons and therefore, in his opinion, it was not truly a private bill. He did, however, say in the same memorandum, and I think we should bear this in mind:

It is appropriate to point out at this point also that although it is the function of this office to prepare opinions of law based on the decisions of courts which, on the principle of *stare decisis*, are found by previous decisions of courts of equal or

higher jurisdiction, that furnishing of an opinion with regard to a matter over which the Legislature has final jurisdiction, is somewhat different. For I know that you, as Clerk of the House, realize the greater flexibility in the proceedings of the Legislature and of the right of the Legislature to make final determinations in matters of this kind, notwithstanding previous rulings.

It was my opinion last year, Mr. Speaker, that we should have considered the matter on its merits and forgotten the petty technicalities since there is no doubt, as Mr. Silk says, that this Legislature has the power to do so if it sees fit.

However, the view of the majority of the House was against me. So I have brought in—as a matter of fact, last year I brought in a bill but it was fairly late in the session. It was never called for debate. It was a bill exactly incorporating the principle. In fact it was in the language of the city of Toronto bill, and I have brought it forward again this year in exactly the same terms: providing that notwithstanding anything that may be contained in any other Act, the meetings of the board of directors of the CNE Association are open to the public, subject to the reservations I mentioned earlier.

I do not think that there can now be any technicality raised. This is a public bill, and a public bill can certainly amend a private statute directly or indirectly. However, this one does not purport to amend the private statute. It is a statute standing by itself. I think that the principle incorporated in the bill simply cannot be impeached.

It is ridiculous to regard the Canadian National Exhibition Association as if it were a purely private organization with no public responsibility at all in the same way, shall we say, as a religious order or something like that. The Canadian National Exhibition Association is technically not a local board, but for all practical purposes it is. It administers a large exhibition in the city of Toronto, on property owned by the city of Toronto and by the citizens of Toronto. The city of Toronto is responsible for all of its deficits.

The taxpayers of Toronto have a direct liability with regard to the financial operations of this corporation, and yet the citizens of Toronto are not permitted to sit in in some sort of public gallery when the meetings of this board are held. They are treated as pariahs. It is none of their business what is done by this board with their money. I submit that this is a wrong principle. The citizens of Toronto have a right to know what this board is doing with their money.

There are representatives of the city council there, but the citizens themselves have no opportunity to find out what is going on. At city council meetings there are obviously representatives of the city present; they are all representatives of the city. But surely the citizens have a right to see what their representatives are doing? That is a basic principle of democracy. Citizens have a right to know what the elected representative is doing. If they do not like what he is doing, they may want to get rid of him on another occasion. It is a preposterous principle to me that this board, operating an important public function involving the taxes of the citizens of Toronto, should be able to sit behind closed doors without the citizens of Toronto knowing what it is doing.

I want to provide to the House certain information the city solicitor and city treasurer of Toronto have been kind enough to provide to me regarding the financial operations of the CNE Association. I am quoting an extract from a letter of March 18, 1963, about a year ago, from Mr. Callow, the city solicitor, in which he says:

All land on which the Canadian National Exhibition is situated is owned by the city. The city owns all the Canadian National Exhibition buildings. The city is responsible for debenture debt incurred in respect of the Canadian National Exhibition Association now amounting to \$9,563,465.37.

That was in 1963. And then:

While under the terms of an agreement with the Canadian National Exhibition the city derives any surplus arising from its operations, such surplus does not nearly cover the debt charges which are incurred. For example, in 1961, the debt charges amounted to \$874,905 while the surplus was \$231,165. The city therefore was responsible for the difference amounting to \$643,740.

That was in 1961.

In 1962, the debt charges amounted to \$945,556, while the surplus was \$570,114. This left the city responsible for \$375,442.

A month or two ago I phoned Mr. Campbell, the city treasurer, to bring those figures up to date. The figures he gave me for 1963 are as follows: The debt charges that the city had to pay in 1963 were \$1,054,463. The surplus was \$532,853—the operating surplus—leaving the city responsible for a net payment of \$521,610.

If my memory serves me correctly that is something like three or four mills in the city of Toronto, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of

Toronto were responsible for in 1963 with regard to the financial operations of the CNE Association. I think when the citizens are responsible for that amount of money they have a right to know what is happening to their money. I do not know of any valid reason why the CNE Association should not be put in the same position as local boards as far as its meetings being open to the public are concerned. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the House would see fit to adopt this bill in principle.

As I have said, last year when the matter was before us many hon. members who did not vote for the bill indicated that they approved its principle. I think that they should have an opportunity now—those who are still here and new hon. members—to indicate their approval of the principle if they do in fact approve it.

I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he should permit the second reading of this bill to come to a vote. I think it could quite properly be a free vote. This is not a government bill and the government, as far as I know, has made no announcement of policy on the matter at all. Therefore the government's life would not be at stake in a vote on this bill. It would be a matter, I take it, of indifference to the government as such as to whether the bill carried or not.

I think it would be appropriate that the hon. members of this House should have an opportunity to indicate whether they personally approve of the principle in much the same way as they do with private bills. Private bills, in the overwhelming majority of cases, are decided not according to party lines or according to government policy but according to the convictions of the individual members.

Mr. Singer: On occasion.

Mr. Bryden: I think this year in particular we have had occasions where there was certainly no sign of party discipline. This is a matter where originally an attempt was made to deal with it by private legislation. It does not involve government policy and I think it should be settled according to the individual convictions of the hon. members. I would hope that the hon. Prime Minister will permit it to come to a vote and permit the vote to be a free vote.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few brief remarks in support of this bill.

The exhibition held here in this particular area belongs to not only all of the people

of Ontario but it is the Canadian National Exhibition. For that reason we should lean over backwards in an attempt to show that the operations of this great concern are open to the scrutiny of the press and open so that all the people in Canada can see just how the exhibition carries on.

The Canadian National Exhibition is something of which we should all be proud. It is certainly the finest show of its kind anywhere in the world and for that reason, I think having the public attend open meetings of its board helps to advertise the great work that it has done and it is doing.

If there are certain matters that should not be discussed, perhaps of interest to competitors in large cities to the south that maybe hold similar shows, if we want to keep that quiet, this bill allows that the board of directors can, when necessary, hold meetings that are not necessarily open to the public. But we have a duty in order to help the exhibition to have open meetings.

Even more important than that, Mr. Speaker, it is always dangerous when public monies are involved if a small group of people are more or less ruling the roost and the general public does not know exactly what is going on. We would all be shocked if suddenly the city council or the board of control here in the city of Toronto, said: "No, we must not have the press. We must not have the public." Occasionally there has been a mayor or controller who has advocated that here in Toronto and there has been a great outcry. I think that the Canadian National Exhibition should be judged on the same basis, that where millions of dollars of public money is involved the public should know what is going on.

Also what the board of directors of the Canadian National Exhibition does affects businessmen in the general area where the exhibition is being held. If the exhibition is a success, it is good for business; if it is not a success, it is harmful to the economy of the entire area. Businessmen themselves want to know what is going on.

I would sum up briefly, Mr. Speaker, and say that because the exhibition belongs to the country as a whole the meetings of the board of directors should be open. We are spending public funds, and this probably is the main reason the board of directors should have its meetings open to the public. Third, it affects business as a whole so that the business community should know how things are being handled.

We must avoid this danger of a small group of people—which is becoming so com-

mon today where business and labour and everything becomes so centralized into a few hands—we must avoid even giving the impression that this large public corporation is being run by just a few people and possibly for the benefit of a few. It is a public corporation to serve Canada as a whole. I hope with that in mind this bill is supported by the House.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge the hon. members not to support this bill. I cannot agree with many of the things that have been said here today and for the benefit of hon. members I would like to point out some of the reasons why we should not support this bill.

For example, the Canadian National Exhibition Association is composed of representatives of all branches of agriculture, commerce and industry throughout Canada, while the city administration is represented on the board of directors by the mayor and seven members of the city council. Now, I think that is a pretty good public representation, Mr. Speaker, and that the elected members of the council are fully aware of what is going on on the board of directors at all times.

As a matter of fact, the press is invited into the meetings from time to time and I understand that following all board meetings a release is given to the press.

Now the association is operating under the terms of an agreement dated November 15, 1954, effective January 1, 1955, whereby the association is solely responsible for holding an annual exhibition and as agent for the city is in charge of the control, management and maintenance of all buildings in Exhibition Park and all parking lots associated therewith.

The exhibition grounds consist of 350 acres located entirely within the city limits and extending a mile and a half along the north shore of Lake Ontario. The buildings, which include 25 permanent structures providing 522,000 square feet of rental space, are connected by 14 miles of paved roadways. Both the grounds and the buildings are owned by the city.

The exhibition has been held annually since 1879, with the exception of the years 1942 to 1946 when the buildings and grounds were used by the armed forces. In 1962 the attendance of 3,009,500 exceeded that of any previous year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is rather amusing to hear the Opposition speakers

talking about this wonderful show we have here in Toronto, then at the same time suggesting that maybe there might be some skulduggery going on on the board of directors and that we should have them open—which is just a silly thing to say. As a matter of fact, I think one of the reasons why we should leave it just as it is is because many of our public-spirited citizens who serve on this board just do not want to be in a position where they have to take some of the criticism which we, as politicians, expect to get. They are not political. They are businessmen. They are sound businessmen, and farmers, and others who give up their time voluntarily to assist this great exhibition.

As has been noted, Mr. Chairman, the Canadian National Exhibition has been going since 1879 rather successfully. It is said to be the largest annual exhibition in the world and surely if there was any really justifiable reason why these meetings should be open to the press, this would have been done over the past 80 years or so. It has been a most successful operation to date and, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any reason why it should not continue in the same manner as in the past.

As far as the board being the same as other boards and commissions of the city, I would like to quote another legal opinion—we have already had two or three today. This one is from Mr. C. W. Yates, the general municipal counsel of The Department of Municipal Affairs, and he says this:

It should be pointed out that the Canadian National Exhibition is not a local board of the city of Toronto or any other municipality, so that the provisions of The Municipal Act in this regard to open meetings do not apply, nor were they ever intended to apply to the Canadian National Exhibition.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The hon. member is arguing against himself and does not even know it.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): He is talking, not you.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would remind the members, particularly the ones who have spoken, that they were given an audience when they were speaking and I would ask the same for the other members when they are speaking.

Mr. Cowling: Well, Mr. Speaker, one expects a certain amount of that from the other side. It really does not bother me. I like to give it a bit, too, at times.

I should say that the financial operations,

as has been pointed out here today, are under the supervision of the city auditor and the city treasurer and the city solicitor. The affairs of the citizens are represented on the board by the elected controllers, the mayor and the aldermen. To change it, or to alter the situation as it stands today, to my mind, Mr. Speaker, would not just be the right thing to do.

We have a great exhibition. It is being operated efficiently and economically and in the best interests of the citizens of our great city. It is the greatest annual exhibition in the world and I cannot see any reason for supporting this amendment. I would urge hon. members not to do so.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government is somewhat interested in the views of other hon. members of the House. I cannot understand the unnecessary haste in rushing the hon. member in with his adjournment motion.

It is an important topic and I would have thought it would have been only courtesy to inquire whether or not there were other speakers.

Mr. Cowling: I thought everybody had spoken over there. I have no objections to holding this motion.

Mr. Speaker: I want to ask: Does the member wish to speak to the motion?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

I have listened with great interest to the arrant nonsense which comes forth from the hon. member for High Park on occasions like this on many occasions in the House; and this afternoon, too. He seems to be saying—after taking us on a travelogue of the lakefront of the city of Toronto and describing the buildings and the lakeshore and what a wonderful city we have—with all of these things we agree—that because all these things are so fine and handsome there is no need to open the meetings to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been any suggestion of skulduggery or wrongdoing; but if there is nothing to hide why give the appearance that there is something to hide? I would think that since this body deals with public funds and with a public investment of which we are all very proud, there would be an anxiety on the part of all concerned to hold these meetings open to the public, to invite the press in to do whatever reporting seems fit to the press, and not

to be handed pre-condensed releases at the end of a meeting.

I cannot imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Toronto council members would have any real objection to discussing such matters as these in public. Nor can I imagine either, Mr. Speaker, that those other members, the members of the agricultural industry and the other members of the board who serve there, would have any objection at all.

I wonder why the objections of the hon. member for High Park are so urgent and so violent. What is he trying to protect? If there is no reason to doubt what is going on in those meetings, I would think the hon. member for High Park would be among the first to welcome open meetings of the board of the Canadian National Exhibition.

For these reasons, sir, I too support this bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak at length on this but, since it apparently is the intention on the other side of the House to move adjournment, and not have a vote, I just want to make two points. The first one is that it is preposterous to say we are alleging that skulduggery is going on because a bill is introduced to implement a widely accepted principle of democracy. This is the kind of low-level tactics used in dealing with a principle when people want to ignore that principle. In fact, in that connection may I just read one paragraph from a letter which my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, got from the city solicitor of Toronto, written at the instruction of the late Donald Summerville:

I thought that you should be aware that the city's proposal to require the association to hold its meetings in public was dealt with by the city council on October 22, 1962 when it was passed unanimously, and subsequently council unanimously reaffirmed this decision at its meeting held on February 18 of this year.

In other words, that a bill introduced by my colleague, to implement what the council of the city of Toronto has unanimously requested in two succeeding years, should be treated in the manner in which the hon. member for High Park has done I think is unforgivable.

Mr. Chairman, my second point is briefly this: If this government introduces bills, and we in the Opposition were to adopt obstructionist tactics—because we happen to be of a different party, even though the principle is highly commended even by many on the government side—and oppose this bill, we

would certainly bring ourselves into disrepute before the eyes of the people of the province of Ontario. And I suggest, in the bill which has been discussed before in this House, in which many hon. members on the government side of the House have indicated their support in principle, that the time has now come for an expression of support and principle by the hon. members of the House.

Therefore, if the hon. member for High Park is going to insist on moving adjournment of the debate, we will oppose his motion for an adjournment. We will call for a recorded vote on the motion for adjournment as the only way of expressing our disapproval.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Price moves the adjournment of the debate. Shall the motion carry?

Several hon. members: No!

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the motion to adjourn the debate, will please rise.

As many as are opposed to the motion, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the yeas are 56 and the nays 27.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion for adjournment carried.

THE STATUTE LABOUR ACT

Mr. Sopha moves second reading of Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you for getting me an audience.

Mr. MacDonald: How long can the hon. member keep it?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I say to you, sir, and I must get the words out quickly, that we have seen something quite shocking in the way of debasement of parliamentary institutions in this House this afternoon. Two bills have been called, and no person in any position of authority in the government has seen fit to acquaint the House with the views of the government. As for the hon. member for High Park, I do not know what authority he has or what influence he has, but certainly none of us were ever under the impression he has the authority to speak for the government.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would simply say that when we call a private member's bill it is not necessary for the government to express any opinion on the matter. Our opinion is expressed in the government bills brought before the House. Certainly I do not think it is the intent of introducing and having debates on private member's bills.

Mr. Sopha: Nor has the executive council the right to show contempt for private members of the House, no matter where they sit. Let it be noted that when the other bill, The Fatal Accidents Act, was called, the hon. Attorney General got up and left the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! I would like to remind the member that Bill No. 35 is before the House and I would ask him to proceed to debate the principle of this bill.

Mr. Sopha: With respect, I am fully aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Talk about contempt for the Speaker!

Mr. Sopha: I did not utter any contempt.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: The evil is in the eye of the beholder and the hon. Minister of Labour is quite an expert at it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: This bill seeks to repeal section 3 of The Statute Labour Act. If the hon. member for High Park moves the adjournment of this one, he will be adjourning the principle of taxation without representation.

Mr. MacDonald: That will not stop him.

Mr. Sopha: Section 3 of The Statute Labour Act, for any who have not read it recently, reads as follows:

1. Councils of cities, towns, villages and townships may pass by-laws for levying and collecting an annual tax to be known as "poll tax" of not less than \$1 and not more than \$10 from every male inhabitant of the municipality who (a) is 21 years or over and under 60 years of age, (b) is not exempt from performing statute labour, (c) is not otherwise assessed in the municipality or who is assessed and whose taxes are less than the poll tax and, (d) has not filed with

the clerk a certificate showing that he has been assessed, will perform statute labour or pay poll taxes elsewhere in Ontario.

2. Where any person is assessed and his taxes are less than the amount of the poll tax, he is liable to pay the poll tax only.

3. Where any such male inhabitant has been employed by the same person, for not less than 30 days, the employer shall pay over the amount of the tax to the collector on demand out of any wages due to the employee, such payment relieves the employer from any liability to the employee for the amount so paid.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the chief complaint that I have, among many others about poll tax, is that it is taxation without representation. It is true that municipalities would make use of The Municipal Franchise Extension Act and provide, after a vote of the electorate or the ratepayers, that every male person who is a British subject of the age of 21 years, might have the vote at municipal elections. However, in Ontario there are few municipalities that have availed themselves of that provision. Consequently, the great bulk of persons not otherwise assessed and on the rolls of the municipality have no franchise in the selection of those who shall govern them at the municipal level.

Poll tax, of course, falls in greatest proportion upon single men, because single males make up the great bulk of those who do not own property in the municipality and for that reason would be exempt from the payment of poll tax. Perhaps it is well to find out at this juncture the discriminatory feature in order to leave it and hasten away from it. The discriminatory feature that is involved is the fact that this form of tax is paid only by single men. Certainly it is paid by males only and as I have said, by the nature of the tax, it falls in the greatest proportion on the single male.

There is no comparable tax on single women or, if you like, bachelor girls, and in that sense it is discriminatory because as surely as single men employed in the community are able to pay the tax, avail themselves of municipal services, then the same considerations apply to single women. However, the single women have never been called upon to pay the tax and, in principle—I am not suggesting that single women should pay it, indeed I want to relieve both single men and single women from the liability to pay it—but as a matter of principle there is no philosophic or moral basis that single men should be any more liable to pay a unique and special form of tax than should

women, especially when many of the women are gainfully employed.

Now, a poll tax is a very old tax. It was first introduced in England in 1377, so the records show, and at that time the thought of taxing land did not occur to the authorities. Even if it had it probably would have caused civil war in the feudal system of those days. Rather, they taxed persons.

In the introduction of the poll tax and poll, as the word is used in this connection, has nothing to do with voting at all, nor any reference to the place where the vote is taken. It is a word that is a derivative from the old Norman French which means "head". The poll tax was a tax on heads. The introduction of the tax led directly to the revolt of the peasants organized by Wat Tyler in 1380. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that the reactions to taxes was more violent in those days than it is in the milder times of today.

As introduced, it was a device whereby every citizen in the realm paid a tax fixed at a certain amount per head. Later on in its development it became a tax on aliens only.

The tax was introduced into British North America in the 18th century and it soon became allied, at least in Upper Canada, to the concept of statute labour and the duty of all male persons to contribute their labour to the building of roads. So then it becomes apparent why it is a tax on males only. Certainly in those days, as today, women were not expected to do anything constructive towards the maintenance or the building of roads.

It is still levied under The Statute Labour Act and it is still very closely connected in the words of section 3 of that statute with a notion that has now become archaic that male citizens have an obligation to devote certain days each year to road work. This, of course, is no longer required of any citizen in urban communities.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, in my view the tax is unfair and discriminatory and it has the effect of depriving those who pay it—or the effect is that those who pay it are deprived of the right to select those who collect taxes from them. For this reason alone, aside from any other, I would think an enlightened government at this stage in the development of our province would see fit to abolish this repressive, regressive and archaic method of collecting taxes.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is levied at the local level by councils of municipalities. As a matter of fact a good many municipalities to which I am going to refer specifically do not see fit to collect it at all. A survey was

taken by a group, and I am not going to name the group for fear of divulging the author of a communication to me in reference to this tax among the tax collectors and treasurers of municipalities throughout the province, but the comments are illuminating. I was very gratified to receive a letter from the city tax collector of a fairly large urban municipality of this province after my bill went on the order paper and he addressed these very kind words to me. I want to put them into the record as an item of evidence in support of my introduction of this statute:

February 12, 1964

Dear Mr. Sopha:

I am writing to you to offer my congratulations on a fine piece of legislation which you are presently putting through the legislative assembly.

He is too sanguine, sir, he is too sanguine, if I may interpolate at this point, because I will have to inform him that the hon. leader of the government called these bills this afternoon because he wanted to indulge in the playing of games, I suppose.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I thought the hon. member was against reading complimentary letters in the Legislature.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, he wanted to indulge in playing games, I say, apropos of that muttering of the hon. Provincial Secretary.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is the one letter in five years he has had that was complimentary:

Mr. Sopha: The letter, sir, continues:

Your Bill No. 35, designed to repeal the levying of a poll tax in cities, towns, villages and townships, will no doubt meet with the approval of every tax collector in the province.

For your information I have enclosed a photostatic copy of a poll tax survey made in October of 1961 showing the cities levying and not levying a poll tax and comments regarding them.

I have also enclosed a copy of a report on our methods of levying the tax. I sincerely hope that you use all available means at your disposal to ensure that Bill No. 35 is read a second and third time and finally passed.

Well, those are very encouraging words. That is signed, it is on the stationery of a municipal corporation and I am not going to refer to his name in case he might get into trouble and come up under review by those who employ him. I might say though, I will just

give a little hint, that he is a tax collector in an urban municipality which is represented by the hon. Minister of the Crown who sits on the first two benches on the other side.

An hon. member: Who now sits?

Mr. Sopha: No, whose seat is on the first two benches.

Now this survey that he provides me I say has some illuminating comments. I am going to pick a few of the cities out in it and read the remark that was made as a result of this inquiry to the tax collectors.

Kitchener, which abolished it for 1964, but was still collecting it when this survey was made, the comment was: "Recommending abolition in 1962."

Brantford said: "Personally consider it not worth the cost."

Sarnia: "The cost to levy and collect is becoming more and more. Also is becoming more of a nuisance to collect."

Peterborough: "Revenue from this source is entirely offset by cost of collection."

Fort William: "Great many complaints that women should be liable too. Act should be revised."

Port Arthur—I say, Port Arthur—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Now I will listen to this, it might be worthwhile.

Mr. Sopha: Port Arthur: "Recommending abolition of the tax in 1962."

Sault Ste. Marie: "It is an unpopular tax, with men, due to women not paying." Not very gallant in that community, not very chivalrous.

Mr. MacDonald: Gallantry is all concentrated in one man up there.

Mr. Sopha: Guelph: "Difficult to collect in many cases. Antiquated method of taxing."

Calt: "Tax is unpopular. A fair amount of work to administer."

Niagara Falls: "A nuisance, too hard to collect for result obtained."

Stratford—this may be a significant one. I hope not. "Requires considerable follow-up. We think a similar tax should be levied on females."

St. Thomas: "The poll tax is definitely a nuisance tax, the income not worth the bother."

Then I turn to a part of the survey which deals with municipalities which have abolished the tax.

Hamilton abolished it in 1959. North York, Ottawa, the township of York, the township of East York are among those who reported that they had never collected or levied the tax. London, London in the bush—

An hon. member: No representation from London?

Mr. Sopha: No representation from London at this point. They will never be able to carry the message back. London abolished it as of December 31, 1958. I would say that the hon. leader of the government, if he were here in his seat, I would say to him, that we could subscribe to the principle that what is good enough for London is good enough for the rest of the province.

The comment they made from London in reference to the abolition of the tax is: "It was felt that the cost of administration did not warrant its continuance."

Windsor abolished it in 1947. St. Catharines abolished it January 1, 1961 and made the comment: "Had always found it hard to collect."

Kingston, represented of course in this House for many years by that very vigilant and redoubtable defender of the civil rights of all in the democratic process, the former member, William M. Nickle. Kingston, did I say, Mr. Speaker, abolished it in 1937. Cornwall abolished it in 1930: "Too hard to collect. Very poor public relations."

Belleville abolished it in 1957. "Difficulty in collecting," said Belleville, "Found not worth while."

Chatham abolished it in 1941. North Bay abolished it in 1952.

Barrie abolished it in 1950 and the collector and treasurer made the comment that the good people of Barrie found that it was considered inequitable if applied only to males.

So one can see that a good argument can be made for the abolition of this tax from the point of view that any form of taxes should apply to the whole of the province rather than to specific areas. Whether a person lives in Barrie or Sarnia or Kingston or London, on the one hand, or lives in Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, Peterborough, Fort William or Guelph, then that person ought to know in a uniform way the type of taxes to which he is subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is not much else I want to say about it. I do not want to take the time of the House at any undue length, because I feel that I have made my argument. It just needs to be elaborated.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Is that the same speech as in last year's *Hansard*?

Mr. Sopha: My answer to my hon. friend is no, because the matter did not come before the House this last year. It came before the House two or three years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this in conclusion, that I would be perfectly agreeable to living with this tax provided that municipalities which collected it were required as a condition precedent to its collection, to extend the franchise to all those who are required to pay it.

It is not the quantum of tax and it is needless to argue that whereas one home owner may pay \$300 or \$400 taxes and another may pay only \$50, that one by reason of the fact that he pays so much more, or a multiple of what the other pays, that he has a greater right to vote. As I understand the democratic principle, it is that if any person pays any form of taxation whatsoever, notwithstanding the size or the amount that he pays, that that person ought to have a share in selecting those who are to govern. So if the government prefers not to allow this bill to pass, then I would urge them, and I suppose I must really urge the hon. member for High Park.

I observe he is no longer here, he has tired of the proceedings, so I had better address my remarks to the hon. member for St. David, who deputizes for him in these particulars and he might say to those in authority in government who hear me not, that if they will bring forward a measure that will require as a condition precedent that the vote be extended to persons who pay their tax, then the violation of the principle that I have stated of no taxation without representation will be cured and rectified.

Therefore, I say to you, sir, that I invite support for this amended bill from all corners of the House.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the abolition of poll tax as a representative from a small village that is not on that list.

For 12 years I sat in municipal council and the clerk of our village tried to collect the poll tax and he would notify them by letter or otherwise. Some would pay and most would not. We found it rather difficult to try to collect it, but in many instances where a man owned a property and he had a boy, two or three, coming to the age of paying the poll tax, often the father would put the son on the roll as a taxpayer, part owner

of his property, and in so doing the son did not have to pay the poll tax and also had a vote in the municipality. So he not only got away from paying the \$10 because his dad was fortunate enough to own a home, but along with it he had a vote and often the fathers were men who were aspiring to office in council. We found it very, very unjust; not fair to the ones who could not afford their homes and had children who were compelled by a peculiar law to pay the \$10. So I, at that time, did not know what I know today, that municipalities could volunteer on their own to abolish it or at least quit collecting it. I suppose municipalities that do that, actually break the law, or is it permissive legislation?

Mr. Sopha: It is permissive legislation.

Mr. Bukator: Permissive legislation. Well, I would think if you were to—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Were you asking me a question?

Mr. Bukator: Oh, no, I was asking anybody who knows. I got the answer from the hon. member for Sudbury. He seems to be well acquainted with these things, as a matter of fact as well acquainted as anybody in the House.

But I felt at that time it was not fair. Some paid, a very small portion of them did, and so I feel that our hon. member for Sudbury has a bill that is worth looking into. I can imagine what will happen to it. The hon. member for High Park is back again! At least the government may bring in a bill of their own. We will support it, we will work along with them for a change and that will be a little out of the ordinary.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Will you pardon me, because I realize that there are more important matters to be discussed, Mr. Speaker, but as one who is interested in the government of municipalities in this province would you permit me a few moments?

As the hon. member for Sudbury has said, this is permissive legislation. Only a comparatively small number of municipalities in the province have passed the necessary by-law and those which have the collection facilities find it rather a valuable source of revenue. As a matter of fact I have a letter from one of the small cities, in which I am advised that this poll tax represents one-fifth of a mill.

In this country, the development of this particular type of tax applicable only to single men is to provide the municipality

with some funds to assist the local ratepayers in the expenditures they have to undertake in the maintenance of certain facilities which, I might suggest to you, are at times used more by single men than they are used by married men. So, under these circumstances, I think we should leave the legislation as it is at the present time, purely permissive; those municipalities who wish to collect it may do so.

I would suggest to the hon. member for Sudbury that the report he was reading was, of course, a report prepared by a number of tax collectors; and of course the tax collectors would like to collect all of their taxes with one cheque each year and then they could stay home the rest of the year.

The thing to bear in mind is that the municipal councils have not passed those opinions you have read out, sir, necessarily; so I would suggest that the matter can be left in the hands of the municipal councils. If they have a tax collector then they instruct him what taxes they want him to collect, and he has to collect them. I would ask the House not to approve this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Cowling: Is it all right now, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Speaker: Has every member spoken who wishes to speak to this bill?

Mr. Cowling: moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 29th order, the House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mr. A. Johnston (Parry Sound): Mr. Chairman, I understood from the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) that they had several questions they wished to ask. From their comments I understood they were interested in the changes mentioned, in the operation of the railway, which take effect on Sunday, April 25.

The main reason we are making changes is, of course, to improve the service of the railway to the people in the north country. The hon. member for York South made reference in his comments to the letters of complaint from certain people in the north

country regarding changes in the service. In order to be entirely fair I think it should be noted that the complaints he read to the House were all from the one newspaper, the *Timiskaming-Speaker*.

As a matter of interest to the House, I have favourable comments from all the other municipalities on the line except the one municipality to which the hon. member for York South made reference.

In explaining why we are making this drastic change in our operations, we have found that the revenue from the train which we are deleting has been going down every year for the past ten. The revenue, of course, has been going to the transport companies because we are not able to provide service in time for them to get their express, and their LCL particularly, the same day.

As a matter of fact, at the present time, the LCL from Toronto to Timmins is taking four days to be delivered in Timmins and Cochrane. Under this new merchandizing train which we are operating, starting on Sunday, we propose to give the people of Timmins, Cochrane, and all points north of North Bay, overnight service on LCL, their mail, and their express.

As I said before, I thought that when we had discussed this at government commissions I was quite sure that all of those members on government commissions, including the hon. member for York South and the hon. member for Nipissing, understood thoroughly the proposed changes.

I still hope, Mr. Chairman, that they understand them, and I would be glad to answer any questions they may have in connection with this because I think that it needs some clarification to the members generally, as to what we propose to do.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I understand thoroughly the reasons for the changes but, as far as I understand it, the Canadian National Railways is certainly the train which brings the freight and mail and passengers from the south to the north, and its terminus is at North Bay. It was going to make certain changes in the operation of its trains 46 and 47 and other trains, and naturally the Ontario Northland had to fit in with that plan.

I might say, too, that while the hon. member for York South had referred in his presentation earlier to complaints from the New Liskeard area, it is my understanding from talking to people along the line that there are other places complaining. I know that the town of Timmins—I do not know

just how many signed the petition which was circulated in that town and other places, but I know that the mayor of Timmins was quite concerned in regard to mail. I know that, earlier, I brought to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Simonett) the complaint of the railway mail clerks. They do not subscribe to the proposition of the hon. Minister, that the new services will mean speedier service.

In fact this is their position, and it is set out by the third vice-president of the Association of the Mail Clerks of Canada, their national association. He points out that the supposition that the post office department will use trains 347 and 346—in brackets here it says “the Blue Goose”, and I do not know which train that is—has already been disclaimed publicly:

As seen in our letter of information, that departure time at Toronto was not compatible to our operation. Other reasons are: there is no heat, no one in charge of the car, such as a baggage man, therefore security regulations would not permit first class matter to use this media. Also this train will not leave the passenger terminal at the Union Station. The term “express terminal” could mean in a short time the hump yard at Maple.

Trains 49 and 50—

which are known as the Northland:

—will continue to carry mails but the bulk of the mails for the north are not received at Toronto until after train 49 leaves.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Ontario Northland.

Mr. Troy: What is the reference?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You said Northland.

Mr. Troy: Ontario Northland—

Mr. A. Johnston: The hon. Minister said Ontario.

Mr. Troy: Well, is that not what it is?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, that is right. But you said Northland. I was just correcting you.

Mr. Troy: Thank you very much.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I do not know how we can get along without the hon. Minister of Mines.

Mr. Troy: I am always glad that we have somebody in the wings to give us the cues.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): I did not think the hon. Minister of Mines had any other northland except Ontario.

Mr. Troy: I may point out here, to hon. members that train 49 leaves Toronto at seven o'clock in the evening and that train, as the vice-president points out, has departed too early for much mail to be processed in Toronto. This is the reason for maintaining a railway post office on train 47.

The moving of processed mail from Toronto to North Bay or North Bay north is not the problem. The delays would stem from overloaded, space-starved terminal post offices trying to complete the business received at that post office first, after which transient mails are processed.

The railways are faced with exactly the same problem: no matter how fast a service exists. One must first of all place the express, freight or mail, on this train to utilize its speed. If, by delaying the departure of this express train for two hours we could serve another 25,000 to 50,000 people this, to me, would seem the proper thing to do.

That is, to delay the express service. That is the first point.

Mr. A. Johnston: Is the hon. member talking about express or mail?

Mr. Troy: This is the presentation of the railway mail clerks' third vice-president. I will repeat his argument there.

The moving of processed mail from Toronto to North Bay or North Bay north is not the problem. The delays would stem from overloaded, space-starved terminal post offices trying to complete the business received by that post office first, after which transient mails are processed.

The railways are faced with exactly the same problem no matter how fast a service exists. One must first of all place the express, freight or mail on this train to utilize its speed.

Presumably he is referring to the new train No. 47.

If by delaying the departure of this express train by two hours we could serve another 25,000 or 50,000 people, this, to me, would seem the proper thing to do.

The figures you have quoted on the effect of change of revenues on the Ontario Northland Railway—the figures you have quoted I can only accept as a true picture, although the difference between direct

costing and indirect costing, namely, \$650,000, would probably still exist if both 47 and 46 and the express train were withdrawn.

Mr. A. Johnston: May I ask the hon. member a question? What is he referring to by \$650,000?

Mr. Troy: This is, I presume, in answer to the hon. Minister's letter of March 6, 1964, to Mr. J. A. Belland.

Mr. A. Johnston: Who quoted the \$650,000?

Mr. Troy: In the hon. Minister's letter he brings out this figure under the heading "Effect of Change of Revenues on the Ontario Northland Railway." It goes on: "The annual operating cost is—"

Mr. A. Johnston: The hon. member must have some authority for these figures.

Mr. Troy: Yes, I am just reading the hon. Minister's argument. Apparently there must have been some—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Read it all then, if you want it in the record.

Mr. Troy: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Read it all.

Mr. Troy: In the hon. Minister's letter, he had a paragraph on the "Effect of Change of Revenues on the Ontario Northland Railway" and Mr. Leason's letter of March 13, 1964 is in answer to the hon. Minister, I presume, to the figures the hon. Minister has quoted—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right. But if you would read my letter then we would get the facts, sir, as they were put by the Minister. I do not know what is in the answer. I do not have it with me.

Mr. Troy: You know your letter.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know it, yes, but the House does not.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Well, you read it.

Mr. Troy: I will repeat again:

The figures you have quoted I can only accept as a true picture although the difference between direct costing and indirect costing, namely, \$650,000 would probably still exist if both 47 and 46 and the express train were withdrawn.

Now the hon. Minister had said in his letter that the annual operating cost of trains 46 and 47 is between \$550,000 and \$1,200,000, depending on the amount of indirect costs included. So if you deduct \$550,000 from \$1,200,000, I think you will arrive at the figure of \$650,000.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Would you read that statement again. I said "between".

Mr. Troy: Yes, that is right. The statement you had made; the annual operating costs of trains 46 and 47 is between \$550,000 and \$1,200,000 depending on the amount of indirect costs included.

Now Mr. Leason's reference concerns the figures the hon. Minister has quoted in his letter of March 13, 1964.

I can only accept as a true picture although the difference between direct costing and indirect costing, namely, \$650,000 would probably still exist if both 46 and 47 and the express train were withdrawn.

Trains No. 46 and 47 are the two trains that are now operating as passenger trains, passenger and express and mail to and from Timmins and the express train is the new train to be in service after the changes become effective April 26, 1964. Mr. Leason continues:

Nevertheless, these costs must be met and the amount of revenue we expect to retain on the ONR portion of this operation from the post office will be quite a bit short of your expectations.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: How would the direct costs remain if the trains were not running?

Mr. Troy: I am just commenting on this man's argument.

Nevertheless, these costs must be met, and the amount of revenue you expect to retain on the ONR portion of this operation from the post office will be quite a bit short of your expectations.

Using your figure of \$122,000 per annum as the average revenue received from the post office department by the ONR, some \$92,227.20 of this figure is paid for the mail car on trains 46 and 47, plus a very conservative estimate of overflow mail in the baggage car. It is handled exclusively by railway mail clerks at no expense to the ONR. Another \$8,409.60 per annum is paid. This reduces the revenue now received by the ONR to approximately \$20,000.

By using the above figures, Mr. Leason points out:

I cannot possibly accede to your statement that the railway hopes to improve its revenue by this change. Even if I did agree that this service was necessary, with the reduction of commission agents, freight and express people, which is not my concern, the one point we cannot understand is the emphasis placed on the departure time from Toronto by the railways concerned. With very little thought and co-operation both the CNR and the ONR could retain all post office revenues simply by delaying departure of this express train, this new operation you are going to put in on the 27th, until 10.30 p.m., and supplying the car with heat. The schedule, as laid down, could be maintained with the same stops. I am quite sure the railway mail service can very easily adapt its operations to the needs of this train.

The point he brings out is that if you delayed that train for two hours, or at least an hour and a half, you would then also get mail which arrives at the Toronto postal terminal after the departure of train No. 49, and still provide speedy service.

Mr. Leason continues:

The removal of this postal service now, the railway mail clerks allege, will evoke the delays as stated in our previous letter which was sanctioned and accepted as true facts by senior officials of The Post Office Department at Ottawa. It will affect not only the railway mail clerks on the ONR part of the operation, but the CNR portion as well. These men will then displace other people in other centres of Ontario.

The result, of course, is more unemployment; but worse than this is the loss to the citizens of Ontario of 34 specialists in the correct despatching and routing of mails which, to reach this level, takes years of constant study, experience and yearly examinations which demand a mark above 97 per cent to maintain.

The sorting of mail en route is the only method whereby delays can be kept to a minimum and a complete efficient communication system, serving not only industry and commerce but all people in northern Ontario equally.

This letter is signed by K. G. Leason, the third vice-president, who is based with The Post Office Department in the Scarborough area.

Now, just before you answer this, the railway mail clerks also pointed out that under

the scheme The Post Office Department is going to have additional terminals, for example, as I indicated previously, Cochrane post office will be a terminal. The railway mail clerks point out that the postal clerks in these smaller places have nothing like the knowledge of despatch and routing of mail the railway mail clerks have; and that if these mail clerks will be taken off there will be no RPOs on the train, the clerks will be back into the North Bay post office. Some of them, I believe, now live in Timmins; I do not know what is going to happen to them. Will they be brought into North Bay? That is a matter, of course, for The Post Office Department.

But, nevertheless, the ONR and the CNR are indirectly responsible, probably directly responsible, for changes; and so you are at least indirectly responsible for the possibility of people being out of work, or in other jobs at less salary. I will just leave that for the moment.

Mr. A. Johnston: In reply to the hon. member for Nipissing, I am assured the mail clerks will not lose their positions. They will stay in Timmins or North Bay. And I am informed that one of their chief complaints is that when they are travelling, and sort mail en route, they get 22 per cent more salary. Of course, personally, I feel sorry for them; they are now grounded and, as a result, they take a reduction in salary. But other than the personal feeling, I do not see why the ONR should subsidize the postal people, because they make their own arrangements as to where these people are.

The hon. member made reference to a poorer service for the people in the north regarding mail. I have here a statement, and I think the hon. member for Nipissing read it too, from the district postal inspector, Mr. Philea—and I would like to read it—in which he states:

The Ontario Northland Railway's efforts to streamline its mail-carrying operations will result in a more efficient service for northern Ontario according to reports from the district director of postal services, J. C. A. Philea.

So I do not think it is quite correct to say that there would be any deterioration of service, because the postal inspector himself says it will be improved.

The hon. member did make mention of the fact that 49 leaves at seven o'clock and some of the mail could be left behind. Probably it is my fault that I did not tell him, when he asked me about this before, that there is a

CNR and ONR joint effort—a tractor-trailer—leaving Toronto at approximately the same time as 47 originally left, which is taking the mail not taken by 49. Once again, the inspector states that this mail will be received in North Bay earlier than before.

In respect to the loss of revenue which has been mentioned, there was an announcement by someone about two months ago in the north country that the ONR stood to lose \$400,000 in revenue, or in profit, on the change in our operations. But the total revenue—and this is not profit—which the ONR received last year was \$170,000, and we still maintain all of our mail revenue other than what was on 46 and 47.

I would like to point out we still have all of the 49 and 50 mail; we still have all the mail north of Cochrane. It is a very small portion of the mail business we are losing. As a matter of fact, I am informed that we are losing about \$60,000 in revenue which actually means, as far as profit is concerned, practically nothing; because we are carrying this mail on an old contract which has not been adjusted for several years.

Mr. Troy: There is one point the acting chairman of the commission brought out, about the railway mail clerks losing salary. I discussed that with the railway mail clerks when we had an interview with them; it was not salary they would lose. I think there was a certain amount of a living allowance when they travelled up and down on the train. What is certain, when they are brought back into the terminals, the post offices, and are not doing the very expert job they had before, is that they may have reductions then. There are certain other points, and I might as well finish mine.

I do know, though, that the chairman says that this new service will benefit the north, and in every way it will be all to the good. Well, we will have to wait and see. We know that the mail is going to be trucked, I understand, from The Post Office Department, I was in Ottawa with the railway mail clerks, and The Post Office Department said they are going to truck it mostly. There will be trucks from North Bay to Kirkland Lake, and Kirkland Lake to Timmins, and so on—about five different services. The complaint of the railway mail clerks is that the ones going to suffer are the small places. Maybe others will speak on this subject.

There are several things about the operation of the railway. We have not yet seen in this House the result of that three-prong survey made by the former Minister of Economics and Development, and who is

now the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay). We had a three-prong survey which was going to go into all the operations of the Ontario Northland. That is one of the weaknesses of the present system, we do not get those reports. I am sure that the Legislature would not have been able to take action on it, but at least we could know about these things.

Then again there is the present setup, not only of the commission itself but the management of the railway. With all due respect to the present general manager, he is a communications man. He is originally from a telephone company and one of the services of the Ontario Northland has is a communication system which has been earning money and very likely will be earning more money because of the contract with the federal government—with that new microwave line that you put up there. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) pointed out once in North Bay, they are spending \$7 million. But you are getting that \$7 million back again, I understand. It is guaranteed and there will be no loss to the ONR.

Now I must say, and I am thinking back over the years since I have been in the north country and that goes a long way back. The one time that the railway, I think, operated at great efficiency with a very fine spirit among the employees and certainly a fine operation of the road, was when there was brought in to operate the railway by the then Prime Minister of this province, Mitchell Hepburn, a very well qualified man from the Canadian National Railways, Mr. Arthur Cavanagh. It operated well; certainly there was good harmony, I know, with the service.

That is one of the complaints which you hear among the working force that, as the chairman knows, there is a certain amount of unrest and has been in the railway. They just wonder why they did not pick a railroad man to be the general manager. I suppose at the present time, though, the service that you operate that is making money is the communications service.

By the way, who made that appointment? Was it made in the time of the acting chairman?

Mr. A. Johnston: The appointment of Mr. Frith?

Mr. Troy: Yes.

Mr. A. Johnston: No, that appointment was made when Colonel Reynolds, who is now deceased, was chairman, just shortly before he retired as chairman. Mr. Frith

previously was the manager of our communications system. Fortunately it is our most profitable branch of the service.

I might say, in mitigation with respect to that, that 20 years ago the Ontario Northland was chiefly a railroad operating service. Today it has branched out into the boat lines, it has branched out into hotel management, communications and the various other operations so that a good administrator certainly has merit. But as to who decided Mr. Frith would be general manager, I was not the chairman so I cannot say that.

Mr. Troy: In that report that was presented to the former Minister of Economics and Development, was it recommended by them?

Mr. A. Johnston: I have the Price-Waterhouse report and I appreciate the interest of the hon. member for Nipissing in it. I think probably it would be very fine if he sat down and read the report.

Mr. Troy: Is it too lengthy to have it repeated and given to others that may be interested?

Mr. A. Johnston: I would have to take that under advisement. I have no direction on it yet, so I will discuss it with them again. I think that it would be fair to say this, that Price-Waterhouse did a very comprehensive report on the ONR, on all of the operations. They had Professor McDougall from Queen's also, and as a matter of interest we have implemented all of the recommendations that Price-Waterhouse made except one. One recommendation that Price-Waterhouse made was that the ONR install throughout all their office operations IBM machines, but this involved a very heavy expenditure and, of course, the hon. member for Nipissing and myself know that it would also eventually mean certain layoffs of personnel. I am too sensitive to that and I think he is too, so the one recommendation that we did not implement was the installation of IBM machines.

Mr. Troy: There is one thing about the commission itself; the hon. leader of the government is not here but I can say to the hon. Minister to whom the commission reports, I think it is high time that the commission itself had some reorganization. As the hon. member for York South has pointed out in that letter he had read, at least I think it was a newspaper editorial, Mr. Chairman, that some commission members were not from the area serviced by the Northland at all. Although I must say that

the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle) while not living on the ONR line, nevertheless I think he knows very well the problems of the north. But I think we could dispense now, with all due respect to him, the former member for Algoma-Manitowlin. As I mentioned before, the late Mr. Aubert, when he was appointed, represented labour on the commission I believe, and I think that they should have possibly some voice on the commission.

I should have mentioned this much earlier. I just want to pay—I am sure the House will let me pay—respect to that marvellous location engineer who laid much of the lines of the ONR, the late William R. "Pete" Maher. Pete was a legend in the north country. He was a native of that section of the Ottawa valley from which many of our railroaders have come, both on the CPR, CNR and ONR.

He died just recently and I think that the hon. member for Cochrane North and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) will certainly remember that great location engineer, Peter Maher. I just wanted to make some reference to him.

Now I have other complaints in regard to employees. They are somewhat uncertain about what is going to happen with this new LCL service. You are changing the operation to a freight operation. I believe the CNR has taken over the freight shed at North Bay as its terminal and the ONR will take over the CNR shed at Noranda as the ONR terminal. Now what is going to happen to these employees of the ONR based in North Bay and other areas in regard to this change of service of express and freight? What effect will that have? Will they have to go to the CNR and will they do so? Will they retain all their seniority and their pension benefits and other considerations?

Mr. A. Johnston: Arrangements were made when the Ontario Northland Railway assumed the express at Noranda and Cochrane and Timmins that we would take over their employees and their union considerations, their pension plans completely. Then the same thing applied at North Bay, the CNR would take over the Ontario Northland Railway employees.

Those employees who do not wish to transfer to the CNR, have been guaranteed employment with the ONR. My information is that 99 per cent of the employees have gone to the CNR and, in the same vein, I understand all of the CNR employees have come over to the ONR because they lose no seniority whatsoever.

Mr. Troy: Then is there lowering in wages if they stay with the ONR?

Mr. A. Johnston: We pay them the same wages. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Troy: Yes, as long as the seniority and the pension rights and those things are protected and, knowing that they do not want to move, say, from North Bay to Noranda, they will still have employment with the ONR and still be protected.

Mr. A. Johnston: Yes.

Mr. Troy: That is all right. Now, about the port of Moosonee. We have not heard much about it recently. It was one of the dreams of the former member for Victoria, and also of the former chairman of the ONR commission, but there is one thing I want to mention. I believe that the ONR controls all the town-site of Moosonee.

Mr. A. Johnston: Excuse me; I would not say we control it. We own the major number of the lots.

Mr. Troy: Then, since the RCAF is up there, and since the area is growing to some extent, and since you are trying to increase traffic up there, and since we have already had a word of sympathy for our Indian population—the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) has had a committee, and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) has a committee, and we are going to do a lot of things for the Indians—it seems to me, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Chairman of the commission—

By the way, I said chairman because I understand the media controlled by that very well-known member of the Conservative Party when he was here in Canada, and who is now Lord Thomson of Fleet—his papers, his radio and his TV stations—are now calling the hon. member for Parry Sound the chairman of the ONR. So would you make that matter legal and make him the chairman, and no longer acting chairman?

But the point—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That was very heavy, that one.

Mr. Troy: You heard that, Mr. Minister.

I refer to Moosonee, about the fact that the bulk of the area is under the control of the ONR. Why do you not give those Indians an opportunity to get their own lots? Why should they bother building a home, any kind of a decent home, when they have no security in the place? No wonder there are

shacks up there. No wonder they live in certain unhealthy conditions.

If only you would give them the opportunity to have their homes, if you only gave them an opportunity to get, not the statute labour board which the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) was going to set up last year, but services for water and sewage.

This year, I understand, you are going to set up a tent camp up there. Well, I am afraid of possible developments. There is always the possibility that it will be because of the sanitary conditions in that area—that you will be flirting with an epidemic. I suggest that you think of that and give these Indians an opportunity, now that they have a chance for gainful employment at the station and in other ways. I think it would be certainly a great help along that line.

Mr. A. Johnston: Do you want me to comment?

Mr. Troy: Yes, I want you to comment on that.

Mr. A. Johnston: I appreciated that, and one of the reasons we have not handed these lots over to the Indians, of course, is the health hazard there. But we must get the spot settled once and for all.

In the year-end review, I made some comments on this, and if you do not mind, I will read them to you:

The commission is responsible for the administration of the townsite of Moosonee. Because of the increasing frequency of a number of problems relevant to the administration of the townsite, the commissioners have decided that there should be a new and more comprehensive development programme.

In view of the various branches of the government involved, both Dominion and provincial, and including the great problem involving The Department of Indian Affairs, it has been decided that the only reasonable solution would be to hire a firm of engineers and town planners to make a study and to provide the commission with recommendations.

The commission, with the assistance of the community planning branch, asked for tenders to complete this programme and accepted the bid of Project Planning Associates Limited of Toronto. This firm has been asked to secure facts pertaining to the social, physical and economic character of Moosonee area, to enable the govern-

ment of Ontario to make policy decisions regarding future services for Moosonee.

One of the great problems there, of course, is the sewage, as the hon. member for Nipissing has mentioned. This is government policy and, in all fairness to the ONR, I do not feel that the Ontario Northland Railway should get involved in building sewers.

In my own opinion, I think the ONR should 'revert back to the purpose for which it was originally intended. Certainly the ONR never was intended to build sewers. We now have the report from the community associates. We have just received it. Once again, I would be very glad to make it available to the hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if the government of Ontario is quite willing to spend money on a statute labour board, to set up a statute labour board in an area with a mile and a half or two miles of roads, it would certainly be quite willing to do something to provide services, particularly when it is bringing people up there. You are inviting them to come up to this tourist area, and you take responsibility for sanitation and health when you take them up there. I suggest that if the commission does not feel it is its responsibility, then it should recommend to the government that it be done.

There are just one or two other things. You have an office in the city of Toronto; I think I have mentioned this before. On each occasion I go to the sportsmen's show, there is nothing there which is really any publicity of promotion for the Ontario Northland. I think also that here, in the city of Toronto, which is the hub of a great industrial area in which most of the people of Ontario live, you should have promotional men down here as well.

Another thing, too. What are you going to call this particular train you are going to run up there now? Is it to be called the Blue Goose special? Is it?

Mr. A. Johnston: I am not prepared to answer that.

Mr. Troy: I know.

An hon. member: It is a very good name, anyway.

Mr. Troy: Well, it is a very good name, and very descriptive. There was another point but it has escaped my memory at the moment and I will defer now to the hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there are a number of comments and questions I would like to make. But let me at the outset say that if I left the impression, because I was quoting only from the *Timiskaming-Speaker*, that it is my view it is only in that area there is any undercurrent of unhappiness in regard to these decisions, let me disabuse the chairman's mind.

He is aware of the fact that the petition which I tabled with the hon. Minister has names from North Bay, from Cobalt, from Englehart, from New Liskeard, from Larder Lake, from Virginiatown. You attended a meeting in Haileybury at which I think gave you some indication of the temper of the people there. I know I have had personal representations from other places along the line; and maybe, just to cap the whole thing—I thought this was the unkindest cut of all—following the visit to the north of the “whiz-bang” Minister, a story datelined Cobalt, appeared in the *North Bay Nugget*:

Now I know how Alice felt in Wonderland, Mayor Mamie Cunningham said this morning. Mrs. Cunningham and the Cobalt council had a private session with the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission in a special railroad car Thursday night before the commission attended a public meeting in Haileybury.

And then there is a paragraph in direct quotes:

They are very nice people but completely divorced from reality, she said. If they want to economize I suggest they fire the experts and hire a few housewives.

Now that is really damning with faint praise and in just about as harsh fashion as I have heard for quite some time. I am sure this hard-hitting man of the man's world, our hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, has never been cut to the quick quite as badly as he is in that comment.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not take that out of it.

Mr. MacDonald: You do not take that out of it? Well, each to his own interpretation!

Mr. Chairman, I think some of the difficulties that have arisen with regard to the reactions up in the north are derived from an uncertainty as to exactly what is the commission's position.

For example, I recall during the meeting of the standing committee when the commission came before us that I quoted from the *North Bay Nugget*, following that meeting in Haileybury, the concluding part of

the final paragraph in which it referred to the representatives of the ONR stating that the whole thing is experimental and may be revised after a couple of months. My recollection is that at the meeting this was denied; the chairman said this was not experimental at all. This decision had been made and it looked like a fixed decision.

A day or so ago when we raised the matter again—I have not had a chance to check in *Hansard* because it has not yet been printed—but my recollection was that the hon. Minister said: “Six months from now we might review the situation.” It is this kind of apparent indecision that I think is creating some of the uncertainty in the north. Indeed, let me take one specific case here. I was interested in the interjections of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs with regard to the Elk Lake subdivision, because a few years ago, so it has been drawn to my attention, the ONR replaced a \$100,000 bridge across the St. Jean Baptiste river at Mileage 10.8 on the Elk Lake division. That took place at the very time when apparently negotiations were going on with regard to discontinuing this line. I am not certain as to whether the negotiations had reached the point of just rampant rumour or some form of official announcement last year, but certainly a real storm broke in that area at the prospect that they were going to close that line down altogether.

Maybe the hon. Minister is in the position, or the chairman is in the position, to confirm this, but certainly there are a great many people in the north who believe that there was heavy political pressure put on this government—indeed right at the level of the hon. Prime Minister or so I have heard it contended many times—as a result of which the consideration of cutting off this subdivision outright has at least gone into abeyance. I do not know how much of this is fact.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You were listening to rumours like a lot of other people who start them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this point. I repeat I do not know how much of this is fact, but something is sadly wrong when you have created an atmosphere in which these rumours are rampant. The question of whether or not the Elk Lake subdivision is going to be cut off or whether it is not going to be cut off, is a very pertinent point in the minds of the people who are going back to the basic question: is this a development road; or is it,

as the editorial in the *Timiskaming-Speaker* said, being run by a group of people who cannot see past the nearest dollar bill?

However, let me get to one or two specific questions. In the course of that meeting at Haileybury, as reported in the *Northern Daily News* in this instance, there is a paragraph that says:

Acting ONR chairman Allister Johnston, Parry Sound, said that the railroad had not yet purchased Grant's Transport but did not deny that negotiations were underway. He promised that the ONR would let the citizens know if the purchase is seriously contemplated.

I wonder if the chairman would comment on the present status of these negotiations.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We did not create the rumours.

Mr. A. Johnston: That is exactly correct. They asked me had we purchased Grant's Transport and the answer was no. And they said: If you do purchase it, will you let us know? And I said, we sure will let you know; and the situation is still the same today.

Mr. MacDonald: Are there negotiations for the purchase—

Mr. A. Johnston: No, sir.

Mr. MacDonald: None at all? It is all rumour, too?

Mr. A. Johnston: It is all rumour, the same as Elk Lake. In connection with Elk Lake, how can we stop rumours? We have not made any change in our operations at Elk Lake in the last ten years.

Mr. Troy: Do you want to, though?

Mr. A. Johnston: No, but how do you stop rumours there when people start talking about it? There are rumours about elections all the time but it is just newspaper talk.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is still running.

Mr. MacDonald: It was contended that there were negotiations to cut that line off.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: With whom?

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister says there is absolutely no foundation, I will accept that.

Mr. A. Johnston: In a lighter vein, I would like to say to the hon. member for York South I have here a recent clipping. You

mentioned Cobalt and said that we were treating them like Alice in Wonderland. I have a recent clipping in which you might be interested from Mamie Cunningham in which she states:

You get a devil of a lot more today by negotiations than by putting out a blue goose.

Someone made reference to that:

Mrs. Cunningham, fresh from Toronto, said that she had consulted with the ONR chairman and had managed to get service to Cobalt the same as before.

I would be willing to send it over, if you want me to. As far as I know, the only municipality that has really complained, and you say you have petitions from various people—

Mr. MacDonald: I tabled it with the hon. Minister.

Mr. A. Johnston: You tabled them, but I have received favourable comments from every municipality on the line. At the present time the only one that was against the proposed changes was the town of Haileybury. In fairness to them I cannot quite blame them because they wanted to have the centralization for the area at Haileybury, but New Liskeard being much the larger town we centralized our services there and naturally Haileybury objected to it.

Mr. MacDonald: I would say that the number of names on that petition from Englehart would suggest that there is considerable concern in that town. However, let us not argue about who is concerned one way or the other—

Mr. A. Johnston: That is very interesting, because the mayor of Englehart was in to see me Saturday afternoon and I asked him were the people happy and he said, "We are perfectly happy in Englehart; we always have problems but we have nothing of any consequence."

Mr. MacDonald: I am glad to have that on the record; I will send that *Hansard* back to a few of them.

Now let me get down to two basic points that I want to raise. These are very basic. When we were before the standing committee on government commissions there was considerable discussion as to whether or not the ONR has not now become too heavy. As somebody put it, it is "all chiefs and no Indians."

I must say at the time the hon. Minister momentarily silenced me by revealing that there had been this investigation by the Price-Waterhouse Company and his contention then was that Price-Waterhouse had, in effect, endorsed the present structure and that you were living within that structure; indeed, that there was even one position that you had not filled because of the criticism.

Now the more I have reflected on this and the more people who are living in that area are considering it, they find this difficult to believe and to understand. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the ONR some 40 years ago now was running three times as many trains and there was only a handful of top officials. I have heard it said it was four, I have heard it said it was five or six or seven.

Now, it may well be that Price-Waterhouse has said that this is a great and growing railroad, that you need these many departments. I acknowledge that there have been new facets of the activity of the ONR in your boats and in your hotels and things of this nature. But I still find it difficult to understand why the commission used to be three and the commission is now five. You had three times as many trains running back in the 1920s and yet you had only this handful of officials.

Indeed, it was pointed out to me that back in those days wheat was routed over from the CNR to the east coast, that livestock were carried from Cochrane to North Bay. During the winters of 1920, 1921, 1922 and 1923 a train was cleared through New Liskeard every 34 minutes during 24 hours. And now, with this big overhead, this does not happen every seven hours. In fact, they point out that in 1964—and just let me repeat this for the record, though we dealt with it at the committee—in 1964 these are your chiefs. You have one acting chairman and an assistant, one general manager and an assistant, one superintendent and three assistants, one rule instructor, one trainmaster, one superintendent of transport, one superintendent of freight and express, two chief despatchers, one superintendent of motor power and an assistant, one master mechanic and an assistant, one superintendent of transport, one superintendent of buses, one superintendent of boats and water transportation, one superintendent of dining cars and restaurants, one superintendent of communications and three assistants, one general manager, two public relations in Toronto, one passenger traffic manager, one superintendent of maintenance way employees, four roadmasters, one super-

intendent of bridges and buildings and one assistant.

Mr. Troy: And there is the research department.

Mr. MacDonald: Quite apart from the research department.

That sounds like a pretty top-heavy organization for a railroad of this size with only 500 miles. If this railroad were developing in the fashion in which it was originally conceived it should develop, then it might begin to justify this. But the simple fact which I do not think the acting chairman can deny is that 40 years ago, with as many chiefs or heads in the ONR as you could count on the fingers of one hand, you were running three times as many trains. In fact the figures, I think, depend on what period you pick.

I wonder if the acting chairman would comment on that aspect again?

Mr. A. Johnston: Well, I was trying to follow the hon. member with my chart and I lost him about half way down. When the hon. member mentioned this at the committee on government commissions, my secretary told me afterwards that he was incorrect in his references to previous employees. I checked it afterwards and I found, since I have been chairman, that there have only been two additional appointments made. But, as a matter of interest, the hon. member says there is an acting chairman and an assistant acting chairman. Who does he mean?

Mr. MacDonald: You haven't an assistant?

Mr. A. Johnston: Well, I would like to know.

But I think there is a lot of merit in what the hon. member for York South says. Maybe all of Price-Waterhouse's recommendations do not have to be necessary, so I am watching these. We have tried to eliminate some of the chiefs, and have a few more braves and a few less chiefs.

Since I have become acting chairman, it is true I did appoint a manager of the Toronto office; and incidentally, the sales office in Toronto has been, in my opinion, very successful; it is a very busy office. I think the hon. member for Nipissing mentioned this.

I think, with an operation such as this, you cannot do too little in public relations. I think you must promote, and if you have something to sell you use people of that type. I personally would sooner have ten salesmen than one assistant superintendent,

as the hon. member for York South said. Does that answer the question?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, my final point, Mr. Chairman: I cannot go into detail and argue the necessity for having a different man for each one of these different positions. All I can say is that in 40 years you have certainly proliferated in these positions until you got three or four times as many top people as you had then—and the railway is running fewer trains. On that one point alone it seems to me that the case has considerable validity.

But the basic one, Mr. Chairman, which I think is disturbing the people of the north—and this is what they come back to all the time—is the growing suspicion that the people who are running the ONR are now running a business in which they are so captivated with its ledger that they are forgetting the original objective of the ONR, which was a development railway.

I had somebody up there, who has been on that railway longer than you might think, draw to my attention a comparison between the situation on our side and that on the Quebec side. They sent me a map of the Abitibi section on the Quebec side and pointed out the kind of things which are happening in the development of the frontier of Quebec. I concede that there are other policies the Quebec government has for what might be described as northern or frontier development, apart from what the railway would be expected to do. But certainly the development of northern Quebec puts into the shadow what is happening on the Ontario side.

And since the ONR is our chief instrument for doing this, I think we had better take another look at it.

It is drawn to my attention, for example, that they are now in the process of opening a highway to Rupert House on James Bay. Well, I can recall, God rest his soul, the former chairman, who said that over his dead body would there be a highway built up to James Bay. And indeed it is now being discussed on the Quebec side that they are going to build a railroad to haul the iron ore from Belcher's. Now, this is going to be very interesting and embarrassing.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: It is a pipe dream.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister of Mines says it is a pipe dream. If it is a pipe dream, I can tell you there have been at least two elections fought on that pipe dream in this province already, with the Prime Minister of the province leading with this

dazzling vision. This was not a Diefenbaker vision, this was a Frost vision—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There is plenty of it up there, but not in the Belcher's.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, wherever it is, all I am saying is: Let us not get sidetracked on that unessential detail. There are discussions now going on, so I am told, in northern Quebec, of not only building a road but a railroad right through to James Bay and into that iron ore territory. This is the point which impresses me most in the examination of the ONR's activities. It is true the revenues have tended to decline some in recent years but you yourself, in your annual report which I quoted in my introductory remarks in 1962, indicated that your financial position was a little better.

True, you ran into difficulties last year. You ran into what, we trust, will be non-recurring drops in revenue, such as the New York strike. And you now are facing the prospect of increases in revenues from your communications investigations, from the Boston Creek development. And with all that is happening around Timmins these days, who knows, you may have to double-track the blessed railway to cope with what is happening in northeastern Ontario.

It seemed to me that there was premature panic because of this preoccupation with the ledger sheets. You are getting away from the original objective of the ONR and its development. I would say, as a concluding comment, that if the ONR commission wants to rebuild confidence in northeastern Ontario—and I hope that I can persuade them that at the moment there is enough discussion and enough rumour and enough criticism that confidence is not at the point that it should be—I think it has to give more convincing proof of the fact that the ONR is still a development railway and is willing to take some lead, and even do a bit of pioneering for the development of the northeast in somewhat the same fashion as they are doing on the Quebec side.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I just want to support what the hon. member for York South has said because we have not got the department in Ontario, as they have in Quebec, in regard to northern affairs. At one time we had, in this province, a Department of Northern Development. Each one of these commissioners will have to be, himself, the one who is most concerned with development. I am sure that even the hon. member for Cochrane North and the hon. Minister of

Municipal Affairs will also admit that there is a feeling, just as the hon. member for York South has said, that the development picture has been dim.

You have also a transportation truck service. Gosh knows, you were told about 25 years before it was put into operation that you should get into the trucking business; but you have it now and it is called a transfer company, the Star Transfer Company. Anybody would think all you are doing is carrying baggage to a station, or delivering it to some depot. No one would get the impression that the Star Transfer is running from Toronto to Timmins, to Cochrane, to Kirkland Lake and these other places. Have you any intention or any thought of changing the name of that service?

Mr. A. Johnston: We have asked our solicitor to investigate the cost of changing the name to Star Transport Limited, or some such name as that. Of course, before you change the name you must make sure that there is no other company in Canada of that type.

Mr. Troy: How about some Indian name?

Mr. A. Johnston: Well, yes, we could call it the Star Blue Goose, perhaps. But we have

asked our legal counsel to look into the possibilities of another name.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that it is intended that the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development will be considered tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 23, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Public Service Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	2371
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	2371
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	2371
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	2371
Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall	2373
Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m.	2410

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Barrie North Collegiate Institute and Streetsville High School; and in the west gallery, students from Bracebridge and Muskoka Lakes Secondary School; and in the Speaker's gallery, members of the Canadian Daughters' League.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): **Mr. Speaker,** the purpose of these amendments is, first, to extend the time a civil servant may exercise his option to contribute in respect to continuous past service from six months to one year, and to clarify the intent with respect to the methods of payment in respect to such past service. It also gives civil servants, who are now contributors to the public service superannuation fund but have failed to exercise their former rights in respect of their non-contributive service, another opportunity to establish credit in respect of such service.

It also brings The Public Service Superannuation Act into line with The Pensions Benefit Act, 1962.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): **Mr. Speaker,** by way of a short statement with respect to these two bills; they refer to retarded children and I would like at this time to make a brief statement as to the past and present legislation this House will be considering.

I think we all would accept the fact that great results have accrued from the time of the inception in 1953 of grants to local associations for retarded children. More than 40 new schools have been constructed with the aid of capital grants from The Department of Education, and more than 400 teachers have received summer course training. At the present time 84 associations are operating 87 schools, with a total enrolment of approximately 2,750 children.

Studies were started immediately after the announcement in the assembly on March 26, 1963, in which it was stated that after consultation with interested organizations steps would be taken to develop a plan whereby the financing of the current operation of schools for trainable retarded children would be placed on a plan whereby the grant from the department would be a percentage of approved cost including approved transportation. The remainder of the funds necessary for the current operation of the schools would be raised by means other than charity drives.

A very detailed analysis of the 1962 financial report was carried out, and consultations were held with a number of organizations, including the Ontario Association for Retarded Children. These studies and consultations revealed the necessity of keeping the local interest high by involvement of the local associations for retarded children, and also by avoiding any geographical boundaries as a barrier to attendance at a school.

So while the local interest will be retained by leaving the title to buildings and property

in the hands of the local associations, the school conducted therein shall be under the control of an education authority, on which will serve representatives of those bodies concerned. This education authority will operate the school under regulations and will be paid a grant by The Department of Education. This grant will be a fixed percentage of the approved cost of current operation, including approved transportation.

The remainder of the funds necessary will be raised in the municipal taxes of the municipality in which the pupils reside.

As the plan becomes operable on January 1, 1965, it will herald achievement of the objective of making it unnecessary for local associations to raise money through charity drives for the current operation of the school. At the same time, it retains certain desirable features of the present arrangements.

The year 1953 is regarded, Mr. Speaker, as a momentous year in the development of provisions for trainable retarded children because it was in that year that legislation provided the basis for a plan which has served the movement well. I believe that the year 1964 may well be another milestone in this movement; in this year, provision through this proposed legislation will remove the current operation from the realm of charity drives.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there are a number of slight amendments in The Planning Act dealing with the duties and responsibilities of the committees of adjustment. The important thing in this amendment is providing authority to municipalities, which have a zoning plan and an official plan, to pass by-laws providing provisions relating to housing conditions and maintenance of housing.

Hon. members may remember that a year or so ago The Department of Municipal Affairs published, after considerable study, a report dealing with this subject of maintenance of dwelling standards and dwelling conditions and so on. This amendment to The Planning Act will provide the authority to municipalities to pass the necessary by-laws.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have several questions before the orders of

the day, the first directed to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart). Does the hon. Minister contemplate an early amendment to The Meat Inspection Act which would bring northern Ontario within the scope of the Act?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): An amendment is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, since any exemptions under The Meat Inspection Act are by regulation.

Mr. Troy: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Has the hon. Minister had any information from his agriculture representatives informing him that the municipal councils and health bodies are concerned because of the implications of the Act, and because it does not apply to the inspection of meat in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have had no representations made by any of our Department of Agriculture representatives along the line suggested by the hon. member. All I know about the situation is what I have read in the press, from a statement that I believe was made here during my estimates. It is recorded in *Hansard*.

Frankly, I think the matter is being exaggerated to some degree for the simple reason that we believe, from the examination of the matter as far as our department is concerned, that there is a greater degree of inspection already in existence of meat used for human consumption in northern Ontario than in any other part of the province of Ontario. I explain this for the simple reason that a good many of the local municipalities have their own inspection service now through their medical officer of health.

A great deal more of the meat that is used in northern Ontario comes in across provincial boundaries and of necessity must be inspected to cross provincial boundaries. This is the information that we have been given. There is no thought whatever of exempting northern Ontario continuously. But to get the plan in operation we felt that here was an area that now enjoyed a greater degree of inspection than any other area at the present time, and so we are trying to get it into operation here and then expand the service into northern Ontario.

Mr. Troy: I hope that the—

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has answered the question and I think that completes this question.

I was going to suggest to the member concerning his second question that as the Minister of Energy and Resources Manage-

ment (Mr. Simonett) is not in his seat, perhaps he could ask the question and if the Minister should happen to take his seat in time I shall give him the opportunity of answering it then, or at some time later.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, I notice this member of the commission here. I am sure that if my question has been considered—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. The question I have addressed to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and it should be answered by him.

Mr. Troy: Thank you. This question is addressed to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts). Did Mr. Carman Naylor of London, Ontario, who is a member of the Dr. Hagey committee studying the proposed Ontario medical insurance plan, speak for the government as reported in the press when he stated that the medical insurance plan will not be ready to start by the beginning of 1965; and further, has he the authority to make comments on the cost of premiums under the plan?

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is, of course, no. The committee, within its terms of reference, has freedom to deal with the matters entrusted to it and any comments the members make are their own. They do not speak for the government.

In answer to the second part of the question that, too, of course, is no. This man has no authority to speak for the government in regard to what the premiums may be.

Mr. Troy: That just confirms the concern of the people—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, even though this year we were unable to present each of the hon. members, as last year, with a rose, it cannot obscure the fact that today is St. George's Day. Whether one believes in the old story of St. George and his slaying of the dragon or not, does not alter the fact that through the years—for a number of centuries in fact—this has epitomized to the people of the world the eventual triumph of truth, righteousness and justice over the forces of evil. These are the things for which this old story of St. George and the dragon stands. These are the things that the Englishman, and the English in particular in this world today, stand for. Sir, I think, as the member for

St. George, that this fact should be brought to the attention of the hon. members of this Legislature especially, as we, of course, are founded upon the British parliamentary system.

As well, sir, today is the day on which we are celebrating the 400th anniversary of the birth of William Shakespeare and I do not think this fact should go unnoticed by the House either. The beauty and the power of the words written by a man almost 400 years ago have had a tremendous influence in the development of the English language and the evolution of the English language. Indeed, it is a tremendous factor still today in influencing the English language. Of course, as we have seen here in our own city of Toronto just lately, Shakespeare is influencing other fields of endeavour, especially in the cultural pursuits of the arts.

Sir, as the member for St. George, I hope that the rest of the hon. members of the Legislature will allow me to say that this Legislature salutes the English and all they stand for, and as well, the memory of William Shakespeare.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, while we are on the subject of birthdays, my hon. friend could have gone a little further in dealing with great people whose birthdays fall today. I understand that the Governor General of Canada, General Vanier, and of equal importance and greater satisfaction, I should say, to those of us on this side, the Right Honourable Lester Pearson, the Prime Minister of Canada, are celebrating their birthdays today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the report of my department, I would like, not only as a new member of the Legislature but also as a new member of the Cabinet, to express my sincere appreciation not only to the civil servants in my department but to all civil servants for their very great kindnesses to me during these last several weeks since I took office. Their help

in getting settled in my department has certainly been of very great assistance in assuming these responsibilities, and to them I am most grateful.

I might also say that I have learned a great deal from the hon. members of the Opposition, not only in personal conversation, but in having had the opportunity to sit here since January 15 and listen to the debates and watch them in action.

It is my intention to review the economy in 1963 and then comment on the outlook for the provincial economy for 1964. I would then like to make some remarks on existing and future programmes of the department and the results we are confident can be achieved, keeping in mind, however, that there are great external economic forces being marshalled throughout the world that can have a major effect on the future of this country and Ontario industrialists in particular.

The present economic situation must be viewed in the context of developments in the Canadian economy over the last few years. On the whole I am pleased to report that our long-term prospects are better than they have appeared for several years. Our main concern is that we may now be on the threshold of a long-term capital investment upswing that should provide exactly the foundation required to meet the employment and growth challenges faced by this province in the sixties.

To fulfil these prospects, all levels of government in Canada must allow the factors of production—labour, capital and natural resources—to work as efficiently as possible, and thus provide us with a maximum rate of economic growth and employment. There will still be some problems that cannot be met through a rapid rate of economic growth alone, and these will have to be dealt with by special measures.

A year ago my predecessor hit the nail on the head in forecasting the increase in the Ontario gross provincial product for 1963. In dollar terms, the GPP advanced by 6.9 per cent last year; however, when price increases are accounted for, the real growth rate was about five per cent. So I believe it is well not to delude ourselves into becoming too complacent if we wish to maintain or improve our productivity and remain competitive.

Manufacturing was the real key to Ontario's economic progress in 1963. Within manufacturing, the most dynamic sector has been the motor vehicle industry and the signs point to a further improvement this year. Produc-

tion of new motor vehicles increased by 23 per cent in 1963 and for the current year are up 28.5 per cent over last year.

Growth in the motor vehicle industry has exerted demands on many supplying industries such as steel, glass, rubber, electrical, aluminum, nickel, copper, textile, wood and chemical products. We are particularly fortunate that a very high proportion of these suppliers are located in Ontario. These and other associated industries, as well as distribution and servicing industries, have provided higher employment and increased personal incomes. Consumer spending by these employees and their families has exerted demands on food, clothing and other consumer industries providing goods and services.

My department has been particularly heartened by the fact that exports of manufactured goods proved to be another highlight of the economy's performance last year. Much of the department's economic programme in the past two years has been based on the premise that Ontario manufacturers are capable of competing in international markets, and that through an extension of markets into other countries, longer production runs will lead to improvements in manufacturing efficiency.

In 1963, exports of manufactured end products rose by 19 per cent. Among such products, exports of motor vehicles and parts increased by 53 per cent, industrial machinery and parts by 25.6 and farm machinery and parts by 25.1. The industries producing these commodities are overwhelmingly concentrated in Ontario, and continuous efforts urging more direct activity in export markets are, I firmly believe, a must for the future prosperity of this province.

Largely owing to these favourable factors, manufacturing shipments in Ontario increased by 8.3 per cent in 1963 to reach a total of \$14,563 million. This was considerably larger than the total for all Canada only 13 years ago. The value of output of transportation equipment alone is estimated to have risen by 19 per cent and to have contributed 32 per cent of the total gain in Ontario manufacturing. Strong rises have also been estimated for the following in 1963: textiles, 16.5 per cent; machinery, 15.1 per cent; rubber, 13.3 per cent and electrical products, 10.8 per cent—all of which are industries employing large numbers of our labour force.

The drive in Ontario's manufacturing sector was supplemented by continued strength in the services, wholesale and retail trade and finance. Farm cash income increased by 6.5 per cent to reach \$997 million providing one of the best years on record.

The year 1963 was excellent for Ontario: more people worked than ever before, and they made more money. Sixty thousand new jobs were created, and our unemployment level dropped from 4.3 per cent in 1962 to 3.8 per cent in 1963. By the end of 1963 our unemployment level was down to 3.3 per cent and in March it dropped to 2.5 per cent, seasonally adjusted.

I might add there are 124,000 more people working in Ontario at the end of March, 1964 than there were at the end of March, 1963.

I might add at this time that this level is generally considered as full employment for an economy structured the way the Ontario economy is. In Canada the national average unemployment was 5.5 per cent and in the U.S. 5.7 per cent in 1963. The result of this high level of employment in Ontario meant that labour income in Ontario rose by seven per cent to reach over \$9 billion.

I do not intend to go into more detail on the statistical performance of the economy last year. The hon. members have received copies of the January issue of the "Ontario Economic Review" and also the "Ontario Statistical Review," both of which provide useful reference material.

The year 1963 was the third year of expansion following the low point of the last recession reached at the beginning of 1961. In both duration and rate of increase, this current cycle stands in marked contrast to the slow growth period we experienced following 1957.

Changes in monetary and fiscal policies in the United States and monetary and exchange policies in Canada played an important role in bringing us out of the period of slower growth. In addition, grain sales to Communist countries, the trade promotion activities of the Ontario and federal governments, and the more aggressive efforts of Canadian manufacturers in external and domestic markets all contributed greatly. The devalued dollar and slow price rises in Canada compared to the inflation problems now being faced in several European countries have meant that unit costs of production in Canada relative to other countries are at their lowest level for a number of years.

Substantial increases are expected in new machinery and equipment this year. In fact, the recently announced capital investment intentions for 1964 indicate an increase of 14.9 per cent in expenditures on machinery and equipment in Ontario manufacturing this year. The immediate impact on the economy will be reduced by the fact that our

machinery and equipment industries are already operating at full capacity. Substantially more than half of the increase anticipated in this investment, therefore, may have to be spent for imported equipment.

We are emphasizing our machinery industry in assessing our prospects for 1964 and subsequent years. Ontario accounts for two-thirds of the Canadian machinery industry and almost 90 per cent of its electrical industrial equipment. This industry offers an excellent example of the increasing competitiveness of Canadian industry, which, while supplying the domestic markets, was also able to export. Canadian exports of industrial machinery and equipment increased by 29.4 per cent between 1961 and 1962 and a further 27 per cent in 1963.

Although there was a significant increase in Canadian expenditures on machinery in 1963, imports of mining, metallurgical, business and printing machinery and other non-farm machinery declined slightly. When we combine this encouraging story with the prospect that Canadian expenditures on machinery will rise rapidly in 1964, we can see an obvious opportunity for a rapid expansion in the capacity of the machinery industry.

In addition to the push that investment will provide to economic activity in 1964, we anticipate a further increase in exports of grains and manufactured goods. Higher incomes of prairie farmers as a result of the wheat sales will support further demand for Ontario-produced farm machinery and consumer goods.

In each succeeding year of an expansion it is more difficult to maintain the rates of increase that were obtained during initial stages of a recovery. The automobile industry is the best example of this. In the past two years its annual increases of well over 20 per cent generated expanded activity in a host of related industries. While we expect a small increase in motor vehicle production in 1964, the industry may not provide the same dynamic stimulus.

Construction is another area where activity may not show a significant increase in 1964. However, we do expect the construction industry to renew its vigour in subsequent years.

In summary, therefore, we believe the rate of growth in the Ontario economy will be about six per cent which is well above the average of the past seven years.

We are confident the Ontario economy can expand at an accelerated rate over the next five years for the following reasons: in the

first place, assuming favourable monetary and fiscal policies, the tax reduction in the United States will exert increasing force in expanding consumer and investment demand in the United States over the next two years. This will have a stimulating effect on Canadian exports, mostly of industrial raw materials, but also of those manufactured goods where we have established an ability to compete internationally.

In the second place, the growth in demand in both Canada and the United States will stimulate large capital investment expenditures. In both countries, most industries are operating closer to capacity than has been the case for seven years. Increased profits and aging plant and machinery also contribute to setting the stage for several years of large-scale investment.

As this situation emerges more clearly it will become obvious to business that the sooner a firm increases its capacity, the better it will be enabled to participate in supplying the expanding need and the greater chance it will have of holding or improving its relative position in the market. Knowledge of this fact will tend to advance the date at which new business investment will occur.

If we are correct in anticipating a strong rise in business investment, the multiplier effect will be felt in all parts of the economy in the form of increased production, employment and incomes. Similar forces will be at work in United States, encouraging Canada's exports and reinforcing Canada's economic growth.

Thus the opportunities for growth in the second half of the sixties are most favourable. The requirements of the large United States economy for industrial materials from the considerably smaller Canadian economy will be strong. Therefore, the growth rate for Canada may well be faster than that of the United States. At the same time, we shall continue to encourage further domestic processing of Canadian raw materials.

The basic requirement of the Ontario economy is that we achieve our long-term growth potential. This is much more the core of Ontario's problem than it is for other areas of this country. The economy of Ontario has reached a more mature stage than most of the rest of Canada which is still basically dependent on resource development. Although the prairie provinces do not have an unemployment problem, they are concerned with diversifying their economies to raise the standard of living and cushion them from the shock of a poor harvest or lower export sales, particularly when 80 per cent of their harvest has to be exported to

countries which next year may have a good harvest and require no imports.

In British Columbia, although the standard of living is high, there are some unemployment problems that must be met by special measures. In the maritime provinces and much of Quebec there are severe unemployment problems which cannot be solved through an acceleration of national economic growth alone. In Nova Scotia, for example, the declining demand for coal has left large numbers of unemployed who cannot find gainful employment in mining. These regions are attempting to solve their difficulties through an expansion in manufacturing activity, and this may require that people move from the mining centres.

With the exception of some areas, particularly in the north, the Ontario economy is characterized by such a diversification of industry that, with a real rate of economic growth of four or five per cent and high levels of employment, a continuing rise in the standard of living can be maintained. Barring sharp cyclical changes at any given time, those Ontario industries where productivity is rising faster than output, and therefore fewer employees are needed, are balanced by other industries which require more workers. If there are barriers to the free movement of labour and capital, however, we may have high unemployment in one area of the province, while industries in other parts are in great need.

A high rate of labour mobility means that it must be relatively easy for employees to move: (1) from areas where there is a stagnant or declining demand for labour to those where more labour is required, (2) from industries with a receding demand for labour to others that can employ them and (3) from declining occupations to those with good prospects for gainful employment. Studies are now under way in my department and by the federal government on industries and areas which have not been offering new employment opportunities. If these studies reveal long-term trends of dwindling employment, then measures to facilitate labour mobility from them to more productive areas are indicated.

If the economy is to grow at its maximum rate, investments must be concentrated in areas and industries with the greatest growth potential, not only in the interests of the investor, but in the interest of the labour force. Naturally, there are occasions when this general principle may have to be carefully weighed, particularly when there are immediate problems of unemployment and hardship in a specific area. However, financial

support or other alternate programmes of assistance to such areas should be planned with the long term in view and steps devised to correct the underlying problems. A patchwork of temporary measures is costly and too often a waste of our human resources. The most helpful way the Ontario government can ensure that investment is directed toward areas and industries of growth potential, is through assisting business to ascertain where the long-term prospects are good. My comment on the machinery industry earlier was an example of pinpointing a likely prospect.

The full potential will not be realized unless continued efforts are made to take full advantage of all opportunities. Growth industries only maintain their growth if they are constantly searching for new techniques, new products, new markets and other means of improving productivity. The Ontario government, through its vocational and technical training programme, its export promotion and import replacement activities, and its assistance to the Ontario Research Foundation, offers many services which will aid industry in attaining these essential increases in productivity.

The federal government must bear the main responsibility for plans affecting the long-term rate of economic growth and for measures designed to round off the excesses of business cycles and provide stability to the economy. The Economic Council of Canada has undertaken the maintenance of long-term, well-rounded economic growth as its chief area of concern. It will be recommending programmes to the government of Canada from time to time concerning future long-range monetary, fiscal and tariff policies. The reports of the Economic Council of Canada will be available and should be most helpful to provincial governments in developing their own economic policies.

We welcome some of the programmes which the federal government has recently undertaken and which have had a beneficial effect on the Ontario economy. The winter bonus for housing construction has undoubtedly been a factor in keeping down the rate of unemployment this winter. The export incentive for automobile parts has had a salutary effect on the Ontario automobile parts of industry. The tax incentive for increased research facilities which Ontario has incorporated into its own corporation tax structure has been a factor in spurring expenditure on research and development in Ontario industry.

Due to Ontario's overwhelming dependence on manufacturing, we are particularly interested in any federal government action which

will have an impact on our manufacturing industry. The forthcoming GATT negotiations are a case in point. We agree basically with the federal government desire to consider reductions in the Canadian tariff schedule on the basis of reductions in other countries' tariffs of equivalent advantage to Canada. We are concerned, however, that tariff concessions on manufactured commodities should only be granted if assistance is provided to affected industries to make the necessary adjustments to protect jobs and investment. Any comprehensive effort to aid Canadian industry to adjust to changing international conditions may require a co-ordinated programme of tariff changes, adjustment assistance to both capital and labour, and possible changes in anti-combine legislation and its administration. Changes in anti-combine legislation may be essential in order that there be greater specialization in affected industries while maintaining competitive conditions. The precedent to this has already been established by legislation permitting industry co-operation for export purposes.

One of my first duties after becoming the Minister of Economics and Development was to attend federal-provincial conferences of Premiers and Ministers of trade and industry. As a result of these meetings I am convinced the groundwork has been laid for effective federal-provincial co-operation and co-ordination of economic programmes.

We made known our dissatisfaction with the lack of prior consultation on the part of the federal government when it introduced its incentives to slow growth areas and the Municipal Development Fund. While we cannot assume that such things will not happen in the future, we at least know that we will henceforth be consulted on the revision of the criteria for designating slow growth areas. We will also be given much greater access to federal government statistics and information on economic conditions and prospects. We have agreed on the extent and type of provincial and federal efforts in export and industrial promotion and have co-ordinated the timing of trade missions and exhibitions in other countries. A schedule of regular federal-provincial meetings has been set up to iron out programmes and problems at both ministerial and civil service levels.

Our economic development depends not only on action by the federal government and the province of Ontario, but also implies co-operation with other provinces. For the reasons I outlined earlier, a number of provinces have embarked on programmes to promote industrial development within their own

jurisdictions. These efforts can make a substantial contribution to the economic growth of Canada, if the advantages of specialization and rationalization in resource locations are respected, and wasteful duplication of existing facilities is avoided. If instances occur where development plans of the various provinces conflict, a method should be developed of reviewing such plans in the light of the national interest.

The economy of Ontario is more closely attached to the Canadian domestic market than is that of any other province in Canada. This means that Ontario has a vital interest in encouraging increased wealth in other sections. Just as an example, I could mention that one of the chief sources of increased demand for Ontario-manufactured products this year is the prairie farmer, whose income has greatly increased as a result of wheat sales to Communist countries.

Ontario will suffer, of course, if a manufacturing industry is forced to close down because its markets in another province have been cut off or reduced through discriminatory action by a government agency. At a time when both this government and the federal government are directing their efforts toward the expansion of markets for manufactured goods in other countries, it would be a retrograde step to have the Canadian market fractioned even more than it is already. I hope that any problems of this nature can be solved through friendly informal discussions and that the issue is not magnified unduly.

As I have stated, the economic problems of Ontario, and more particularly the activities in my department, are concentrated on our manufacturing industry. While Ontario accounts for almost one-third of mining activity in Canada, 25 per cent of the agricultural production, 30 per cent of the pulp and paper, and one-third of the hydro-electric power generation, its economy is, nevertheless, highly developed and dependent to a large extent on secondary manufacturing. In fact, less than ten per cent of the Ontario labour force is engaged in the fields of resource development, while 26 per cent is in manufacturing, with a sizeable proportion of the remainder in that part of the services which includes transportation and trade and finance sectors of the economy directly supporting or dependent on manufacturing activity.

The performance of the Ontario economy in 1963 gives some indication of how important manufacturing is to Ontario. We have experienced what can only be described as

an excellent year, with an increase in gross provincial product of about six per cent, the lowest unemployment rate since 1957, and a rise in per capita income to over \$2,000. However, while the economy as a whole was doing well, our resource industries, particularly mining, have not enjoyed what could be termed a banner year.

The success of our manufacturing industry in replacing imports, increasing exports and generally improving its competitive position was largely responsible for the economy's growth. The dominant position of manufacturing resulted in a good growth rate in spite of the performance of other sectors of the economy.

For the benefit of the new members of the Legislature I would like to explain some of the reasons behind the Ontario Trade Crusade and the role it has played and will continue to play in the interests of Canada and this province in particular.

When this administration first took office in November, 1961, a number of papers were prepared on economic problems facing Ontario. At that time we had an unemployment rate of 4.7 per cent in Ontario and our level of economic activity was too low. This province was faced with the imminent entry of large numbers of young people into the labour force during a period when prospects for employment appeared to be quite limited. Many people were pessimistic about the economic future of this province and Canada.

Traditionally, it had been felt in some quarters that the economic development of Canada was almost solely the concern of the federal government. However, as a result of the Ontario government's analysis, it was obvious we had to become more actively and directly involved in the economy of the province. I might emphasize at this time that this is still our view and we will continue to do all we can to promote the economic well-being of this province.

To assist the government to meet its economic goals, The Department of Economics was merged with The Department of Commerce and Development. This merger contributed materially to the success of the government's economic programme because, for the first time, it combined economic research and industrial development facilities.

Concern by economists within the department over balance of payments and employment problems led to an aggressive programme to export Ontario-made goods to the markets of the world. Conversely, the interest of others in the department in regional development, specific industries and federal govern-

ment policies, led to the preparation of studies by the economics branches.

The size of Canada's continuing current account deficit was a subject of much concern in 1961. In the previous nine years the deficit had amounted to over \$9 billion. Although much of this amount was spent on establishing new factories and mines, we were also spending too much on imported goods and foreign travel. Canadian business and consumers were, in effect, spending their money on imported goods and services while depending on imported capital to finance expansion of productive facilities. Tight money and high interest rates attracted foreign capital to finance the imports. At the same time the high exchange rate on the Canadian dollar provided important competitive advantages to imported goods and services and maintained too high a price for Canada's exports.

The Ontario government decided that its best contribution would be a programme to promote exports and encourage import replacement. This, to a very marked degree, was achieved by the Ontario Trade Crusade.

On the import replacement side, the government initiated several steps.

We took this problem directly to the people through a consumer advertising campaign. We asked the people of this province to buy Canadian-made products where the domestic products were comparable in price and quality to imports. As results indicated, the people of this province overwhelmingly supported this programme and thus contributed directly to their present economic well-being.

We undertook a programme to increase the Canadian content of manufactured articles through a series of trade exhibits which we call "manufacturing opportunities shows." At these shows Ontario manufacturers display components which they import and seek to replace through Canadian suppliers. These exhibits have been a great success for all concerned and since their inception have been closely studied by other jurisdictions. Since originating this programme, it is conservatively estimated that we have replaced imported components to the value of over \$30 million. This has been done at a saving to the importer and means additional business, employment and longer production runs for Ontario economy. Most of the components replaced have been of U.S. origin.

The department further attempted to reduce imports by inducing manufacturers, who previously had exported to Canada, to establish a branch plant in Ontario. In the past year the department had a part in bringing

in 173 branch plants, the highest number in any year since we started compiling statistics in 1945.

When the item imported does not have sufficient volume to warrant a branch plant, we attempt to interest the foreign company in having a Canadian company produce it under licence. In the past year we were instrumental in concluding 78 manufacturing agreements between Ontario-based companies and foreign firms. This figure of 78 is again a record.

The department also felt that immediate steps had to be taken to increase the exports of Ontario-manufactured goods, and developed a number of programmes to do just this.

The department arranged for sales missions to go abroad and sell Ontario-made goods. Since starting this programme we have sent 21 sales missions. More than 200 Ontario businessmen have been on these missions and we estimate they have sold over \$45 million worth of Ontario-made merchandise.

Some people are under the impression these sales missions duplicate federal government export efforts. This is not so. The federal government does not have sales missions of a similar kind; they have in the main concentrated on single industry groups and associations. If the Ontario government had not undertaken its programme, most of the previously mentioned manufacturers would not have had the export success they enjoy and \$45 million in sales would have been lost to the economy; profits would not have been made, and a measure of employment would not have been created. I might add that this programme has made a very substantial increase in revenues to both the provincial and federal Treasuries.

We co-operate very closely with the federal government on this programme, and I would like at this time to acknowledge the appreciation of the Ontario government to the federal authorities for the splendid co-operation and assistance they have extended to us.

The government, as a further aid to exports, increased the strength and number of its foreign offices. Through these every Ontario manufacturer has a sales office in New York; Chicago; London, England; Dusseldorf, Germany; and Milan, Italy. The federal government Department of Trade and Commerce has also offered to make space available in its foreign offices for any industrial development officers the Ontario government might wish to appoint. This possibility, I might add, is currently under study.

Ontario House, which is the province's

show window in Europe, has been completely renovated to consolidate all Ontario government offices in the United Kingdom. This has meant complete reconstruction of all seven storeys of the building. The new Ontario House will be officially dedicated early in June. Finding new industry and investment for the province will continue to be the major activity for Ontario House. As part of this programme, showrooms will be opened for businessmen to display their wares and thus sell more Canadian-made products.

In conjunction with our foreign offices, we bring to Ontario successful manufacturers, agents, or buyers and arrange for them to visit groups of companies manufacturing allied but not competitive products, with a view to representing these companies abroad. Last year 26 group agents or buyers were established. One million dollars in sales have been secured to date from this programme.

The Ontario trade crusade has contributed materially to the well-being of this province and this country. More people are working in Ontario and earning more money today than ever before because of the trade crusade. We intend to continue with it and sincerely believe it will be even more successful this coming year.

The department has several other programmes to assist Ontario industry, which I will discuss later. However, I did want to acquaint the hon. members briefly with some of the background of the Ontario trade crusade.

There are, however, limitations to these approaches. There are limitations to import replacement. Some things have to be imported, and not every manufacturer or industry can export. No government can carry the whole load; every person, every industry, every jurisdiction has a role to play. We will have to develop new programmes and new ideas. Longer term measures will be needed, and I believe we will all have to recognize this fact. Careful study and highly sophisticated programmes are going to take time to develop, and in many cases the results of these plans will not be immediate but will become apparent in the future.

It is important that we begin today to develop programmes for tomorrow. We must be cognizant of this fact: Economic development requires hard and continuous work and we are fighting strong, keen competition at home and abroad. An accelerated trade crusade programme, with continuing emphasis on exploring new markets, is vital if our trade is to prosper and expand.

Before outlining some of our new pro-

grammes for the 1964-65 fiscal year, I should like to spend a few minutes on a subject which has received much attention at this session of the Legislature. I am referring to the nature and amount of unemployment in this province.

The Ontario unemployment situation has shown great improvement over the past year, and in the last quarter of 1963 there were approximately 85,000 more persons employed in the province than in the final quarter of 1962. And as I mentioned earlier there are 124,000 more since March of last year. Buoyant conditions have resulted in a smaller than usual seasonal decline in employment in the first few months of this year and unemployment levels have been the lowest since 1957.

Most of the increases in the labour force during the past year were women and young men. Of the total increment between February 1963 and February 1964 of about 56,000, only 11,000 were males and 45,000 were females. The increase in female employment just about balanced the increase in the labour force, leaving female unemployment virtually unchanged from last year. On the other hand, there was a greater increase in employment for men than the number of additional entrants, so that the male unemployment rates declined.

Although the employment situation has shown tremendous improvement over the past few years, there are still areas of high unemployment. In March most of the Ontario labour market areas were classified as in moderate labour surplus by The Department of Labour in Ottawa. Several areas—Galt, Guelph, Kitchener, Listowel, St. Thomas, Stratford and Woodstock-Tillsonburg—had balanced labour markets at the end of March.

Two of the Ontario areas which have suffered from the most persistently high levels of unemployment, Windsor and Cornwall, have experienced considerable improvement over the past year. In fact, they both moved into the balanced labour market category in the late summer or early fall of 1963 for two or three months. That was the first time Windsor had had a balanced labour market since 1956; and for Cornwall, it was the first time since 1957.

While unemployment among the unskilled is of serious concern to the Ontario government, shortages have developed this year in parts of Ontario for professional and skilled workers. Nurses, skilled workers in the metal trades and draughtsmen are in short supply. The immigration branch of the department has been handling a sharply increased number

of requests from Ontario employers for skilled workmen. Through Ontario House it has been able to meet some of the immediate needs. A possible expansion of the immigration services of the department is now under review.

The Department of Education is continuing the expansion of its vocational training programme to ensure a more highly skilled and flexible work force to meet longer term requirements. However, as the evidence of the past year or two shows, the most important factor in offsetting the disemployment resulting from technical change is an adequate rate of growth in the economy. We are making every effort to ensure that our economy continues in a healthy state. We can then treat spot areas of unemployment on an *ad hoc* basis. We hope in this way to quickly design solutions to such problems when the decline of job opportunities in traditional industries occurs.

Following the conference on automation and social change, a steering committee was appointed to recommend the possible terms of reference of a body to carry out continuing work in the field of automation and employment. The committee sent in its report at the end of January. Following its receipt, the chairman of the Ontario Economic Council discussed the question with the chairman of the Economic Council of Canada and other provincial economic councils. It was agreed that further research in this field be co-ordinated on a federal-provincial basis with appropriate government departments assisting as required. Although no permanent body separate from the council will be established at this time, staff from the council are being assigned to the question. A decision on whether or not to set up a separate organization will be made later.

We believe this type of approach will help find a solution to the problems of technological unemployment.

Since taking office as Minister of Economics and Development, I have been engaged in a review of all of the department's programmes in conjunction with senior officials of the department. This review will continue; let me summarize by saying that the existing programmes of The Department of Economics and Development will be maintained but the emphasis of some will be altered to take account of changing circumstances. In addition, some new programmes will go into operation while others are being studied. As an example of a programme which has been modified to take account of changing circumstances, let me review briefly our consumer advertising campaign.

During the past two years imports of most consumer goods were sharply reduced. For example, of 308 tariff classifications covering what would normally be classified as consumer items, 208 items showed a decline in imports in the first ten months of 1963 as compared to 1962. The most significant declines occurred in clothing, electrical appliances and other household metal articles—the very type of commodities most likely to be affected by a promotional campaign aimed at housewives.

Normally Canadian imports of most commodities increase during a business expansion. In 1963 imports of producers' goods did increase but imports of consumer goods declined. The Ontario government trade crusade can claim a share in creating this welcome reversal of form. The other factors involved were the special import surcharges in effect between June 1962 and April 1963, and the delayed impact of the lower value of the Canadian dollar.

I think it should be stated at this time that Canada, to reduce its current accounts deficit, will have to increase its merchandise trade surplus. We have a net annual outflow of approximately \$1 billion for services such as dividends and interest on foreign investments, transportation, insurance, and so on, and we have to sell more goods than we buy to get the money to offset some of these charges. This is a point which many, who complain about Canada's highly favourable trade balance with their countries, fail to mention. Our surplus on merchandise account with these individual countries is considerably reduced by our deficit on invisibles with some of these same countries. For example, the United Kingdom had a surplus of \$98 million on invisibles with Canada in 1963, but at the same time had a deficit of \$387 million on merchandising trade.

Some people believe that trade should be balanced with each country, or at least Canada should balance its trade with each country. This of course is ridiculous, if not impossible.

Most of the countries which complain about their trade balance with Canada have a surplus in their balance of payments with the world, so obviously they cover their deficit on trade with Canada by earnings from other countries.

Much is made of the fact that Japan buys two to three times as much from Canada as it sells, and its purchases are in the main raw materials and food stuffs. Our purchases from them are high-labour-content manufactured goods. But let us be realistic. Japan gets the money to pay for its Canadian

purchases from its sales to other countries. For example, in 1962 Japan sold \$65 million worth of goods to Nigeria and only imported \$5.2 million.

In the first nine months of 1963, Japan imported \$870 million worth of goods from southeast Asia and exported \$1.1 billion. She therefore had a surplus with that area of \$270 million to help cover her deficit with Canada and other smaller nations.

Canada for some time to come cannot expect to eliminate its current account deficit. We will have to continue to import capital and services. However, we must work out long-term solutions to our balance of payments problem. We cannot pin a large part of our prosperity on bumper grain crops and record wheat sales. We must strive to improve all sectors of our economy if we are to continue to prosper and meet the demands on our economy at home and abroad.

I would like to submit that Canada will in the future supply an increasing amount of raw materials and agricultural products to the highly industrialized nations which need them for their economic welfare. In return, Canada will be under continual pressure to buy more manufactured goods from them. This will present continuing challenges to Ontario, since this province is the centre of more than half of Canada's manufacturing.

In the coming year the department's advertising activities will be concentrated on those areas that offer the best potential for voluntary individual decision by the people of this province. Advertising will be concentrated in those retail markets where substantial amounts of imports are sold. The department will not have as extensive an advertising campaign as last year in Ontario, as we will be diverting some of our advertising dollars to push the sale of Ontario-made goods abroad. As the foreign distribution of Ontario products improves, we will devote a greater part of our promotion to foreign markets.

Let me assure the hon. members of this House that money will only be spent on advertising so long as it accomplishes the aims we set for it, or in other words only so long as it is worth it to the provincial economy as a whole. In the department's opinion it still is successful in certain areas and thus is being maintained.

At this point I want to pay tribute to the thousands of women throughout the province who, by their efforts, have made our trade crusade a success. Without their enthusiastic support our achievements would not have been possible.

In particular, I want to congratulate the Conference of Women of Ontario for the excellent work it has carried out during the past year. Since becoming Minister I have reviewed the programme and have made the Conference of Women a permanent part of the department. The advisory committee has been enlarged to include representatives from all parts of the province.

Of the many activities of the Conference of Women, I will mention only one at this time. During November, buyers from leading stores in the United States and representatives of the U.S. women's magazines were brought to Toronto for special viewings of Ontario fashions and products of our clothing industry. It is estimated that one story alone which was sent out from this promotion appeared in more than 200 American newspapers.

In the coming year the Conference of Women will hold a number of fashion shows featuring Canadian clothing and fabrics. In conjunction with the Retail Merchants' Association, retail promotions of Canadian-made goods will be held throughout the province. The first will be in Kitchener on May 25. Others will be held in Ottawa, at the Lakehead and in the Niagara area. I think they will make a very great contribution to the economy of this province this year.

Now I would like to say a word or two about regional development. One of the major problems facing the world today is regional development. Indeed, one would not be far wrong in saying that that is what the "cold war" is about. Every country, every state, every province and indeed many great cities could be said to face problems of regional development. Ontario is certainly no exception.

Conditions in a modern industrial society are such that there are compelling reasons why industry concentrates in certain areas. This is true even in a society such as the Soviet Union where the most absolute economic planning takes place.

In Canada we have regional development problems from coast to coast. The United States is about to embark on a regional development programme called the "war against poverty." Further abroad, the United Kingdom, France and Germany have all developed programmes to meet their acute regional development problems.

Meaningful regional development is more than a matter of taxation incentives, cheap power and transportation, and labour and resources, although all of these factors are important. This government as far as possible should seek to create development where it

will be most efficient and where it will return the most to the province as a whole.

There is to our knowledge no perfect regional development programme anywhere in the world, and the problem is much more complex than many would have you believe. Tremendous amounts of money have been spent on regional development programmes that have generated very little, either socially or economically. From what I have said, hon. members might be excused if they felt that I believed the problem to be insurmountable. However, rest assured that I do not. I believe more can be done to develop the economy regionally, and I wish to assure you that it will be. But again, I want to emphasize that the problem is incredibly complex in a modern industrial society. This government could, as I have stated, provide cheap power and transportation, housing and taxation incentives to certain areas and we still could not develop industry.

This province's economy is not strong enough to stand the creation of regional economic sink holes. The demands are too many and too pressing. Nevertheless, as resources permit, we will develop programmes. Our economic branches are working on special economic reports of certain areas, resources, industries and skills to determine possible regional opportunities. We are attempting to improve our economic forecasting, recognizing that these at best are "guesstimates" and unforeseen circumstances are always possible. Other areas and provinces' regional development problems are not similar to ours, and each will undoubtedly require different approaches and solutions.

When we speak of this government's regional development programme we shouldn't just focus on one or two, and accept these as a final development plan. In my own department, for example, we have:

1. A regional development branch that assists the various regional associations to develop economic programmes.

2. We have three different economic branches that all deal in part with regional development problems. Special regional economic and industrial studies are conducted, and in some cases specific area and industry studies are undertaken.

3. Through the Ontario Economic Council, special economic reports on certain areas have been made. In addition, we have a committee of the council to deal with northern Ontario development.

4. Through the Ontario Research Foundation we commission special research projects

that will benefit certain regions within this province.

There is much more we do that I have not outlined, because every department in this government, and the commissions, assist in regional development in some way. Our government's regional development programme is much greater than many would believe; we hope to co-ordinate it more closely and work to establish certain objectives.

In the coming year we are going to hold an international conference on regional development. This we believe will be the first in Canada. We will invite authorities from all over the world to discuss the types of regional development problems they face, the programmes they have developed to deal with them, and the results they have obtained. We intend to study them and see what additional measures might be practicable for Ontario. We hope that this conference will provide more knowledge on the subject. I hope the hon. members will attend—I will certainly see that they get invitations.

I would like to touch for a moment on international marketing. As a further assistance to Ontario manufacturers in entering world markets, the department, in co-operation with the federal government, will be entering a number of international trade fairs. Trade fairs are a very efficient means of promoting Ontario-manufactured products in European and U.S. markets, and we have high hopes for this type of sales approach. I believe that as conditions permit, our industry must be more outward-looking and aggressive. It must look for an increasing portion of its sales in all the markets of the world and we must assist it at every opportunity, while we concentrate heavily and exploit the foreign markets we are now in. I am confident that Ontario and Canadian industry will rise to the challenge and we in government stand ready to do our part in this effort.

As an example, the department, in conjunction with a major northern United States retail store chain, will be sponsoring a "Canadian Week" at which Canadian goods will be prominently featured throughout all departments of the chain. This type of operation is particularly suitable to the promotional plans of The Department of Economics and Development.

We have an extensive range of Ontario-made consumer goods with a proven sales potential in U.S. markets. We have long felt that the northern United States offers an excellent market for this province's manufactured products, as well as its natural resources. If this forthcoming promotion is the

success we hope it will be, we will extend it to other areas. We have top quality high fidelity and stereo sets, electrical appliances, sporting goods, fashions and furs, all of which we hope to promote in the northern United States and throughout the world. This programme, if successfully promoted, could open up a vast new horizon for the sale of Ontario consumer goods.

The Ontario Research Foundation: The plans for relocating the foundation's laboratories, which were announced last year, have resulted in a rapid development of the research community at Sheridan Park. Already five major companies have purchased sites in the park in addition to the foundation's original purchase of the core property. Two laboratories are already under construction and it is anticipated that the others will be started this year.

By assisting the foundation in locating its special facilities, its technical information service, and its specialized technical and scientific library, where they are conveniently accessible to our rapidly growing industrial research teams, the government is making a significant contribution to the technological development of the province.

By employing the scientific and engineering staff of the foundation on research needed by the government, it is providing opportunity for researchers to stay at home and make their special skills available to Ontario industry.

By supporting the foundation in its efforts to have the most up-to-date research techniques and equipment available for industry's use, the government is seeking to assist our industries in maintaining and improving their competitive position. To an increasing extent research is a vital component of our economic and industrial progress.

We intend to make Ontario a major industrial research area and, in doing so, reap the future use of the skills and knowledge of the young people we are spending vast sums to educate today. To fail to provide this opportunity now we are, in effect, sir, simply subsidizing with our trained people other industrialized nations which are much further advanced than we are, particularly in industrial research.

Sheridan Park is already under way to becoming the largest research centre in Canada. We intend to promote this research city to the limit of our ability. Offering incentives for research expenditures is in effect now at both the federal and provincial levels. Sheridan Park research centre can make a valuable contribution, not only to

Ontario, but to all of Canada, so it will have the full support of this government.

We are therefore bringing forward a bill during this session of the Legislature to establish a non-profit corporation to be known as Sheridan Park Corporation. This corporation will purchase the remaining land, amounting to 168-some-odd acres, so that it can be used exclusively to establish Canada's first research satellite community.

We believe this step is essential to ensure orderly development of the property and eliminate any land speculation. In this way we believe it will encourage a greater participation in this research community of both large and small industry. Our promotional efforts for this project will be also directed abroad and in the United States to solicit foreign companies to establish their research laboratories in Ontario.

Ontario Economic Council: As a result of the federal government establishing the Economic Council of Canada, the organization and scope of the Ontario Economic Council has been adjusted to permit closer co-operation between the respective economic bodies.

We have a new chairman, Mr. William H. Cranston of Midland, Ontario. Mr. Cranston served with distinction as head of the tourist industry committee. I would like to take this opportunity to extend not only my own appreciation but that of this House to Mr. Cranston and all the members of the economic council. These men, at great sacrifice, devote a great deal of time to the affairs of this province. They serve voluntarily, initiating research and making recommendations in respect to both economic problems and growth potentials.

In recent weeks, in co-operation with the productivity division of the Economic Council of Canada and with the endorsement of labour and management, the Ontario Economic Council fostered the establishment of a series of work study courses for foremen and foremen-in-training. They are to be held at the Lakehead, Ottawa, Barrie, Peterborough, and Kitchener. Local arrangements are being made by the regional development associations.

In co-operation with the Economic Council of Canada and with counterpart bodies in other provinces, the Ontario Economic Council is initiating a broad programme of research into the economic effects, long and short range, of automation and of other aspects of technological and social change. Announcement of this joint federal-provincial programme, to help us better understand and be better prepared to meet the challenge of

future changes in the methods of production and distribution of goods and services, was made recently. This co-operative approach to the problems of technological change was taken with the full endorsement of the representatives of the economic council.

Linked with this area of study is another project, also being undertaken in association with the Economic Council of Canada, in which the Ontario council will explore ways and means of more effectively matching labour skills to the future needs of our provincial economy. Building on work already done by The Departments of Education, Labour, and Economics and Development, this research will, we trust, help us in our forward planning.

In co-operation with the Ontario Research Foundation and economists in my own department, the Ontario Economic Council is initiating growth studies in relation to the feasibility of Canadian manufacture of a larger percentage of equipment used in conjunction with our rapidly expanding winter recreation industry; of the future domestic market for Ontario corn; and of a number of secondary manufactured products of which the domestic requirements are largely met currently by imports. In this connection, for example, the council is working with the Ontario Hospital Association in initiating test surveys to determine whether a larger percentage of our hospital equipment can be made, or at least assembled, in Ontario.

Currently before the government are reports from the industrial development committee on ways and means of encouraging a greater made-in-Canada content in goods acquired by governmental departments and agencies. The report of the special committee of the Ontario Economic Council on the Windsor area has recently been released.

Five committees of council are now active, manned entirely by volunteer citizens desirous of serving the people of this province and providing expanded opportunities for growth and prosperity. Among the recent recommendations made, for example, by the tourist industry committee of the council, was a greater public investment in the development of our historic sites—a development which, it was felt, would be largely self-liquidating on the basis of increased tourist dollar revenue. The restoration of Fort Ste. Marie, sir, announced by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) last month is an outgrowth of this recommendation. This committee has been working with The Department of Tourism and Information on many matters and will continue to do so.

Ontario's economic council is in no sense attempting to mastermind the planning programme of the government. It is an advisory body only, but it is endeavouring to bring to bear, in formulating its decisions, the best experience of the citizenry at large to assist this government in planning for the future.

The Ontario Development Agency: As a result of the agency's activities since its establishment a little over a year ago, Ontario companies have obtained \$12.2 million in additional financing, most of which would not have been available to them if the agency had not been in existence. This financing has been obtained in four ways and I would like to deal with each of these in turn.

To date, the financial advisory committee has recommended the granting of 37 guarantees to Ontario-based companies, amounting in total to \$3.8 million. Twenty-four of these guarantees have been executed, ten are awaiting the completion of legal documents, while three have not been acted upon because of breach of contract.

Provincial guarantees have been made available to companies which for various reasons were unable to obtain loans from the conventional lending institutions. All are, therefore, in the "high risk" category. When this legislation was enacted, it was fully intended that risks greater than those normally undertaken by the financial institutions would be involved in order to create additional employment, stimulate exports and replace imports.

The onus of deciding whether or not a guarantee should be provided, and the terms and conditions which should apply, was placed upon the financial advisory committee. I would add that all of the recommendations of the financial advisory committee have been implemented in full without any change. This committee, which is composed of representatives of business, commerce, labour and government, has done an outstanding job, and I am very grateful to the members for the assistance which they have rendered.

Guarantees have been provided to firms located in many parts of the province. The hon. members might be interested to know that 12 of these guarantees have supported the establishment of entirely new types of manufactured products, such as certain sporting goods, modern jet-propulsion motors, commercial aircraft, electronic devices, as well as the introduction of novel machining techniques.

The agency also assisted in the establishment of a foreign company in a small town in Ontario to produce an entirely new product

for Canada, formerly imported from the United States. This concern, which is now providing 15 jobs, will be doubling its staff within the next few months.

Of the companies which have been assisted, four have not been successful and are in the process of being wound up. In one instance, assets of the company appear to be sufficient to retire in full the province's guarantee. In the case of the three other unsuccessful companies, it would appear that the province will be called upon to honour its guarantees to the extent of approximately \$300,000. I would point out that all financial institutions incur losses and this is part of the risk of doing business. In the case of the Ontario Development Agency the risks involved are much higher than those for the conventional institutions, because all applicants must have been unable to obtain their financing elsewhere and are therefore in the high-risk category. Most of the other firms which have received guarantees are performing satisfactorily while some have exceeded our expectations.

In 15 instances, agency guarantees have resulted in additional monies in the amount of \$3.5 million being made available by the conventional lending institutions. For example, a firm in northern Ontario was able to obtain a line of credit from a chartered bank in the amount of \$400,000 and \$450,000 from another institution for the erection of a new plant and its equipment, contingent upon the Ontario Development Agency guaranteeing additional working capital of \$200,000. In other words, by providing \$200,000 through a guarantee, the agency forged the last link in a financial deal amounting to over \$1 million. As I mentioned previously, in 14 other instances additional financing was obtained contingent upon the province's guarantee.

Another service rendered by the agency has been to actively assist Ontario-based companies in their financial negotiations with the conventional lending institutions. Twelve companies have been assisted in this manner and have been successful in obtaining \$2.9 million in additional financing. In these cases, as distinct from the advisory cases, considerable work was done by the agency's consultants to help companies which could qualify, to set up a basis for financial negotiations with outside lending institutions.

About 40 companies were successful in obtaining a further \$2 million financing from conventional lending institutions as a direct result of the advisory services with which they were provided. In these instances, only negligible participation in actual financial negotiations was required.

Many owners of small businesses are unaware, for example, of the institution they should approach for the type of financing they require. Others are unaware of the requirements that must be met before lenders will consider additional financing. Our experience has shown that a large number of smaller companies can, in fact, obtain the financing they need, provided they obtain competent guidance in presenting their cases.

All had previously attempted to secure financing but had been unsuccessful mainly because of the lack of technique in submitting their financial proposals in a manner satisfactory to potential lenders. In some instances a complete financial and managerial reconstruction was required. In others a revamping was necessary of the proposed security. In all these cases the financial and technical know-how of the agency's consultants proved to be a key factor in the successful conclusion of negotiations.

Although the provision of advisory services is not as spectacular as that of financing, I view this aspect of the agency's operations as the more important. If Ontario's industry is to thrive, it has to be efficient. Basic to efficient operations are good management and sound operating techniques.

There is a dearth of good management not only in Ontario and Canada, but also throughout the western world. This is particularly true for small businesses where resources are limited. This lack of good management and lack of knowledge often result in the utilization of inferior operating techniques.

Realizing that this situation exists, the agency recruited consultants, many of whom were actively engaged in private practice after retirement from high executive office in commerce and industry. Among them are professional engineers, professional accountants, and men with broad experience in general management, research and development, manufacturing techniques, domestic and foreign marketing, economics and finance. These consultants, whose talents might otherwise have been wasted, have brought a wealth of experience and judgment to bear on the problems of more than 700 Ontario companies, which have benefited from their advice. I might add that *Business Week* last week had an article saying the U.S. was going to do exactly the same thing—use retired business executives to help small businesses.

There is no doubt that as a result of the advice they received, a large number of these companies are now operating more

profitably and efficiently. Many have achieved improvements in costing systems, marketing techniques, financial structure and general and administrative methods. From the numerous letters of appreciation we have received, it is abundantly clear that these advisory services are filling a real need, particularly in the area of small business. There is no other jurisdiction in Canada which provides a service of this breadth and quality.

One of the first steps taken by the agency upon its formation was to come to a working arrangement with the Ontario research foundation for the scientific evaluation of new products and new techniques. The successful marketing of improved industrial products and the development of more economical processes are major means by which Ontario's economy can continue to expand. On the other hand, these are areas in which small companies, and particularly individual inventors, encounter the greatest difficulty in obtaining competent advice and financial accommodation. The agency ensures that inventions which come to its attention are rapidly evaluated with the help of the Ontario research foundation.

To date, 40 products have been referred for scientific evaluation to the Ontario Research Foundation. Not all of these new ideas have proved to be feasible, and the inventors were advised accordingly. Other inventions—technically sound—required managerial, advisory and financial aid before they could be put into production.

Twelve of the 70 new products and processes which have been dealt with by the agency have gone into production with the support of provincial guarantees, while 12 more are either in the process of going into production or appear likely to do so within the near future without provincial financing. Several other of these applications are under consideration.

In summary, as a result of its activities to date, the Ontario Development Agency has arranged financing of \$12.2 million for Ontario industry. Employment in the plants which have received guarantees now totals over 1,300 persons, with another 1,300 new jobs in process of creation, for a total exceeding 2,600 employment opportunities. The \$2.9 million of financing without government participation, which has been confirmed through conventional lending institutions, is providing employment for not less than 600 persons. At least 400 more persons are now receiving pay cheques because of the financing obtained by the 40 companies that we estimate received loans as a direct result of

our advisory services. Thus, in total, over 3,600 job opportunities have been established, or are in the course of creation, through efforts of the Ontario Development Agency. In addition, Canada's balance-of-trade position will be improved by \$12.5 million because of additional exports amounting to \$9 million and the replacement of imports costing \$3.5 million.

I consider that the programme carried out by the Ontario Development Agency has been, on balance, both successful and practical. By its very nature it involves elements of risk and this should always be borne in mind when assessing its results.

It is quite true that the programme has had its setbacks. Some of these were due to the risk elements to which I have referred, combined with the newness of the venture and the unforeseen problems which all new programmes encounter.

This programme, however, has demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt the need for the services provided by the Ontario Development Agency. As a result of one year of activity, there are plants operating successfully in many places in Ontario, including Windsor, Woodstock, Toronto, Carleton Place, northern Ontario, and many other centres, which would not have been operating and giving employment if this agency had not been in existence. The municipalities are deriving additional assessment and taxation from these companies—revenues which they would otherwise not receive. I believe it has fulfilled a real need.

I touch now on a subject which I understand in the past has brought about some levity in this House, but I am sure it is not a matter of fun for those affected. I would like to talk about the termite problem.

I would like to refer to a matter of specific interest to the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden). A few weeks ago he brought to my attention a most distressing problem affecting property owners in Metropolitan Toronto, particularly in the southeastern part of the city, and subsequently spoke on the matter in this House. Termite infestation, which started with a minor outbreak in the docks area some years ago, has assumed alarming proportions in recent years.

As you know, I am quite new to the housing field and was not conversant with the matter which he raised. However, we have since investigated the problem, which is of great concern to this government in that it constitutes a severe threat to the housing stock and to the homeowner's investment in his property.

The government has arranged to carry out a study in collaboration with the city of Toronto to determine the effect of chemical disinfestation when applied to all structures within a given area. For the purpose of this study, grants of up to 50 per cent of the city's contribution toward the cost of disinfestation will be made up to a maximum of \$125 per dwelling or structure. Concurrently, all dwellings and other structures will be thoroughly examined to determine the extent of termite damage and the estimated cost of repairs.

The study will be carried out in certain designated areas of the city which will be selected in consultation with city officials. Participation by the Ontario government in this project will be contingent upon the city enacting by-laws as contemplated in The Planning Act. And we are hopeful this can be undertaken with a minimum of delay.

I will look forward to receiving constructive recommendations on a matter of this kind from the hon. members and can assure you I will do my best to expedite a solution. I might add that we are allotting \$150,000 for the next three years to this programme. I am sure it will be matched by the city of Toronto and I hope we can involve our federal friends at a later date.

One of the programmes of major interest, I am sure, to all hon. members of this House, is the matter of housing. I would like to cover that now and I think you will find what we have to say of great interest.

The federal-provincial housing programme has now been underway for about 14 years. During that time, successive provincial Ministers have brought their housing estimates before this House in the sure knowledge of being criticized for not spending the previous fiscal year's allocation of funds. Never have our expenditures on housing exceeded the capital budget. In most years, expenditures have fallen far short, sometimes by as much as 50 per cent.

Understandably, we measure the success or failure of the housing programme not by the amount of work carried out during the year but by the dollars spent and the number of houses completed.

I am confident we would not judge the housing programme on this basis if we were fully aware of all the factors involved in producing housing when several levels of government are concerned.

For instance, surveys to determine the precise need and demand for rental housing were completed by the housing branch in 16 municipalities in 1963. Of these, 13 showed

a definite need for housing projects and the municipalities concerned were advised of this need. However, after giving the municipalities the completed survey reports, only six requested that we proceed with projects.

It must be remembered that when a municipality requests a survey, after the provincial government has completed the study involving considerable work and expense, it is still the prerogative of the municipality to decide if it wants a housing project or not.

Often there are instances where a municipality has bowed to local pressures and cancelled a project when planning was virtually completed and tenders about to be called. Under these circumstances we have no other alternative than to renegotiate a new arrangement with the municipality, if possible, to overcome local objection, or to withdraw completely.

In view of the criticisms of the housing programme in general, some I assure you unwarranted, but nonetheless sufficiently factual to make one approach a new housing concept with caution, sir, it is my firm belief that, with the full co-operation of our federal partner, the plans contemplated for the new year will enable this department to put into operation a programme to meet Ontario's housing requirements which will not only be workable with the least amount of aggravation and delay, but will be mutually acceptable to the various levels of governments concerned.

This government has always been prepared to provide the funds needed to develop a sound housing programme. Unfortunately, the ability to spend the money allotted for this purpose has all too often encountered difficulties beyond the control of the government. We recognize that the root of the problem is not lack of funds provided for this purpose but more a lack of co-ordination on the part of all involved in housing projects generally. Following numerous discussions with the federal authorities who have been most co-operative, we now feel that a more comprehensive programme can be initiated immediately certain contemplated changes in The National Housing Act come into effect.

In order that all of us may more fully understand the housing programme I am proposing for the future, I believe it is of prime importance to review the housing programme under which we have been operating up to the present time.

Some hon. members will recall that the public housing programme came to a virtual standstill in 1959. Rising costs and high interest rates had placed a premium on the

production of housing. Economic rentals were beyond the means of low-income families and our housing was no longer meeting the needs of those families we were supposed to be helping. Municipalities which had helped to subsidize rentals were no longer interested in sharing this burden.

The government of Ontario carried out a searching economic study of the housing programme during 1959-60 and, after conferring with the other levels of government involved, introduced in October, 1960 the financial arrangements and rent-to-income formula for rental projects which is in effect today.

Despite the difficulties to which I have referred, a great deal has been accomplished by the housing branch over the last three years. In order that hon. members may more fully appreciate the extent of this work I would like to outline very briefly the preparatory work which precedes every development.

As hon. members all know, it is the municipality which initiates a project by submitting a request to the province. To ensure that municipalities are aware of the housing programme, representatives of the housing branch have appeared before over 70 municipal councils during the last three years to explain the terms and conditions under which projects are developed and to show photographs of existing projects.

When a municipality requests the housing branch to establish whether there is a need in the community for low rental housing, research staff of the branch carry out a survey during which they try to contact all families who may be in need of better housing or who cannot afford to rent privately owned accommodation. In addition, they interview local employers, the clergy, and other leading members of the community in order to obtain a broad picture of its housing needs, wage structure and general economy.

For a medium size town, the field work usually takes about two weeks, following which all of the material obtained is compiled in a report which indicates, among other things, the number and size of houses required and the approximate rentals which the applicants will be able to pay. This report is then sent to the municipality which may or may not reject a project.

In 1961, for example, the housing branch completed nine surveys at the request of municipalities. Although eight of these surveys established a definite need for rental housing, only four municipalities asked for projects. Again in 1962, 43 surveys were

completed and although 25 of these proved beyond any doubt that housing projects were urgently needed, only eight municipalities acted on the survey report by requesting projects. There was a marked improvement in 1963 in that 16 surveys were completed, of which 13 justified development of projects. However, 18 rental projects were requested by municipalities, some based on surveys completed over the past two years.

So, over the three-year period, the housing branch has completed a total of 68 surveys, 46 of which justified going ahead with projects; but only 30 municipalities have shown a willingness to participate by requesting one.

I have outlined the preparatory work done over the past three years to expedite the housing programme in this province and I am sure you will have by now recognized the magnitude of the job that has to be carried out before a project gets underway, and how frequently all of this work proves to be fruitless. Nevertheless, during the three years, nine rental housing projects and ten land assembly projects were completed, and at the end of 1963 there were a greater number of projects either under construction, with tenders about to be called, or in the planning stage, than in any previous year.

I am sure you would be interested in knowing the municipalities where rental housing projects are under development or planning for 1964. Projects should be under construction during the year in Belleville, Chatham, Cochrane, Collingwood, Delhi, Dunnville, Fort Frances, Galt, Hamilton, Kapuskasing, Kingston, Lindsay, London, Metro Toronto (five), Midland, Oakville, Oshawa, Ottawa (four), Palmerston, Parry Sound, Port Arthur, Sudbury, Timmins, Toronto township and Woodstock.

Apart from the rental housing programme under which we buy land, subdivide and service it, then build houses for rental, there is also a land assembly programme. For this, raw land is purchased, subdivided and serviced with roads, sewers, water, and so on, then the lots are sold to families who wish to build a house for their own occupancy. Parcels of land are also set aside for schools, churches, parks and other forms of development in order to provide a balanced community.

Land assembly projects of this kind will be under development in 1964 in Brantford, Brockville, Cornwall, Dunnville, Galt, Guelph, Hamilton, Kingston, Metro Toronto (two), Michipicoten, Napanee, Nepean township, Penetang, Peterborough (two), St. Thomas, Sandwich East, Tillsonburg and Trenton.

May I point out that over the years the federal authorities have shown a marked reluctance to participate with us in projects, either rental housing or land assembly, in municipalities of under 5,000 population, or in one-industry towns. This excluded many of the northern communities and smaller centres which are included in the municipalities I have just drawn to your attention. Last year we prevailed upon the federal government to remove these restrictions and now any community, no matter its size or location, can request and qualify for a rental housing project provided housing is needed. For example, a 20-unit project will be starting within a few weeks in the town of Palmerston, population 1,500.

While on the subject of our current programme I would like to say a few words about the "12-point plan" which was introduced in 1962. I believe it was a good programme and showed initiative and courage, but unfortunately it depended in many respects on the willingness of other levels of government to participate. Before we dismiss the 12-point plan, however, let me review a few of the things it has accomplished.

It promised greater federal-provincial co-operation. This has been achieved and is reflected in the great number of projects now under development, many of which are in communities where, up until a year ago, the federal government would never have agreed to develop housing.

It included the rent certificate plan. This was put into operation in Metro where 245 units have been leased to date and are costing this government \$120,000 per year in rental subsidies, of which it bears the entire cost. It has not been expanded for the simple reason that the federal government shows no interest in sharing this cost.

The programme included grants to limited dividend companies. We have already made a grant of \$903,000 to the Moss Park rental project in the city of Toronto. This will provide the housing authority with a rent reduction fund of approximately \$48,000 per annum during the life of the federal mortgage. It will be used to reduce the rents of those families who most need some financial assistance.

Just a week or two ago I was pleased to announce a grant of \$520,000 toward the cost of a senior citizens development at Thistle-town in Etobicoke. This project, which is to be built by the Metropolitan Housing Company, is the first of its kind in Ontario and will comprise 418 self-contained apartment units, each with full cooking facilities: 102

hotel-type units with communal dining services; a lounge, auditorium, and craft rooms. The Ontario government grant will provide a rent reduction fund of some \$30,400 per annum to reduce rentals where most needed. In addition to the \$520,000 grant, the province is guaranteeing that part of the mortgage applicable to the hotel-type accommodation, dining and other facilities. This portion of the mortgage amounts to about \$800,000 and the federal government would not have made the loan without a provincial guarantee.

This project, which is also receiving financial assistance from the Atkinson Foundation, will be an outstanding example of what can be done to provide good accommodation, excellent meals at nominal cost, and the facilities and environment to ensure that life is made full and interesting for the elderly people who will reside there.

The programme promised that the needs of small municipalities and special groups would be looked into, and I have already told you that the housing programme is now available to any community where there is a need for housing. Last year we completed a small pilot project for Indian families living under extremely poor conditions in the town of Red Lake, and I am sure you have read the article on this experiment which appeared in the February issue of *Ontario Housing*. The housing branch is now working with another Indian community which will, I hope, result in the development later this year of a larger project near the town of McIntosh.

Studies to determine the feasibility of buying existing houses to supplement the supply of government-constructed rental housing were to be carried out. In point of fact, The Housing Development Act has provided for this form of activity since 1962, but The National Housing Act does not. This matter has been diligently pursued with the federal authorities and we are confident that the proposed amendments to The National Housing Act will permit the purchase of such houses.

We have already made a start by optioning houses in the north end redevelopment area of the city of Hamilton. These houses will be rehabilitated and rented to families eligible for public housing.

Research grants in the amount of \$15,000 have been made over the past year. Studies which have been carried out are:

The social implications of public housing in Metropolitan Toronto—being carried out by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority; methods of obtaining data on the need and

demand for low rental housing on a continuing basis—by Dr. John Dakin, University of Toronto; a national study of public housing—under the direction of Professor James A. Murray.

A very important aspect of the housing programme was the appointment of an Ontario housing advisory committee to advise the government on all matters pertaining to housing in Ontario. This committee functions under the able chairmanship of Mr. K. D. Soble, of Hamilton.

As a result of its investigations into the Ontario housing scene the committee concluded that any proposals for a diversified housing programme could not adequately be carried out by a branch of government, and a special committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. A. E. Diamond to go into the matter in some depth. Mr. Soble and Mr. Diamond have recently reported to me on the findings of the subcommittee and I will refer to these as I deal with our proposals for a future housing programme.

I would now like to outline this government's plans for a broader housing programme in Ontario, which we are confident will eliminate many of the inherent weaknesses of the present programme, such as: too many levels of government involved, each able to retard or stop a project; time-consuming procedures involving a multitude of approvals before a project gets under way; the limited scope of government-designed and constructed projects resulting in houses too easily identifiable as public housing units; no incentive for the tenant to improve his financial circumstances, in that increased earnings result in higher rent and ultimately in "notice to vacate" or a 30-per-cent surcharge on all earnings over a given amount.

While these are perhaps some of the major difficulties experienced, there are, of course, many minor frustrations which I am sure can be eliminated.

We have based our future housing programme on the changes contemplated in The National Housing Act, two of which are of great significance to this province. The resolution introduced last year by the then federal Minister responsible for housing indicated that provinces which wished to run their own public housing programmes with the assistance of long-term federal loans and sharing of operating losses will be able to do so, and that existing houses in any part of the community may be purchased for this purpose.

Under the programme contemplated, the province could assume full jurisdiction for

planning, directing and administering the housing programme with costs being shared. The governments need no longer design and construct houses, but instead would be able to take full advantage of the building industry's design know-how and cost-saving techniques.

For example, having decided on the need, location and size of project required, the province could invite builders to submit proposals on a competitive basis for houses of a certain size and standard but using their own designs. In terms of time and economy, I believe substantial savings could be made. I think we read a few weeks ago where one Ontario company got a \$15 million project in Buffalo.

Another method could be the purchase of houses in existing subdivisions wherever economically feasible. This method presents a sure way of integrating public housing tenants into the mainstream of the community and of providing accommodation in a minimum of time.

This same method can be applied in suitable older areas of our municipalities. Certain of these houses may well need some degree of rehabilitation, but if this is economically feasible we will have accomplished the double service of providing family housing and also helping to improve a neighbourhood. In certain instances we may well buy larger houses and duplex them for small families.

As you may already know, tenancy of public housing is at present restricted to families within a certain income range and to elderly persons. The family income limit for eligibility varies according to the wage structure of the municipality involved. At the moment this ranges from \$4,561 per annum in most municipalities to \$5,111 in Hamilton. Again, let me emphasize that this is a family income figure.

The point I am making is that public housing is not tenanted exclusively by welfare cases; in fact it is not usual for more than ten per cent of the tenants of a project to be in receipt of welfare.

The large majority of tenants are very ordinary, hard-working people who do not have the financial resources at the time to purchase a home or rent accommodation on the private market. We have to offer these families an incentive to improve their financial position in life, not discourage them with penalty rents or notice to quit when they substantially increase their income.

Here is an indication of what we would like to do if the federal government is prepared to co-operate with us. Our discussions

with the late John R. Garland gave us every reason to believe that we may expect to receive the complete support of the federal government in our endeavours to initiate major administrative changes in Ontario's housing programme.

In future projects a public-housing tenant could be permitted to purchase the house in which he has lived for a number of years when his income reaches a certain point. Each tenant would be told when he rented the house that if his income improved to a point where a penalty rent became payable, he would be given an opportunity to purchase the house at normal NHA interest rates. If his income increased to the penalty level immediately after occupancy and before a reasonable "proving" period as a tenant had elapsed, the penalty rent would be held in trust against the time when he subsequently assumed the mortgage. In other words, any rental payments over and above the economic rent of the house would not be a loss to the tenant but would be "banked" on his behalf.

It would not be possible for tenants of apartment projects, such as Regent Park South, to purchase the units which they occupied, but arrangements could be made whereby interested families could in time transfer to a house which they would then have the opportunity of purchasing. This kind of scheme could also be made available to childless couples who are not eligible for public housing at the present time.

The homeowner instinct is surprisingly strong in most families, and many prefer to live in what may be totally inadequate accommodation but which they hope one day to own. I have said that the income range for public housing is as high as \$5,000 in certain parts of Ontario. Over 13,000 families within this range purchased homes under NHA financing in 1963, and approximately the same number in the preceding three years.

We appreciate that there are a significant number of families who will always need assistance if they are to occupy decent accommodation, and these families will receive our help. However, we should not forget the other end of the scale—the families who, with just a little help could become wholly self-sufficient and proud homeowners in their community.

After many months of investigation into the housing needs of Ontario, the housing advisory committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. K. D. Soble, has recommended that a provincial housing corporation be constituted, responsible to a Cabinet Minister but

operating under a board of directors. The committee believes that such a corporation could achieve far greater diversification in its operations than does a department or branch of government. The corporation, being a provincial body, would be able to deal with Ontario's housing problems as separate and distinct from the federal agency, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which must of necessity deal with housing problems on a national basis.

Such a corporation could assume responsibility for the planning, direction and administration of all aspects of the housing programme, including any or all of the activities which I have suggested. The board of directors would replace the present housing advisory committee but would act in a similar capacity in all matters affecting housing in Ontario.

The advisory committee has already made certain recommendations as to the activities of the proposed corporation, including the provision of home improvement loans, mortgages on older dwellings, loan guarantees, assistance to co-operative housing groups, and financial and other assistance in connection with the conservation of the existing housing stock. All of these proposals will be studied, and if feasible will be implemented.

We are confident that changes in The National Housing Act will be forthcoming shortly which will give the province greater freedom to assist municipalities in meeting their housing needs. Accordingly, I will be bringing a bill before this House to provide for the setting up of an Ontario housing corporation so that we may take full advantage of the anticipated changes in The National Housing Act when they come into effect.

In conclusion, may I say that while I have yet to learn a lot more about housing, this in itself presents a challenge, and furthermore, I consider housing to be one of the most worthwhile programmes under my jurisdiction. I have outlined to you the problems inherent in the programme as it is today and what we propose to do in the future. These proposals have been given considerable thought and are not made idly or without due consideration to the fact that the betterment of living conditions for all segments of our population can have a far-reaching effect on Ontario's economic and social structure.

On vote 401:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, it has been interesting to listen to the hon. Minister of Economics and Develop-

ment for the better part of two hours. It has been interesting to follow his comments and compare them with the comments which came forward a year ago.

I may be wrong in my conclusion, but it appears to me, as I have gone through the speeches of the hon. Minister's predecessor (Mr. Macaulay), that an effort was made, whether conscious or unconscious, to create a brand-new image.

There is a very different approach in what this hon. Minister says to what his predecessor said. His predecessor was a man who believed in strong and positive statements. He had a 12-point programme for this and a nine-point programme for that and a 7.5-point programme for something else. None of his programmes filled that hon. gentleman with extreme modesty, because they were all achievable and attainable within the next 12-month period.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No, yesterday!

Mr. Singer: Well, as my hon. colleague from Sudbury says, probably yesterday, because the Minister of that time suddenly had discovered that these things were needed. And if he discovered they were needed then they had to be done yesterday.

It is very interesting to compare, as I say, Mr. Chairman, the approach of the two Ministers, because this hon. Minister has paid little more than passing reference to the old image. He has ignored—if he studied and I suppose he did—all these many point programmes. He has ignored many of the goals his predecessor set for achievement, and nowhere more pointedly has he ignored these things than in the question of housing.

I propose to deal with housing later on in my remarks but it is a pity that the programme which was hailed and applauded in government publications as probably the greatest thing North America ever saw, in the usual modesty which accompanied such performances in those days, has now been discarded. I have here a publication, *Ontario Housing*, of October, 1963, which says:

Mr. Macaulay has greatly advanced the cause of public housing in Canada. With his 12-point housing programme announced in 1962 he has been described by the United States housing commissioner as being ten years in advance of anything on the North American continent. His tremendous enthusiasm, his knack of becoming truly involved in his task, his ability to accomplish that which at first seems just a little impossible, have all been an inspiration to the housing branch.

This hon. Minister took some 20-odd pages of his speech to quietly inter the great 12-point programme which was ten years in advance of anything anyone had seen in North America. He says he did not do it really because there was a lot of merit in it, and maybe if there was some fault it existed up in Ottawa; but, as I say, I propose a little later on in my remarks to make some substantial references to the housing programme.

The hon. Minister starts out, as properly he should, in commenting on the economic situation in the province today. He paid fair tribute, I would say, to the role of the federal government. He did not take on to himself or his government all of the credit for what has happened in this country in the past 12-month fiscal period. I think that he has noted in passing, although he did not happen to mention it, that not too long ago there was a change in government in Ottawa. Coincidental with that change, there was a real upsurge in the economy and I would suggest that—perhaps it might not lie too well in this hon. Minister's mouth to say it but I will say it—some very substantial credit can, should, and must be given to those who are in charge of our affairs in this field in the federal government.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): One might say they get along better with their enemies than they do with their friends.

Mr. Singer: Yes, as my hon. leader suggests, it is not only true but I think it must be emphasized: This government appears to get along much better with their apparent enemies than they did with their friends, because in the five years preceding 1962 there seemed to be great complaints emanating from here, great grasping on to these branches of authority which normally belong in Ottawa. Now that Ottawa is running well and the government there is accepting its responsibility as it should, this government is happy to withdraw and let Ottawa carry on and promote generally the well-being of the country. This is as it should be. It was unfortunate we had this five-year pause.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They had the same difficulty with their friends as Hepburn did.

Mr. Singer: On the way by I did spend some considerable time making notes on the remarks of the hon. Minister's predecessor. I was hoping he would deal, point by point, with the various projects his predecessor had outlined as goals for the day, or goals for

the week, or the year. He mentioned for instance a three-part survey of the ONR, its uses and purposes; he took that upon himself in his capacity as Minister of Economics. The present hon. Minister of Economics did not join in the debate yesterday and I wonder what happened to the three-point economic survey into the use of the ONR. I think that would have been very valuable, and could have been a very substantial contribution to the debate yesterday which dealt with the Ontario Northland Railway.

An hon. member: Where is the former Minister now?

Mr. Singer: There was a programme suggested of extension to northern communications in the amount of \$7.2 million. We heard very little about that again. The hon. Minister's predecessor talked at some great length about development in northern Ontario, about moving industry around, about decentralization and so on. I hardly heard a word in his address this afternoon about northern Ontario. Yes, there were passing references to regional development; and regional development the hon. Minister compared to the cold war. These are high-sounding phrases indeed, but where is the regional development in northern Ontario?

At least the hon. Minister's predecessor recognized there was a problem. I suppose, in preparing for his remarks this afternoon, the hon. Minister must have admitted to himself there was a problem, but it did not lie well to just repeat what had been said last year because really there is nothing to report. My hon. colleague who comes from northern Ontario undoubtedly will deal with these facts at some greater length before these estimates are through, but I think it is a matter that should be carefully noted. Notwithstanding the high-sounding phrases and promises put forward by the hon. Minister's predecessor just a year ago, we heard very little today about this government's plans for the well-being of northern Ontario.

The hon. Minister's predecessor talked at some very substantial length about a point which I think is most important to our future development; this is to do with the retention in this country, in this province, of professionally trained people. He advised us that we were short some 23,000 professionally trained scientists, and he did set forward a programme where he thought that this lack could be diminished and we would have more scientific people available to us.

This has been referred to as a "brain drain" in England. It is a very serious

problem and I think we should have heard something today about what this hon. Minister proposes to do in connection with keeping in this province, and in this country, those people who are trained here. We need scientific minds; we need people with good scientific background, training and understanding; but we do not seem to have any programme or any idea of how to keep them here. Although, again, the hon. Minister's predecessor recognized this as a problem we heard very little elaboration on it this afternoon.

In the field of agriculture, the hon. Minister's predecessor had a habit that was perhaps annoying to some of his colleagues—he strayed into almost every department of government—but he thought that in the field of agriculture the economic council could make substantial achievements. There were going to be studies about marketing and sale of products. I think the fiasco we had earlier this year, insofar as tobacco marketing is concerned, would cause us to wonder on this side of the House just how far the hon. Minister has progressed with the agriculture committee of the economic council, what sort of suggestions the gentlemen have been able to bring forward, what sort of communication has come from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development through his colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), so that we could have a better agricultural climate in the province of Ontario. This was another one of the goals the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) set, and this goal seems to have vanished with his departure.

In so far as housing is concerned, let me leave that for a moment. I have it at this point in my notes because that was the point at which the hon. member for Riverdale dealt with it in his speech, but I will come back to that shortly.

The hon. member for Riverdale talked about the retraining of the labour force, and even a year ago there was great vagueness as to how this was going to be achieved. I was disappointed, again, in hearing very little reference to methods of retraining, the co-ordination of various efforts of this hon. Minister, when he strays into the labour field, and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree).

We have before us a bill that is of great concern to many people in Ontario, the bill relating to stationary engineers. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is as aware as anyone that the real problem in dealing with the trade of stationary engineers is that with the advances

in technical science many thousands of men who are making their living as stationary engineers are no longer going to be able to make a living in this way.

So really it is an economic problem; it is a problem of automation. It is a problem of the advance of science catching up with the whole trade of stationary engineers. This is one of the reasons why we had this large delegation here in the House when the hon. Minister of Labour brought in his new bill. I would have hoped that with this current example, because that bill has not even worked its way through the House, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development could not have found a better place in which to say: "Here is a trade that has a serious problem. Here is a trade that modern technology is making less and less important. Here are thousands of citizens of Ontario who are going to find themselves with less ability to make a living with a lesser number of jobs."

I would have hoped that with this trade, or any other, the hon. Minister would have come to us today and said: "This is what we propose and this is how we are going to embark upon a retraining programme so that these citizens of ours, these people in Ontario who are facing this very serious problem, will be able to continue to have a responsible place in our society. We are going to train them in new jobs, and this is the way we are doing it."

But we heard not a word of this, this afternoon, Mr. Chairman—not a word. I suppose the hon. Minister's predecessor built us up to too great heights because he was prepared to take on the whole world. There was not a Cabinet position about which he did not have some suggestions to make. Now it may be that this hon. Minister is much more modest. He says, "There is a labour problem; I will leave it to the Minister of Labour." Or, "There is an agricultural problem; I will leave it to the Minister of Agriculture." Or, "There is a tourist problem—" This hon. Minister did mention this afternoon a little bit about The Department of Tourism and Information, but his predecessor had almost moved in and taken over.

Joint letters came out. Joint letters came out. It may be, as I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is a little more modesty here. But I say that the type of problem that the hon. member for Riverdale recognized and at least promised that he was going to do something about, seems to have vanished from the thinking of this hon. Minister and his department.

It may be that this is the way that this hon. Minister envisages the functioning of his department. If this is so, then Mr. Chairman, I think we must take another approach because the sort of speech that he made, except for the housing part, is really part of a Budget speech. It was a long speech and it is the sort of report that is made year after year by the Treasurers of various governments, by the Ministers of Finance.

Mr. MacDonald: Well written!

Mr. Singer: Well written. Many economists must have sat and spent many hours preparing it. It is the sort of thing that one expects from a Minister of Finance and it would belong more properly, to my mind, with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) because he is the Minister of Finance for the province of Ontario. The only real excuse for this new department, as I understood it in any event from the approach taken by the hon. member for Riverdale, is that the economic condition of Ontario is the lifeline of the province. He recognized his responsibility to delve into each separate little compartment of government in order to improve those things.

This hon. Minister has withdrawn from all those fields. It may be only his modesty that allows him to do it. But I say that in his economic studies and so on, these could more properly belong in the department assigned to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It may be that this presages the Cabinet shuffle that we heard talked about over the past few weeks. It probably will not take place until the House rises, but it may be we have heard the new Provincial Treasurer make his maiden address in that portfolio. If so, then we should get The Department of Economics and Development into its proper aspect and recognize that today it should be more than an adjunct to The Provincial Treasurer's Department.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That is a very old-fashioned approach.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for Woodbine talks about an old-fashioned approach. The voters in the province he used to work in took an old-fashioned approach yesterday, they decided they were fed up with some of the ideas that they had had—

An hon. member: Who won? Who won?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would think that one of the things that is important in an election is the day they count up the ballots and they find out who forms the government.

The hon. member for Woodbine's party did not form the government as a result of what happened yesterday and that speaks for itself—old-fashioned approach or not.

If the hon. member for Woodbine had been listening to my remarks a little later on, I was comparing the approach of the hon. member for Riverdale with the approach of the present hon. Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that I have to try to explain things to a person who has closed his mind. We will just let him read it in *Hansard*. I am sure that if he will pay enough attention to the remarks as they are reported in *Hansard*, even he might understand.

One of the points that the hon. member for Riverdale mentioned was the talk of industrial incentives. This is something that we spoke about at some length on this side of the House a year, two years and three years ago. The hon. member for Riverdale apparently thought it was a good idea. Well, I listened carefully to the speech of the hon. Minister this afternoon, and could not find any mention of the idea of industrial incentives.

We talked about the use of hydro with reduced rates to encourage industries to locate in certain areas, and the use of the ONR. These are things I touch on very briefly. I deplore the lack of initiative on the hon. Minister's part in not following up suggestions that were made by his predecessor a year ago in these particular phases.

We have heard substantial reference to the Ontario Development Agency this afternoon. I am inclined to agree with the hon. Minister when he says that somewhere along the line there must be some failures, but I would suspect that more than a few of the efforts in any event were less than satisfactory. I suspect that before the estimates are over he is going to hear a little more about at least one of them.

The hon. member for Riverdale talked about taking a new look at the immigration policy. There was no end of things he was going to examine. I wonder if his successor has taken that look at the immigration policy, and I wonder what he is going to suggest to the federal government.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): He gave you all the ideas you are expressing today.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who formed part of the government—

Mr. Sopha: That hippo was not modelled on the hon. Minister of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, mine was the moose.

Mr. Singer: The trade crusade, and my hon. friend makes mention of the moose, started with the hippo—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Meanwhile, back at the estimates—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Well, back at the review of the hon. member for Riverdale's speech of last year.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I think it is most important. I am very glad the hon. Prime Minister mentioned "back at the review of the hon. member for Riverdale's speech of last year." It is an amazing thing. One of the remarks that this hon. Minister made was that this government first came into being in November, 1961. Now we have heard the hon. Prime Minister say this on many occasions, in fact he knows, as everybody else does, this is a 21-year-old government. The faces change a little bit but it is still the same government. Even if there is some purpose in repeating this remark, I am surprised to hear the hon. Prime Minister deplore the fact that I am commenting on the speech made by his senior Minister of only a year ago. Just because he left, has the hon. Prime Minister discarded his ideas? Does he repudiate him this afternoon? Is that all gone by the board, everything that the former Minister said? Is that finished; is that the end?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not deplore—I just commented.

Mr. Singer: Well, the hon. Prime Minister's comment spoke for itself. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when the hon. member for Riverdale left, the government in fact died. The hon. Prime Minister lacks, in his present Cabinet, a man of the intelligence and ability to come forward with new ideas. This is why we have this deplorable show that this government has put forward in the present session.

An hon. member: His ideas were not carried out.

Mr. Singer: That is right.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: It is funny. The hon. member did not say that about him when he was here.

Mr. Singer: His absence has made us appreciate some of the good ideas he had and it is a pity, Mr. Chairman, that all of these things have been abandoned so quickly, the same way as they gave away the record of the old government — that old government which went in in 1943—and they talked about themselves only being a year and a half old. We are moving up to date; anything a previous Minister says in any department apparently is not part of policy if he is gone.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the trade crusade and the mention of the hippo which gave way to the moose and now to the unfashionably dressed girl—I do not know which advertising agency produced that last image on the poster—I was very pleased, however, to see the carefully couched references in the hon. Minister's remarks to the reduction of advertising in Ontario and the concentration of advertising in other spheres. This at least will remove from our eyes some of the obnoxious features of the government's advertising—and some of it has been awfully poor—and will perhaps subject other jurisdictions to them. I would hope they will have more success in some of these other jurisdictions than apparently they have had here.

The former Minister spoke with great pride about the messages he delivered in New York and Chicago and Los Angeles and other international points. I wonder if this hon. Minister has felt it important to go on international jaunts delivering the Ontario message. If so, again he is a little more modest about them, because we have not heard about his recent trips.

He talked about the women's division of his department—and at that point the hon. Minister of Mines saw fit to applaud because the hon. Minister said the women are doing a fine job—and the hon. Minister of Mines said, "This is great, this is great." But I did notice that several months ago an advertisement was put forward by his department asking for applications for a director of that branch.

An hon. member: Why does the hon. Minister of Mines not apply for it?

Mr. Singer: Several weeks ago, in answer to a question asked from this side of the House, which I think the hon. Minister of

Economics misinterpreted, he did say that that appointment had not yet been made. But if this division is working so well and is so efficient and so important, one would have thought that the appointment which was advertised—oh, I guess four months ago or more—would have been filled by now.

I would like the hon. Minister to tell us what is happening in that department because my mind goes back to the remarks made by my colleague, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), about the description of one of the affairs the hon. member for Riverdale ran in one of the hotels.

Mr. MacDonald: Those were pretty cheap remarks.

Mr. Singer: About the functions of the women's division. It is all very fine to pay tribute to the women's division and say that the women are most important in the programme of the economic development of the province. But rather than pay lip service of the kind the hon. Minister has done, if there is a positive programme to which he is moving forward, if he has a civil service which he has appointed and which is prepared to deal with it, I would have hoped that he would have been able to spell out in some detail what that programme is, and at least tell the House how that programme is going to be carried on and by whom. We have not heard anything about that at all.

The hon. member for Riverdale talked about the decentralization of industry, and again the mention of the importance of northern Ontario in this sort of programme is most important. We have heard nothing at all about how the hon. Minister proposes to decentralize industry; nor has there been any real indication that those areas which are crying out for industrial assistance in job employment and so on, other than in the general broad picture, are being looked after.

What, for instance, has been done for Cornwall? What, for instance, has been done for Windsor? What, for instance, is being done in northern Ontario? Those are the things we should have heard about.

The Minister, a year ago, talked about runaway industries and there have been several examples of runaway industries being moved from one location to another. One of them came to some quite prominent notice in the daily press a few months ago. The Minister did not seem to have anything to say then, nor does he have anything to say now about that particular phase of it.

Sir, the former Minister proposed some nine expansion aids. Amongst those he

mentioned was the conduct of many seminars. I have not heard, this afternoon, any mention of seminars.

Transportation studies were going to be undertaken. This was in line with some of his previous suggestions, but there were no transportation studies referred to at all.

He was going to initiate a new system of Ontario achievement awards. This is a type of encouragement, I suspect, the hon. Minister hoped would produce greater incentive to those people who were going to make certain achievements in the field of manufacturing and other fields. But that seems to have gone by the board.

He talked about his goals for the following year. He was going to have 160 new manufacturing firms make things which were previously imported. Now the hon. Minister did mention this afternoon some 170 branches of American companies which had set up branches in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said 173 new companies; 78 new license agreements.

Mr. Singer: That 173 new companies had opened branches? Well, that is fine. But about the 160 new manufacturing firms to make things which were previously imported, that his predecessor promised a year ago, we have not heard whether the 160 has come, whether any portion of them has come, or whether there are any statistics in relation to their having come. There were going to be 75 new arrangements made to license Ontario manufacturers to make things which were formerly imported. If there are new arrangements to license Ontario manufacturers, again we have not heard about them this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I mentioned 78 of those.

Mr. Singer: Seventy-eight of those? I apologize on that one; I missed that on the way by.

He was going to embark on a programme which would reduce the cost of tooling, manufacturing machinery tools, and so on. If the hon. Minister mentioned that this afternoon, again I missed it, but I do not think he did.

He was going to embark on a programme to urge federal authorities and the other provinces to have a consistent "made in Canada" label. We have heard no reference at all to the labelling of goods and the importance of the "made in Canada" label.

The design awards committee was going to be set up. That again was not referred to this afternoon.

He had all sorts of wonderful ideas. He was going to have an around-the-world, Canadian-built trade ship. Where is the ship? Is it being built? What is the programme? Is it off around the world?

He was going to expand the speakers' bureau. I guess that has really been done, because the speeches which were made all across the country have been very expansive and indicate all sorts of fancy promises.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, on this aspect of the hon. Minister's estimates and his remarks this afternoon, it seems to me that the programme and the goals and the dreams which were presented by the hon. member for Riverdale have been abandoned, and the government would hope that his memory will silently pass away, as he has done, and that we will not hear anything more about these expansive ideas because really we are not in a position to carry them out.

Let me deal with housing for a bit. A year ago there was an important new beginning—and those were the hon. member for Riverdale's exact words—into housing. There was the 12-point programme, which really was to be the greatest thing the world had ever seen. And, as I say, the Minister of that day, in his modest way, in his publication with his picture above it, had somebody admit for him that he had greatly advanced the cause of public housing in Canada. His 12-point housing programme, announced in 1962, had been described as being ten years in advance of anything on the North American continent.

I suggest, having listened this afternoon to the extensive remarks of this hon. Minister, that he does not even recognize that a problem exists. He spent considerable time in talking about housing. He said "Let us not dismiss" or "Before we dismiss the 12-point programme, let us say that it is all Ottawa's fault that we could not carry it out, but let us not dismiss it and we have a new programme." Well, then, his new programme—and it starts about two-thirds of the way through his speech—I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, does not exist at all. It is a bunch of ifs, ands and maybes. We could be doing something or we may be doing something else. There is no programme. There is no plan. There is going to be another series of long studies that might result in all sorts of things. It might result in some houses.

He starts the recommendation part of his programme toward the end of his remarks. He deals at some length with the Ontario housing advisory committee. I wonder if he

could tell us the last time that committee met—the committee as a whole; not the sub-committee, not Mr. Soble and not Mr. Diamond, but the whole committee? I was informed, I hope incorrectly, that that Ontario housing committee, as a group as originally appointed, has not met since this hon. Minister took office. This was one of his predecessor's ideas, as a method of coping with the housing shortage. But whether my information is correct or whether it is not correct—I hope the hon. Minister will correct me—I think it is a shocking thing that the Ontario housing advisory committee has not met since this hon. Minister assumed his present portfolio.

Here is what he says in his programme. He says under the programme the province "could assume" full jurisdiction. Governments need no longer design. The province "could invite" builders. Another method "could be" the purchase of houses. Certain of these houses "may well" be needed. "If this is economically feasible" we might do. In certain instances "we may well" buy larger houses. Here is an indication of what "we would like to do." If a future projects results in public housing a tenant "could be permitted." But arrangements "could be made" whereby interested families. This kind of scheme could also be made available.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, where in all these remarks relating to public housing, is there any programme at all in the mind of the government? How is it going to cope with this very, very serious problem? I am suggesting to you that this hon. Minister—who admits he knows very little about housing; says it is brand new to him—has very little belief or understanding in this field and it is not because there is a lack of material in relation to housing. There has hardly been a newspaper in Ontario that has not commented at great length about the housing shortage. I have a pile of clippings dealing with these matters. Here is the *Star*, and one editorial says "Let Queen's Park step in." This is an editorial dealing with the difficulties in Etobicoke.

An hon. member: The Sudbury *Star*?

Mr. Singer: No, the Toronto *Daily Star* for Friday, November 23, on a page seven article. It says:

Home sweet home. More than 30,000 in Metro lack a decent place to live.

Another article by Professor Anthony Adamson, whom the hon. Minister must know full well, says:

We have taken to public housing like a duck takes to asphalt.

That is the sort of thing that this hon. Minister was talking about this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: How many houses did the government build?

Mr. Singer: That is a very interesting question and I would suggest you ask your hon. colleague. He did not produce that figure this afternoon. What is the number of public houses that the government produced?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: This government has done the greatest housing job—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Another editorial: "Public housing a sorry record," and I think I will read just parts of this "housing by headline":

The joint announcement by Ottawa and Queen's Park that work will start this spring on the \$22 million, 12,000-unit low-income housing project in Thistletown is welcome news.

Well, we all know what is happening. Oh, I forgot one. The hon. Minister's predecessor, during the election campaign, suddenly evolved a great picture of a new complex for the old people. He was going to build a great apartment hotel development, somewhere right in his own riding. Well, with that Minister I guess those plans vanished. I think it was good enough for a day or two, with pictures on the front page of most Ontario papers and another "done" for the election campaign. But it did not happen.

Here is a list of some of the housing projects that were announced in the paper but never did appear on the ground. In September, 1953, an 8,000-unit project near Malvern in Scarborough was going to be built. In March, 1954, there was a Metro promise to spend \$1 million a year for ten years for public housing. That was never done. In March, 1955, Metro approved a \$12 million, 1,100-suite project at Lawrence Heights. Well, that was done. Yes, that was done. In March, 1958, there were going to be 1,000 low-cost units in the suburbs. It was a partial redevelopment of Alexandra Park and Moss Park, and if you know anything about Moss Park, which is finally being built, it is not the sort of housing that does any service to the people who are in need of housing developments and the hon. Minister should know that. In October, 1958, there were going to be some 380 units in Scarborough. In March, 1959, Metro housing committee approved a public housing programme with an objective of 9,000 units by 1965.

Those are the figures the hon. Minister was asking for. I have not heard them this afternoon and I would have hoped I would have heard some, but there are not any figures available. That is why neither he nor I have heard them.

In April, 1959, the Metro council was going to have 1,500 units in Thistletown. In January, 1960, there was a 21-acre site at O'Connor Drive and Victoria Parkway for possible use in low rental housing. And on and on and on. Another editorial is headed: "Thistletown can't wait." This Thistletown one has been going on for a long, long time. Then finally the hon. Minister gets into his portfolio. On January 29, he made a speech in which he forecast a new deal for housing. I do not know if this report is a correct interpretation of his remarks. I hoped at the time I saw the report on his speech that it was a correct interpretation, but there was no announcement of what the new deal would be at that time. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, as I have reviewed the hon. Minister's remarks this afternoon, this government has no housing programme at all—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Of course it has. Most of it is done.

Mr. Singer: Most of it is done.

An hon. member: You are pretty well done, too.

Mr. Singer: Another story: "The neediest wait the longest for low rental housing."

The *Globe and Mail* has done a long series of articles: "Slums with high rents—public housing record." There is no point in reading all of these things into the record. Anyone with any real understanding or appreciation of this subject could find copious material to read, to understand and to evolve a positive programme.

The *Telegram* editorial on November 5 is headed: "Remove the obstacles to the Thistletown project." "Need but dented by Metro's new public housing," said the *Star* on July 25, 1963. "How red tape snarls public housing" was the heading on another article by a special writer in one of the Toronto newspapers.

The Ontario Federation of Labour has done an outstanding job of gathering together material and I am sure the hon. Minister was in receipt of it the same as I was. It is called "Statement on housing." These criticisms do not spare the federal government either. I do not commend the federal government for its lack of action in the housing field, but Mr. Chairman, the main responsibility lies here.

It is not sufficient to say that there are conflicting authorities. There are municipal authorities, federal authorities and so on. The main responsibility lies here, and the main red tape can be cut here, if there was a real belief in the minds of government insofar as public housing was concerned. There is none at all.

I do not think there is any real point in reading the 12-point programme put forward by the hon. member for Riverdale but there are a couple of articles here to which I do want to refer.

One was the very complete study made by P. E. H. Brady, the executive director of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority. It came out in several volumes, the research programmes done as a result of his trips to other jurisdictions, and examinations of what could be done. But in this third volume which contains his recommendations, he goes through many pages of recommendations and criticisms, setting out what is wrong and what could and should, in his opinion, be done.

His major complaint is that there is no clear-cut policy in Canada on public housing and accordingly there are no long-term capital funds available. Although the province of Ontario was the first to come out with a specific housing programme, outlined in this statement a few years ago in 1962, that programme was, I think, sent out the window this afternoon.

There is no point, really, in my reading all of these pages of recommendations from Mr. Brady. This is a very important contribution to the field and I am certain that the hon. Minister would learn a great deal about public housing were he to study these three volumes prepared by this very competent man. The recommendations are outstanding.

I do, however, want to refer to the remarks made by Mr. W. Harold Clark in a speech he delivered on January 28. Mr. Clark was speaking to the social planning council; he is the chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority. These are some of the things he said:

There is an urgent need for housing large families requiring three-, four- and five-bedroom units. Far too many families are living in substandard accommodation. More low rental housing dwellings are needed if we are to keep abreast of urban renewal and development programmes. If we are behind schedule today, and we unquestionably are, where will we be in 1967, our centennial year, or in 1970, when Metro's population will likely reach two million?

He says:

—that the federal-provincial Metropolitan programme has failed to produce family housing in adequate numbers for several reasons—and these are four of the important ones: There are four governments involved—federal, provincial, metropolitan and the area municipalities—

he is talking about this immediate area:

—and the authority is completely diffused. No one government is charged with and has the responsibility for action, nor the power to act on its own initiative.

Of those four governments three are controlled by this Legislature, i.e. the provincial government, the metropolitan government and the area government.

Surely, sir, the hon. Minister could and should, at least, co-ordinate the efforts of those three governments if he has any interest at all in the programme of public housing. And if he had any programme of public housing which would whip away all of this red tape, he could and should be in a position to go up to his counterpart in Ottawa and, together with him, work out a programme which will build houses—not just a few pages of speeches about what may be done and what could be done, which actually are not going to solve this need at all.

He says the second reason, in essence, is part of the first:

The provincially-controlled housing authority, such as the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, operates in a vacuum. It has absolutely no authority to advise the municipality to plan or construct. It is simply a management agency.

This programme costs the federal and provincial governments more money on a continuing basis; and, finally, area municipalities are not very keen about this programme because of the hidden costs, such as education, recreation and welfare.

The hon. Minister made a great deal of fuss about the interest of the local governments in public housing. Somewhere along the line the hon. Minister must know that many local councils are not keen to have public housing because they are not at all sure of the financial burdens they are going to incur.

But, in large metropolitan areas, such as this one, or any other metropolitan area in the province of Ontario, the responsibility must be taken by the provincial government and not palmed off onto the area government. If this government was serious at all about doing

something about public housing, it would have made its peace long before now with the local municipalities.

There is the thought, that Mr. Clark put forth, that we should perhaps concentrate on having smaller projects with a view to integrating them with private development. This may well be so. At least some of the smaller projects we could have on the ground by now and not merely be part of this record of "housing by headline".

I would ask the hon. Minister the same questions Mr. Clark asked him. Why do the federal and provincial governments not make contributions to the rent reduction funds for housing for older people? Is the hon. Minister against this kind of subsidization? Does he not think this is a worthwhile project? And if he does, why does he not say that we will do this?

Why did the hon. Minister not make, this afternoon, any one positive statement about what the provincial government housing programme is? In fact, the Macaulay plan is gone and we have no plan to replace it. We have nothing; we have no housing programme at all.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I return again to a direct quote from the hon. member for Riverdale. He said: "I believe that as a result of our leadership in this venture"—and that is the housing programme—"we will be able to solve in the coming year the problem of housing in the Metropolitan area." I suggest that these words have an awfully hollow ring when, less than a year later, not only has the problem not been solved, it has been made worse.

The programme which that Minister put forward is cast aside, and to replace it we get a series of ifs, ands and buts, we could, we might and we will have to see if it is economically feasible; it is a disgraceful record. And the hon. Minister, this afternoon, has given us little reason to hope for any improvement in the situation.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to congratulate the hon. Minister on his first presentation of the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development. The hon. Minister inherited, I think, quite a difficult task when he took over that portfolio, not only because of the inherent difficulties in the portfolio itself, but also because he succeeded a Minister who was certainly one of the most energetic and dynamic Ministers in the previous administration—indeed I would say the only energetic and dynamic Minister in that administration.

I think he is a hard man to follow. In fact, in reviewing in my mind the events of the last couple of years, I have been impressed by the fact that in the period preceding the election the government conducted what I would describe as a brilliant public relations campaign. It was substantially more effective from a public relations point of view than from a legislative point of view, but as a public relations campaign it is one of the best I have ever seen; and it showed itself in the results of the last election.

Since the last election the public relations of the government have been terrible. In fact, it is hard to believe that any government could stumble and fumble the way this one has during the current session of the Legislature. They have been on the wrong foot at every turn; they have been off balance on almost every issue which has come up. They have had to eat their words with a regularity that must be positively sickening for them because they could hardly have been appetizing words to eat. The only difference in the situation I could see was the departure of the former Minister of Economics and Development.

The former Minister, at the time he resigned, gave ill health as his reasons. Since his resignation, Mr. Chairman, he has carried on a schedule of activities which must undoubtedly be the heaviest in the history of the world for any man in ill health. I am happy to note that the reports of his ill health were apparently very much exaggerated; I cannot believe he could be carrying on in his accustomed way, perhaps even a heavier schedule than before, if his health were genuinely poor. From this, Mr. Chairman, I can only conclude that his departure was not so much due to ill health as to a healthy push he must have got, possibly from the hon. Prime Minister. He in turn no doubt was being pushed and jostled by many people in the immediate circles of his party and in the business community on which this government is so heavily dependent. There is no doubt that the former Minister, with his forthright ways, offended a lot of feelings and stepped on a lot of toes.

However, Mr. Chairman, when I started out I was speaking about the present hon. Minister and not the previous one. I tell you right now that I am not going to make any further references to the previous Minister. I started out by congratulating the present hon. Minister on his presentation today and I would like to repeat that. As a matter of fact, while he was talking—I can see now I am going to violate just for one

minute, the pledge I gave you; I am going to make one more reference to the previous Minister.

As the present hon. Minister was talking I remarked to one of my hon. colleagues that his presentation in my opinion was more intelligent, more thought-provoking, and more substantial than the presentations of the previous Minister, which were very flashy but in my opinion not of the same quality as the one we heard today. My hon. colleague commented that perhaps the explanation is that the previous Minister used to write his own speeches. I do not know if that statement is entirely fair as far as its implications for the present hon. Minister are concerned, but at the same time I have no doubt that the hon. Minister's officials in the department had a great deal to do with the preparation of the speech that he made today. If that is true, that reflects to the credit of the officials in the department. I think also it reflects to the credit of the hon. Minister that he would rely quite heavily on officials within his own department. I think a sound working relationship between a Minister and his department produces sound policy statements, and I think we received quite a thought-provoking policy statement today.

I would like to express a word of personal appreciation, if I could put it in that form, to the hon. Minister, and I think in doing this I may perhaps make so bold as to include the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) as well, for the announcement that he has made with regard to the termite problem in the city of Toronto. This is a problem that affects the constituency of the hon. member for Beaches and also my constituency very severely. I may say it affects the constituencies of a good many other hon. members, for example, Riverdale, York East, and St. David, all of which have a serious termite problem. There is not really a single constituency in the entire Metropolitan Toronto area that is not at least threatened by the termite problem.

I think the announcement the hon. Minister has made is going to start something. I think he has made an offer to the city of Toronto that the city of Toronto will be in a position to accept. I think it ought to accept it, and I think if the offer is taken up it will mean that we are starting a constructive problem on the matter of termites. I admire the hon. Minister as a man who, when he decides something has to be done, goes ahead and does it.

A few months ago I went to see him at his office with regard to this problem and we had

an informal and friendly discussion. I provided him with such information as I could, and he said he was going to look into the matter and he was going to have his officials look into it. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I have received answers like that on many occasions. Many times I have had a Minister say that he was going to look into a matter and that was the last I ever heard of it. But I will say for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, he did what he said. Having looked into it he saw that there was merit in the case. He has, in my opinion, made an important contribution and has really initiated something that I think may in time lead to a solution of this problem.

Mr. Sopha: Has there been public warning to the termites?

Mr. Bryden: The termite problem, of course, Mr. Chairman, is just part of a much larger problem, and that is the general problem of housing. I am not going to make any extended comments about the housing situation at this time. There will be opportunities to talk about housing and question the hon. Minister about it under the vote specifically relating to that topic. I know that there are other hon. members in my group who wish to participate in the discussion at that time, and no doubt other hon. members in other parts of the House.

I will only make one general comment at this time, and that is, that in my opinion the section of the hon. Minister's speech that related to the housing problem was the weakest part of his speech. I might be unfair, I do not know. I am just going on an impression from listening to him, I have not seen the text of his remarks. But that was the impression I got. No doubt he will understand that we on this side of the House have developed a very jaundiced view with regard to government policy announcements in the housing field. Time after time we have heard announcements that caught headlines, but when one came to find out about them a year later, it turned out that they were nothing at all, they led to nothing.

Indeed, many of the announcements we have heard over the years were repeats of previous years' announcements about which nothing had been done. We have that sort of background behind us. The hon. Minister has a difficult legacy in this field. It will be difficult for him, I can assure him, to convince us that he really has a programme. We will certainly want to see it in action before we will concede that it is anything more than

the old window dressing in which this administration and its predecessor engaged for so many years.

The only specific suggestion I would like to make at this time on housing is to repeat a proposal I have made on occasions in the past.

That is, sir, that the housing problem is important enough in terms of both its economic and social implications that there should be a separate department of housing with a full-time Minister in charge. That is not intended as any reflection on the present hon. Minister of Economics and Development. It rises purely out of the fact that the hon. Minister, as we can see from his general presentation today, has a full-time job on his hands just looking after the economics and development aspects of his department, and without having to worry about housing.

I do not think that housing can be adequately dealt with as a subsidiary of any department and particularly of one where there is such a load on the hon. Minister to begin with.

The hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, will no doubt be considering certain Cabinet shuffles in the next six months. I think that he should consider setting up a separate ministry of housing, and perhaps bring in one of these new hon. members of the House—some of whom have shown that they are at least full of beans and vinegar—and give them an opportunity to show if they have anything behind some of the statements they make; give them a chance to prove their mettle in one of the most important fields of policy in this province. I am sure I must be popular with all new members now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Too bad the hon. Prime Minister is not here to see that outburst of enthusiasm.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): He is listening to it.

Mr. MacDonald: But he cannot see who is applauding then.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would now like to deal with the economic policy enunciated by the hon. Minister. I am in disagreement with the hon. member for Downsview that the hon. Minister's comments more appropriately belonged in the Budget, sir. I think that government in this province has now reached the stage where we cannot regard the Budget as the

sole instrument of economic policy. I think it is an important instrument and I think there has to be the closest possible co-ordination between the Treasury and The Department of Economics and Development.

I think there may be, to a certain degree, inadequate co-ordination, but I certainly believe that a basic statement of economic policy, over and above what is contained in the Budget speech, is in order.

My impression of the hon. Minister when he spoke previously in this House, and to a certain degree as I listened to him this afternoon, is that he is first and foremost a salesman. I believe, from what I have heard of his record both in the business world and in his shorter term in the field of government, that he is a first-class salesman. He is probably one of the best in the country. He has the typical approach of the salesman. He is also full of all the little aphorisms which suit the salesman so well, such as one that I quote from his speech in the Throne Speech debate on February 10, from page 521 of *Hansard*, where he said that:

Selling is like shaving—if you do not do a little every day you soon become a bum.

No doubt the hon. Minister is aware that there are also other ways of becoming a bum; and lest his preoccupation with selling and shaving may make him unaware of some of the other pitfalls, I am going to do whatever is possible for me to do to assist him to avoid any of those other routes to “bumdom”.

I am going to suggest to him first, Mr. Chairman—and my suggestion may be presumptuous, but I will make it anyway—that selling is not sufficient in The Department of Economics and Development or, what is more important, in economic policy of a government. And this hon. Minister is responsible in the main for enunciating economic policy! Nor do I think that the emphasis on selling which came out, even in today's very excellent presentation by the hon. Minister, is exactly the right emphasis in a department of this kind.

I would like, in support of my suggestion, to quote from a man from whom I have frequently quoted in this House, a man who also is quite proficient in the field of selling and who, in my opinion, is one of the most responsible businessmen in this country—Mr. R. M. Fowler of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association. This is from a speech that he made in Vancouver, I think, about a year ago. He said:

I doubt if the task of making the

Canadian economy efficient and viable can be done by “Buy Canadian” campaigns, or exhortations to our exporters to go out and sell. No doubt we can progressively make more of the things that we now import, and we should do so, but curtailment of imports is a dangerous game to play. It can very easily provoke retaliation by other countries to the damage done to their trade.

Nor can our traditional exports be expanded enough and rapidly enough to fill the gap in our international accounts, although again we should do all we can to increase traditional exports. We need a much more basic reconstitution of Canadian industry.

If the balance of my remarks have a theme, the statement I have just quoted from Mr. Fowler could be stated to be the theme.

I was very interested, in listening to the hon. Minister this afternoon, to hear the frequent references he made to the need in various specific fields to plan and co-ordinate our activities. In fact, I felt sure that at some stage or other in his speech he was going to come right through with a fully-fledged statement on the need for economic planning; but every time, as he approached that point he drew back for some reason or other, and I suppose this is typical of the situation as it exists in Canada today.

To talk about planning has become fashionable. It is only a few years since planning was considered a dirty word, and fellows like myself and others in my party and elsewhere, who talked about planning, were accused of all sorts of things—of being dictators; of wanting to put everybody in jail, to regiment them, and so on. But now it is fashionable to talk about planning; unfortunately, so much of the talk still consists only of lip service.

We have for example, the Economic Council of Canada. We have the Ontario Economic Council. Professor H. A. Innis of the University of Toronto, many years ago, said that a business man today does not consider himself up to date and progressive unless he has at his disposal an economist and a dog. And it is getting to the point now where a government in Canada today does not consider itself up to date and progressive unless it has an economic council. This is fashionable, and I am not saying anything against economic councils; what I want to consider is what the economic councils are doing.

If one analyzes the Economic Council of Canada, one finds that it is not all that much

different from the old productivity council. It is very much the same as the Ontario Economic Council. The basic characteristic of all of them is that they are a sort of discussion group. Various distinguished and able people are brought together to talk about economic problems, not to any noticeable degree for the public benefit, but apparently for their own benefit and perhaps the benefit of the government. They initiate a certain amount of research; they promise that they are going to publish various documents; and that is about as far as it goes. They are study groups—

An hon. member: What is wrong with study groups?

Mr. Bryden: There is nothing wrong with study groups. I do not know who asked that but there is nothing wrong with study groups. But a study group in itself is something less than we need.

I believe we need the study. I believe that some of the study being initiated is important, although I think a great deal of it could be carried on in a more efficient and less pretentious way than through economic councils.

I am certainly not suggesting that study is not required at all stages but rather that study is not enough. It has become popular in this country nowadays to say that we believe in indicative planning—I think that is the term that is used—indicative planning.

You know, we are not socialists, therefore we do not believe in real, honest-to-goodness red-blooded planning, we just believe in indicative planning. I am not quite sure what that means but I think it is supposed to mean that we have agencies that indicate something or other.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): What is red-blooded planning?

Mr. Bryden: I will get around to that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean? Mean what you say.

Mr. Bryden: It is planning that is planning; that produces results; that goes beyond contemplating one's navel, let us put it that way.

We frequently hear references to so-called indicative planning in France. As a matter of fact I can remember the present Prime Minister of Canada when he was still the leader of the Opposition appearing on television once and making quite a speech about France. He said we should look at France

and see what they are doing in France in the way of planning. He was not too specific about what it was he thought we should look at, but he did say we should look at France. Some of us have taken a look at France, and in France we are told that there is this so-called indicative planning. The government does not really do too much but it indicates goals and it discusses them with business. It does quite a bit more than we do here but it studies the problem and gives certain indications to business.

Of course, those people have not suggested that we look at the fundamentally different economic structure in France as compared to this country or this province. They do not tell us to look at the large degree of state enterprise in France. Through that state enterprise, and because of other situations that exist in France, I would say that in France the government probably has more control over investments—and I mean government control; not indicative control but real control—than perhaps in any other country in the western world.

Mr. White: It certainly does.

Mr. Bryden: It does quite a bit more than we do here.

Mr. White: That is right, so what does that prove?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I cannot hear these comments from across the way. No doubt if these hon. gentlemen want to get in on the debate, they will do so when they get a chance.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: The sudden burst into life from over there by the hon. member for London South—

Mr. Bryden: I believe the hon. member for London South has been lapping up learning at more than an average rate in the past little while. Perhaps he might, at the appropriate time, give the House the benefit of some of his more mature deliberations on this subject. I would suggest to him that he does not do himself justice trying to wedge in comments in the middle of someone else's speech. I have no objection, but most of his comments have been lost on me. I cannot hear them.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): It perks things up.

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton): Just trying to help you out.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, to return to the subject of planning, I was trying to suggest that the so-called indicative planning of France is a very different story from the "study group" approach that we have in this country. I am suggesting that the example of all western European countries is an example to which we should pay much greater heed than we have done to date in either Ontario or Canada. The study is fine, it is necessary, but we must go beyond study. It is essential, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Like Saskatchewan!

Mr. Bryden: —that there should be positive leadership from the state in the whole area of economic development. We are past the stage, if we were ever at it, where we can expect desirable economical consequences from mere indications on the part of the government as to the sort of things it has in mind, and mere trust that private enterprise in its totally unco-ordinated way, is going to produce the results we want. The government has to set goals and I would agree that the basic responsibility here is with the federal government. But I also agree with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development that in this province there is an important responsibility on the government, too. I am going to deal with the problem of co-operation a little later but I would agree with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development that co-ordination of the efforts of the two governments is also important.

There is no question that positive leadership from the state is required, yet I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that because we are now again at the high point in the economic cycle we are not going to get that sort of leadership in terms of setting goals, of working with industry, labour, agriculture and all segments in the community in achieving those goals, in working out priorities and in adopting policies that will achieve those priorities.

Listening to the hon. Minister this afternoon confirmed my suspicions that now that we are up at the top of the cycle again, we are going to assume that things will pretty well work themselves out as long as the government takes a moderately active role in the field.

To be fair, however, Mr. Chairman, I should concede that the hon. Minister did put con-

siderable emphasis on the long-term problem as well as the immediate problem. The fact is that we certainly are at the high point of the economic cycle again. In this province at any rate, we are approaching full employment—I have a somewhat different definition of full employment than the hon. Minister has—but we are certainly approaching it. We are at a high level of investment and output.

All this is well-known fact. Of course we had a situation like that a little less than ten years ago around 1955-56 and carrying on into 1957. We were at the peak of a cycle then too. It lasted about two years and then we went down into a recession, into a period of low growth, or a period of almost stagnation.

The hon. gentlemen who sit immediately to my right in this House would tell you that the change arose in 1957 because there was a change in government at that time.

Mr. Singer: Well, it is at least a coincidence that it happens every time those governments change.

Mr. Bryden: It is, of course, also a fact that the downturn had started before the government changed. However, I will say that the government that succeeded that Liberal government in Ottawa did not do very much, for a long time at any rate, to offset the recession that set in—

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): The present boom began in the time of the Diefenbaker government.

Mr. Bryden: However, I think we should just bear that in mind so as not to get carried away by the fact that we are now again at the top of the cycle, or close to it.

I would also like to call attention to another fact, just so that we can keep all these matters in perspective. I would like to refer to an item by J. V. Poapst of the School of Business of the University of Toronto, and the item is in regard to unemployment. Our unemployment situation is more favourable now than it has been for some time, but Mr. Poapst had this to say:

Unemployment, seasonally adjusted, declined both absolutely and relatively in the latter half of 1963, was 5.1 per cent of the civilian labour force in November and 4.9 per cent in the following month. The figure for December was the lowest since July, 1957. As encouraging as the current statistics are, they lose some of their lustre when employment conditions and trends in

Canada are compared with those in other countries. The table below—

He reproduces a table here but I think the substance of what he says can be gathered without actually seeing the table.

The table below shows average unemployment as a percentage of the civilian labour force in Canada, the United States, and six other countries in 1962. In making comparisons between countries, it is necessary to allow for differences in the yardsticks which are used in statistical measurement.

Much progress has been made in international standardization of the concepts and definitions upon which manpower statistics are based, but differences remain. The data (approximate) in the last column of the table have been adjusted to a common (U.S.) base. They indicate that, at 5.9 per cent, the proportion of the civilian labour force unemployed in Canada in 1962 was higher than in all the other countries shown. It was more than three times the proportion for France, West Germany, Sweden and Japan, more than double that of Britain, and almost double that of Italy. Only the rate in the United States, 5.6 per cent, was close to that of Canada.

The relatively high rates of unemployment in North America thus cannot be dismissed as merely the results of differences in statistical yardsticks.

I would also like to refer to a speech the hon. Minister himself made not so long ago, on March 10, 1964.

I think some people may have missed the speech because the headline gave no clue as to what they might expect in the story. The headline was: "Could have kept out invaders by efficiency, garage men told." The hon. Minister's statement was tacked on to another story about a conference of garage operators in Toronto; and the hon. Minister's remarks are summarized, as follows, in this statement from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*:

Stanley J. Randall, Ontario Minister of Economics and Development, said in opening the equipment show that much of Ontario's recent prosperity has been due to rising sales of cars in the past three years.

And he made a similar sort of statement this afternoon:

He said that when automobile sales and production decline, the drop in economic activity is multiplied several times in other sectors.

Now this is attributed as a direct quote to the hon. Minister:

"We would be fools to expect the same amount of increase in motor vehicle production in 1964 as we have had in the past three years," the Minister said. "We put that growth at 60 per cent, 627,000, since 1961."

He added that Canadian governments should devote much of their efforts to encouraging greater exports of cars and parts to world markets. He estimated that one of each seven or eight manufacturing industry employees in Ontario is engaged in making motor vehicles or parts.

"The automotive industry is the consumer of almost 15 per cent of output from Ontario primary iron and steel mills," he said.

So even the hon. Minister himself was suggesting that there could be a rather vulnerable factor in our economic recovery as far as this province is concerned.

It is so dependent on the sale of automobiles that if the sale of automobiles should slump, and he is quoted as saying that we would be fools to expect it to increase as much as it has, then we will run into difficulties all through our economy.

I am not going to engage in an argument with the hon. Minister or anybody else as to how long we can expect the current boom to stay at its present high level. I do not know—I do not profess to know. But I can certainly say from any study of previous economic history that we can expect that, barring government policies to offset it, the economy will go down again. It always has before. The last boom collapsed about 1957 and we went into a pretty severe trough for this day and age. I think it has to be the job of government to not merely level out these recessions, but eliminate them, to maintain a continuous development.

The hon. Minister has talked a great deal about the improvement of our export-import position. That has been the basic factor, I would say, in the improvement of our overall economic situation.

The hon. Minister has claimed credit for the Ontario trade crusade in improving our trade picture. I would not wish to deny credit to this campaign, I have no doubt it has been a factor in improving sales. But it has been a very small factor. The hon. Minister is a good enough salesman to know that you just do not sell if you cannot compete in prices. Actually, as the hon. Minister

to a certain degree himself recognized, the improvement of our trade position has been due really to two factors: First, the devaluation of the dollar and, second, the sale of agricultural products behind the Iron Curtain. Those have been the stimulants in our economy.

The trade crusade had nothing to do with it, or little to do with it. The trade crusade perhaps cashed in on the advantages which arose from the devaluation of the dollar in that our competitive position was improved; we were able to quote lower prices to purchasers overseas and in the United States. But these were the basic factors, and both of them are factors whose effects are bound to be temporary.

The sale of agricultural products behind the Iron Curtain will depend entirely on the crop situation in those countries. We certainly cannot count on them as a continued stimulus to our economy, or as a continued lifesaver as far as our trade balance is concerned. The devaluation of the dollar produced a tremendous stimulus—in fact I was surprised myself at the strength of the stimulus it provided to our exports—and it certainly discouraged our imports because it increased the prices of imports. But that sort of policy gradually wears itself out; its effects become less and less pronounced as time goes on.

So these two factors have been the important stimulus. They got us going again, but we cannot count on them to continue indefinitely. We are going to have to look to new policies and new co-ordination of policies if we are going to continue to maintain economic activity at a high level and unemployment at a low level. This again comes back to government policy. I would suggest that the logical conclusion of everything the hon. Minister said this afternoon—even though he did not draw it—is co-ordinated planning, an overall programme of planning, instead of merely expedients in individual fields.

I would say that the need for planning becomes all the greater when we again appreciate the problems we are faced with in what we in this group describe as the scientific revolution. I am talking about what is commonly referred to as automation, but I think the term "scientific revolution" is a better term because it is broader in its implications and extends beyond mere automation or even cybernation. It extends into all fields of our lives, and the implications of that revolution are almost impossible to comprehend.

My hon. colleague from Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) presented, earlier in this

Legislature, what I would regard as one of the best analyses I have ever heard or seen of the problem. Unfortunately it does not seem to have had as much effect as one might have hoped.

We ran into the same old chorus of voices saying there is no need to be alarmed or frightened by technological progress. Well, good heavens, there was nothing in the speech of the hon. member for Scarborough West that would suggest that he or we are alarmed by that prospect. We welcome the scientific revolution. What we are alarmed about is the refusal of many people in high places to accept the full implications of it in terms of policy, and to recognize that fundamental economic and social adjustments are going to have to be made, and that if we do not do something now to plan those adjustments we will not escape them—they will happen the hard way. We will suffer through them.

It is much better that we should try to take control of the situation, rather than suggest simply that in the long run it is bound to be good for us. Certainly it is bound to be good for us in the long run; and as we all know, J. M. Keynes said a great many years ago that in the long run we are all dead, too. The problem of adjustment is the difficult problem, and it will create economic problems which I think will be far beyond anything we have ever contemplated in the past.

One of the economic problems that I think we should concern ourselves with in this country was, I think, underlined by the hon. Minister himself in the speech he made in the Throne Speech debate.

I am going to quote a couple of extracts from that speech.

I will, I am afraid, draw a somewhat different moral from what the hon. Minister said than he drew from it, but I think what he said is beyond dispute. I am going to read two paragraphs, both of which appear, not consecutively, on page 518 of *Hansard*. He was talking about the problem of adjustment to automation:

We are, in many ways, in a better position from this point of view than is United States industry because of the smaller size of most of our manufacturing industries. We are not becoming automated so rapidly, and growing demand, along with normal retirements and job shifts, is taking care of a great deal of this technological disemployment.

I think the word would have been sufficient if it had just been displacement, but it is printed

here in *Hansard* as displacement. The other paragraph I want to quote is:

"The size of American industry invites rapid introduction of automatic techniques. In Canada, most of our industries have not reached a size which makes total automation economical. It is, for the most part, being introduced in limited areas of our total production."

And then the hon. Minister goes on to say quite rightly, that as a result we have not met the same sort of acute problems as they have in the States, and we do not have the same problem of areas where the economy has practically collapsed, as they have in the States, because of the effects of automation. This is true and it is very comforting at the moment. But I think we should be considering the long-term implications of this.

As I see it, we, in Canada, in the long-term, have a much more serious problem than the United States. We not only have to consider the total effects that the scientific revolution is going to have in the world economy, we also have to be concerned that in our little neck of the woods we might be left behind by automation altogether. It is quite true that our industries in many cases, as the hon. Minister said, are not large enough to make the introduction of automatic techniques economical at this stage at any rate. It may be that they will never be economical, so those industries are just going to be brushed aside as the scientific revolution progresses through the world.

How are they going to compete in the long pull? They may be doing all right now as the result of devaluation, but how are they going to compete in the long pull against the huge automated enterprises of the United States and Japan and the European Common Market which are coming into being now? They are certainly coming.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to get in on this thing. If we do, it is going to create the same dislocations for us as for other countries. But if we do not get in on it, we will become an economic backwater, a pool of stagnation, which will sell raw materials to the industrial machines of Japan and the United States, no doubt, and, will have declining manufacturing industry of its own.

This, I think, is a problem that we should be concerned about now. It leads me to a conclusion which in past years I tried to present a number of times in this House, that a basic objective of our economic planning in this country—if we had any, and I suggest that we should have some economic planning—

should be the specialization of industry and creation of the adjustments and the incentive that will bring that about. Whenever I raised that matter in the House before, the previous Minister used to scoff at what I said. In fact, on one occasion he said, "What will we specialize in—Eskimo carvings?" As a matter of fact, I was quite surprised that I could never get that point across at all to the previous Minister.

I think that the present hon. Minister is to some degree, at any rate, thinking in these terms. He did talk about the importance of policies that will facilitate adjustments from declining industries to growing industries. He did stress the importance of identifying the industries in which we have a potential for growth.

He stated, I fully agree with him—in fact, I think he is in danger of becoming a socialist if he does not watch out—that he would go along with tariff reductions, but that if they take place there has to be government policy to facilitate the transfer of men and resources from the industries that lose their tariff production, into other forms of production. All that makes sense. All that is in the direction of economic planning.

If we could just give the hon. Minister one more little push, I think he would probably qualify to be a Swedish socialist. I do not know how he will get along with some of his backbenchers and some of the people who contribute to the party, if he gets into that category, but this is obviously the direction in which his thinking is tending. I welcome the development because I think this will be good for the province and good for the country. After all, that is really what all of us are fundamentally concerned about.

The hon. Minister also talked a good deal about the need for labour mobility, and he put his finger on a key point. We are talking about planning to meet the problems of the future and to adjust to the challenges of the future. We have to have a high degree of mobility of labour. This is not the first time the hon. Minister has talked about this. I think he is persuaded of the importance of labour mobility in the future development of our economy, and I would only wish that he could convince some of his hon. colleagues and the federal government about the importance of it.

The hon. Minister tried to make the best statement he could for his hon. colleagues, and perhaps for the federal government, by saying that we have programmes designed to increase labour mobility. Well, Mr. Chairman,

I think the hon. Minister is too intelligent a man to really believe that the programmes we have to increase labour mobility are anything but drops in the bucket; they are hardly worth anything.

We have some retraining programmes where people are paid starvation allowances to learn skills, if you can call them that, which may or may not be economically valuable in the future, where a very small proportion of our labour force has some training, but we are

certainly lagging behind in the whole field of technological education.

When I say lagging behind I mean lagging behind the clear needs of the situation. We have no provisions of any kind to facilitate the movement of workers from one area to another. We have no moving allowances. In Sweden they pay people in some cases more than full wages in order to take training.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 23, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 23, 1964

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued	2413
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2438

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(continued)

On vote 401:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend greetings to those members who have been impelled, by a sense of duty or the Whips or both, to forego the pleasure of watching the hockey game on television so that a quorum could be provided in the House.

Before the recess, I had been talking about labour mobility and the almost total lack of any plans in this country or province to increase labour mobility. I had proposed that the government might take a look at the sort of programme they have in Sweden, which has been an important factor in maintaining unemployment at little, if any, more than one per cent of the labour force for 15 or 20 years. I think perhaps I can leave that subject on that note, Mr. Chairman.

I have one other topic I would like to refer to briefly. It arises to some degree out of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). I am referring to the question of federal-provincial co-operation in the economic field. I think such co-operation is important in all fields, but we are concerned mainly with the economic field at this time and I will try to concentrate my attention on that.

The hon. Minister, himself, recognized in his introductory remarks this afternoon that the economic welfare of this province ultimately depends on adequate economic policies at the federal level and—I think this is a fair inference to draw from his remarks—that any economic programmes we may devise should, as far as possible, be co-ordinated with those at the federal level.

I would have hoped that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) might have been in the House to hear that portion of the hon. Minister's remarks. I think they might have been beneficial to him. I know he talks a good deal about the need for co-operation

and the determination of the provincial government to co-operate in the economic field. The hon. Prime Minister is an amiable man. He rarely says "yes," he practically never says "no," and he almost always says "maybe." I think that has been his approach to federal-provincial co-operation.

I am submitting to this committee, Mr. Chairman, that it is not an adequate approach from the head of the government of the economically strongest province in Canada. I think that this province should assist the federal government in giving leadership—and the federal government from my observation requires a substantial amount of prodding—in developing a co-ordinated economic plan for the development of the whole of Canada into which provincial plans can readily be fitted.

As we all know, we have a situation in Canada which creates difficulties which are perhaps greater than those in most federal states. The province of Quebec is in a special position. I want to make it clear that anything I may say tonight is in no sense intended as a criticism of the province of Quebec or its government. That province has a government which is responsible to its people, and it will be held accountable to its own people and nobody else for what policies it may adopt. I think it is inappropriate for us to try to make any comments at all, critical or otherwise, about its problems.

But I think we can recognize that there is a special situation in Quebec, requiring special policies by that government and special consideration by the federal government and the rest of Canada. I regret it, when I see our hon. Prime Minister of Ontario forever putting forward the proposition that if a concession is to be made to one province it has to be made to all the others. Perhaps that is correct technically, but on the other hand I would suggest that, if he cared to exercise the leadership that his position calls for, he would take the further position that just because that may be technically true there is no reason why this province should claim the concession.

We can argue, if we wish, that technically any concession offered to one province should

go to all the provinces, but we should take the position that we are not necessarily going to claim concessions which may be made to Quebec. Our position should be to try to develop a stronger federal union so that we can develop the kind of economic policies which, in this day and age, are essential to the well-being of Canada and, as the hon. Minister has pointed out, to the well-being of Ontario. Economic developments in some of the underdeveloped sections of this country, if I may call them that and I think they are appropriately called that, are of vital importance to Ontario. Ontario, as the manufacturing centre of Canada, will prosper as other parts of Canada prosper.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): That is right. That is what he said.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, that is what the hon. Minister said, but I do not think we see sufficient evidence of that in the position the hon. Prime Minister has taken in vital matters affecting federal-provincial co-operation. I think that, instead of insisting on our rights as a province, we should be trying to give leadership to all the other provinces in working together with the federal government in the development of adequate economic planning.

I would suggest that one thing we should propose is the establishment of what I might describe as a federal-provincial planning and development council. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development has noted that there is fairly continuous consultation between federal and Ontario authorities in a number of fields. I think this should be regularized and systematized, and we should have a full-scale organization with adequate staff to carry on consultation and voluntary co-ordination of efforts in all economic fields. Such a council, of course, would have no power, but it would be a medium of exchange of information between the federal government and the provinces, and among the provinces. It would assist them to come to co-operative plans for the benefit of the whole country and it would at least permit each government to be advised as to what the other governments are doing so that if necessary it could adjust its own plans to take into account the plans of the other jurisdictions.

We see a problem right now in the United States. The federal government has undertaken a significant tax reduction programme to stimulate economic activity and, to an important extent, that programme is being

nullified by the fact that various states are now moving into the vacuum to pick up the taxes the federal government has vacated. Therefore, the effect of the programme, whatever it may be, has been neutralized. This is the sort of thing we should avoid in Canada. We should try to develop joint plans, common plans, for the benefit of all of the country; I would emphasize again that this will be particularly to the benefit of Ontario.

We heard an announcement earlier this week with regard to certain compromise settlements which had been arrived at primarily between the government of Canada and the government of Quebec. We all welcomed those announcements as an important step forward but at the same time we should consider the other side of the coin. If the concessions offered by the federal government are fully exploited by this province and other provinces they will tend in the direction of balkanization of our economy, as so many developments in recent years have done.

We have to face the fact, as I said before, that Quebec has a special situation; but let us not take advantage of that situation to create minor economic empires in the various provinces and regions of Canada.

I should, to be fair, concede that the Conservative administration of Ontario over the last 20 years has taken what I would call a progressively more constructive attitude toward federal-provincial relations. It is certainly a far cry from the days of Mitch Hepburn with his bucolic inspiration when he coined such phrases as, "Ontario will not be the milch cow for the rest of Canada." I am afraid in the past, to a considerable degree—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Why don't you get up to date and tell us about Woodrow Lloyd?

Mr. Bryden: The sensitivity of these hon. gentlemen beside me is quite remarkable. I have been under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that they had long ago disclaimed any responsibility whatever for Mitch Hepburn. In fact I thought they had even disclaimed responsibility for John Wintermeyer. Time started with them about six months ago. It certainly had not been my intention to stir them up from their slumbers. I thought a reference to Mitch Hepburn would merely be among the rest of us. I did not think that it would even make an impression on them.

However, Mitch Hepburn coined the phrase, "Ontario will not be the milch cow for the rest of Canada," overlooking the fact that to a considerable extent the rest of

Canada has been the milch cow for Ontario, and I—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Downsview can certainly speak with authority about—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, if you can remember that far back, the administration in Ontario, certainly since the days of George Drew, has taken an increasingly constructive attitude toward its responsibilities to the rest of Canada. I think that is an intelligent point of view. I regret the frequent throw-backs we see toward the old attitude that was epitomized in Mr. Hepburn's famous comment, and I may say in the attitudes of many other Premiers in previous eras in this province. I think that notwithstanding the relief with which we all greeted the announcement with regard to the pension settlement—if it is a settlement—we once again, in the pension negotiations, saw a tendency toward narrow provincialism and toward a balkanization of economic policy in this country.

I do not think we should let our policy be determined by Quebec and that is essentially what was happening in the pension negotiations. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go into the entire pension question tonight. It obviously should be discussed at some other time, but the pension programme has important economic implications and I want to discuss some of these economic implications tonight.

The decision taken by the Ontario government produced a watering down of the original federal plans in a number of stages. Two of those stages are particularly important from an economic point of view. First of all, the attitude taken by the Ontario government forced the government of Canada to abandon its original proposition of an unfunded plan in favour of a partially funded plan. The original position of the hon. Prime Minister was that he thought the plan should be fully funded. The new plan proposed by the federal government is not fully funded but it is partially funded. That is the first important change in the economic field. I will refer to its economic consequences again in a moment, but while I am at it, I would like now to mention the second important change, which was advocated, at any rate, by the hon.

Prime Minister of this province. Whether he was the one who forced the change, I am not quite sure, but the final offer by the federal government was to make all of the investment funds arising from the funding of the plan available to the provinces in which they are collected. The position of the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario was that 90 per cent of those funds should be made available to the province. As it has turned out, the federal government has offered 100 per cent.

I saw an analysis on television in which the commentator stated that the close-to-the-vest position, or whatever it may have been, of the hon. Prime Minister actually turned out to be hard bargaining. The hon. Prime Minister asked for 90 per cent and he got 100 per cent. That is hard bargaining? I have never heard of a bargain like that before. There was indeed hard bargaining. The hard bargaining, however, took place in the province of Quebec. The province of Quebec insisted on 100 per cent and as a result Ontario also got 100 per cent of the investment funds.

The hon. member for Downsview does not think investment funds have any economic consequences but I am sure that you are fully aware of their importance from an economic point of view, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development this afternoon emphasized the importance of investment in some of the other areas of Canada. Through this modified pension programme, substantial investment funds become available, but they become available only for the province in which they have been accumulated. Yet in terms of total economic policy for the country, which includes the benefit of Ontario, it may very well be that the investment funds would be better made available in other less developed parts of the country. I am suggesting to this House, Mr. Chairman, that this great victory achieved by Premier Lesage, I believe, but in which the hon. Prime Minister of this province shared, was actually a retrograde step.

Investment policy, and fiscal policy and financial policy fundamentally have to be under the control of the federal government if we are to develop a strong economy in this country. Here is an important area of investment policy which is not in any sense at all under the control of the federal government, it has been handed over entirely to the provinces. It will tend, if it has any effect at all, to increase rather than reduce the disparities between provinces, and this,

as the hon. Minister pointed out this afternoon, will not be to the benefit of Ontario in the long run.

I am suggesting this was a retrograde step in federal-provincial relations. It was not a constructive attitude by the government of this province, it did not contribute to the kind of federal-provincial co-operation which we require. It reduced the possibility of the strong type of economic leadership that I think most of us in this House will agree is necessary on the part of the federal government.

I would also like to refer back now to the first point I made as to the modifications produced in that plan as a result of, to some degree or other, pressure from this province; and that was the decision to fund the plan in part. One effect of that, of course, was that pension benefits have been reduced. But the other effect is the one I am interested in at the moment.

It is purely an economic effect, or rather it is primarily an economic effect. The pension plan now becomes in part a form of compulsory saving on the people of Canada. The major part of the saving it compels will be by those who are least able to save; that is the lower income groups.

A disproportionate part of the savings under this compulsory plan will come from lower income groups. This will have consequences in the future of reducing demand which surely is something of some consequence to a province that is primarily dependent on manufacturing. It will reduce demand because these people will have less disposable income. They will be compelled under this plan to save, and they are the people least able to save. Yet the method by which we are now raising investment funds is by compelling saving on the part of people who at the present time hardly have enough income to meet their current bills.

I think we can carry the analysis one stage further, Mr. Chairman. This is not really compulsory saving, it is taxation. The pension benefits that will be paid in the future will not be paid out of the premiums that are collected today. Let us get that notion out of our heads, if it is necessary to do so.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: By the widest stretch of the imagination what connection has this with the vote we are on in this budget?

Mr. Bryden: Investment funds, economic—

Mr. Sargent: Well, that is stretching it pretty far. Let us get down to the business of the House and quit this drivel. This goes on for hours and it is not intelligent.

Mr. Bryden: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Grey North is a very poor judge of intelligence. If he wishes to go and hear the hockey game that, I think, would greatly contribute to the debate in this House.

I am dealing with economic policy as far as Canada and Ontario are concerned and if the hon. member for Grey North does not think that this proposed new pension plan has important economic implications and is integral to a consideration of economic policy, then I certainly am not going to take time to improve his education, Mr. Chairman, because that would take a long time indeed.

The point I was trying to make was that this compulsory saving is really a form of taxation. The contributions made today do not pay the pensions of tomorrow. The pensions of tomorrow come out of tomorrow's production, but the effect of the so-called funding of the plan is that certain people are required to sacrifice certain purchasing power today—certain income today.

That income, I understand, will be used for investment purposes. I hope that in this province—now that we have grabbed 100 per cent of it—we will use the money available to an important degree for education, for investment in the physical facilities for education. I have no doubt that the hon. Prime Minister has that in mind to some degree.

So what is really happening, Mr. Chairman, is that under the guise of a pension plan we are taxing the lower income groups to provide capital to create educational facilities. I am a strong believer in the need for increased educational facilities, but I think this is the worst possible way to go about it. It makes even more regressive a tax structure in this country that is already regressive, it weighs heavily on the lower income groups. They are the groups least able to make the funds available for this purpose and yet as a result of the positions that have been taken by the government of this province this is what is happening.

This is what is happening in Canada today, and I am suggesting that this is a retrograde step, both economically and socially. Its economic consequences are undesirable, sir, because it discourages consumption on the part of those who have the greatest need to buy goods. It goes flatly contrary to the type of policy that has been adopted under

the Kennedy-Johnson administration in the United States, in which there have been significant tax reductions and a significant part of them has been for the lower income group. We are now proposing to impose a new tax on the lower income groups under a guise of accumulated investment funds. The investment funds we are accumulating are now being distributed in such a way as to intensify rather than reduce economic imbalance across the country.

That is why I say, sir, that the policies adopted by the government of this province as distinct from the exhortations given to us this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development tend towards the balkanization of the country. They are parochial policies that do not take into account the needs of the country as a whole and the need of Ontario to have a strong central government with the capacity to carry out strong economic policies.

That is why I suggested a little earlier that I could only have wished that the hon. Prime Minister had been present for that portion of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I think that some of his remarks in this field were very much to the point and very much worthy of consideration. I am hoping in the future they may actually represent a philosophy that will be translated into government policy. But for the present time it would appear that this government's support of increased federal-provincial co-operation in the economic field and other fields is in words mainly. When we get down to the brass tacks we do not go as far as Mitch Hepburn did.

I will agree we do not have an Ontario-Quebec axis which tries to disrupt Confederation for the short-term benefit of the individual provinces. Certainly I do not think there is any danger of any recurrence of that, but we still have a strong provincial, parochial tendency which is bound to weaken any role the federal government may wish to take in the development of economic policy. It is indeed essentially a determination of Ontario policy by the province of Quebec.

As I said at the beginning I am not making any comments favourable or otherwise about Quebec's policies. All I am saying is that we should determine our own policies. Our situation is entirely different from Quebec's. We should make our policies in terms of our situation, and our situation demands strong leadership by the federal government. I believe that this government, if it were willing to accept the responsibilities of leader-

ship, could induce the federal government to give a far stronger lead than it has been willing to give to date.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 401 carried?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to address some remarks to item number 6.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could take item four and bypass five and do five after 411. I think it would be in context with the rest of the presentation. Put all housing together with capital expenditures.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to address some remarks to item 6 in 401—the Conference of Women.

In the course of his remarks this afternoon the hon. Minister made the comment that he wanted to pay tribute to the women who had made the trade crusade a success.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Now let me add my tribute to all of this outburst of enthusiasm here.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Gallantry obviously is not dead in the backbenches of the Tory party. But the thing that puzzles me is that it is all very fine for the hon. Minister to be paying tribute to the women. I want to review what has happened in the Conference of Women and their role in the trade crusade over the past year, and I wonder if his tributes to the role they have played really match some of the actions of this department. When I say actions of this department, I recognize that the hon. Minister came in sometime during the month of October, if I recall correctly—no, in November—so that prior to that the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) was the man responsible. Therefore, I want to divide my comments into two chapters, so to speak. Chapter one was the period up to September 25 and shortly thereafter; Chapter two is the reorganization of the Conference of Women that has emerged slowly and was formalized in an official statement by the hon. Minister early in February of this year.

If we go back to chapter one and its beginnings something like 15 months ago, you will recall that the then Minister of Economics and Development, the hon. member for Riverdale, launched one of his

real productions. And when he launches a production Cecil B. De Mille is really thrown into the shadows. There was going to be an involvement of all the women of the province of Ontario in the crusade for trade, and obviously within the context of his proposition it was a very logical move. If you are going to influence the consumers to buy Ontario products and not to buy foreign products—without examining the merits of this whole concept for the moment—clearly, the women who control the major force of purchasing power—in the purchase of food, clothing, furniture and so on—these were the people to whom he had to get the message across. So, over 15 months ago—about the beginning of January—some 6,000 invitations were sent out to women across the province of Ontario—women in almost every organization. And in the month of February, on February 12 to be exact, a conference was held at the Royal York Hotel; and at the famous banquet about which we have heard so much, there were 2,300 of those 6,000 in attendance. A pretty successful kind of venture. Unfortunately—

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): It was a free dinner.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. leader of the Opposition interjects it was a free dinner—he is right, but it cost a fair amount of money. Most of the publicity it got by way of cartoons, with some rather cheap gibes from politicians and others, was with regard to the amount of drinking. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I am told that the number of drinks served that night were 600-odd.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): It was Ontario whisky.

Mr. MacDonald: And I would suggest to you that if only 600-odd drinks were served to the 2,300 people being there—and since the press was there, I suspect that the ladies had at the most about 300-400 drinks—that would be one in six who had a single drink. I present this little mathematical calculation particularly for the hon. members here who really had a field day in picturing all of the women of Ontario in quite a “drunk”, given free by the—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, this is strictly untrue. On a point of order. I, at this time a year ago, brought this matter up stating the government spent \$17,000 on a free dinner where they had bars. A great many people I know were there; I could not accuse the women of going

on a “drunk.” The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) completely misused the remarks I made, as the hon. member for York South is doing so now. Please stick to the facts; try to keep to them, will you?

Mr. MacDonald: I am trying to straighten out the facts. The image that was created was that an awful lot of drinking was done; and the simple fact was that 600 drinks were served to 2,300 people, plus the press.

An hon. member: Where did you get that information?

Mr. MacDonald: Never mind where I got the information. At this banquet, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister gave a speech which apparently was a bit too political because most of the women had been brought there under the impression that this was a very above-politics venture, in which they were going to be involved to save the economy of the province of Ontario. However, sir, they suffered that because they were subjected to the impassioned pleas of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. He was pleading for them to play their role, saying that they had a role to play in the development of the economy of the province of Ontario, to create 60,000 new jobs which were necessary if we were going to be able to have full employment.

Indeed you will recall, Mr. Chairman, at that time the theme he was operating under was, “Do you really care?”

I remember one time, and I think I have already mentioned this in the House, when I went home and was looking over the mail which had come in during the day; I saw one addressed to my wife which started out: “Do you really care?” My interest began to perk up, and I wanted to know what strange male was beginning to intrude into the serenity of the MacDonald home, it was much to my surprise to discover it was the Minister of Economics who was writing to her, starting out: “Do you really care?”

However, seriously, Mr. Chairman, once again I have to give credit to the hon. member. The hon. member convinced the women that there was a job to be done here. As a matter of fact the women came in and participated in this whole work, almost in an atmosphere of war-time self-sacrifice, as a contribution to the economic welfare of this province.

When the conference of women was over, they went home, and their executive committee got into operation. The Minister announced that he was establishing a women's

division in The Department of Economics and Development—in answer to the interjections, let me say it has died in the interval, like so many things. A director was appointed. In the course of the ensuing months they organized a central information agency, and established a speakers' bureau.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the House of some of the developments which took place then, and I will tell you that I am reading it from the minutes of the executive council of the conference of women. If anybody is curious to know where these minutes came from, I will tell you that there were about 30 or 40 copies, at least, distributed to all the women. Then, as I shall comment a little later once the election was over the women were just dropped—like that! There was a very great and widespread feeling of disaffection in regard to the whole matter.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): These minutes are not before the courts, are they?

Mr. MacDonald: No, they are not before the courts. They are before the court here.

For example, when they got into the organization, it is interesting to read in the minutes—of a meeting held on February 20, 1963—almost one of the first meetings, very shortly after that banquet on February 12 down at the Royal York Hotel.

There is a note on page 5 of the minutes which says that the chairman will appoint chairmen of subcommittees in a number of regional areas of Ontario—i.e., Metropolitan Toronto, Hamilton, Kitchener-Guelph-Galt, Peterborough, Windsor, North Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie, Owen Sound, Kingston, Fort William, Port Arthur, Stratford, London, St. Catharines-Niagara Falls, Sarnia, Ottawa. You can just see the Macaulay touch here, the whole of the province was being covered. We were getting an organization which would encompass the four corners of the province of Ontario.

They also set up a great number of committees which were to cover the whole range of consumer problems. There was a manufacturing committee to look into the hard goods; a retail sales committee; a production committee, a production-promotion committee; a human resources committee; a natural resources committee; a consumer purchasing committee; a textile committee; and they had volunteer groups working on all those.

There were literally, so I am told, tens of thousands of people involved in it. And these women were playing their role. They all

thought they were making a contribution to the development of the economics of the province of Ontario, and they did; indeed they accepted the assurances of the Minister and his deputy and others. So, as the summer went by, and they discovered that they had been too late in giving consideration to organizing exhibits which might go to all the fall fairs, they thought they would do that next year because the Minister had told them this was a five-year programme.

Toward the end of August, they came before the Minister and other members of the committee and presented their programme for the coming year. In the minutes, for example, of September 4—we are into the election campaign now—there is a note which said:

The Minister informed the executive council that he and Mr. Clarkson would go over the brief and let the council know, on the first or second day of October, how much money the Treasury board would allow them. Mr. Clarkson told the executive council that money will be found for the organization of the regional conferences proposed in the presentation and that plans were to go ahead for the proposed mission from abroad.

In other words, in the early stages of their action, they were told that as soon as the election was over “we will have meetings and we will set up your programme for the coming year”.

Well, I will tell you what happened, Mr. Chairman—and I am waiting until I have the attention of the hon. Minister of Mines because I want him to be brought up to date.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): My ladies have been appointed.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the hon. Minister just listen? I am talking about chapter one. If he just listens he will not get himself confused.

There was a promise that right after the election the executive council would be called and it would map out the plans for the next year. The executive council was never called. That group of women was never called back at all, never once. Once the election was over, it was just dropped in the most callous manner.

Some hon. members: Oh, no!

Mr. MacDonald: And if the hon. Minister of Mines thinks I am wrong, I invite the hon.

Minister to get up and deny what I have said to be the case.

Now, I will tell you what happened in all this, Mr. Chairman. Tens of thousands of women were harnessed into a magnificent political machine; they were invited to do a job on idealistic terms, to meet the economic needs of the province of Ontario. But what they did not realize, in their degree of naiveté, is that they were being used in the Tory build-up to election day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, okay, Mr. Chairman, just let me document my case by going back to the minutes of April 9, 1963 for the executive council. This is rather delicious; this is so inimitably the hon. member for Riverdale. The minute reads:

The Minister personally pledged his absolute devotion to the success of the Conference of Women—

Do you really care? Here was the Minister's response. He was pledging—it is officially recorded in the minutes—his absolute devotion to the success of the Conference of Women:

—and requested that a meeting of the executive and members of the council of the Conference of Women should not be held until October.

In April he pledges his support, his passionate support, and then he requests that they not meet again until October. The executive met September 1. It agreed to meet right after the election about its budget. In the five or six weeks that the Minister was in his department after the election, the group was never called together at all. It was dropped.

The organization just drifted out into limbo. The director did not know when the end of her period of employment came. Her salary was just cut off. One woman, after a change in Ministers was made, wrote in because she thought—she just wanted to test the situation, I think—that if there was a change in Ministers it was like a change in the Prime Minister and as a Cabinet Minister you tendered your resignation. By way of finding out what the reply would be, she tendered her resignation and she got a thank-you letter back from the new hon. Minister. They were dropped, I say to the hon. Minister of Mines, just like that. They had served their political purpose and nothing more happened.

But if you want to find out what was happening during these months, let me go back

to the minutes of April 9. The second paragraph after this expression of passionate devotion to the success of the Conference of Women:

It was requested by the Minister that a weekly report be submitted to him in connection with the speakers' bureau.

An hon. member: A very good idea.

Mr. MacDonald: A very good idea, you bet. The politician spoke there.

This report is to include information as to who the speakers are, where they are speaking, what organizations they are speaking to and the size of the reaction and the audience. If the Minister were informed ahead of time of these speaking engagements he would be in a better position to facilitate the speakers as to press, radio coverage and the attendance of the local MPP.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you can think of anything more fatuous than that the very busy hon. Robert Macaulay should be looking after the press and TV for each of the meetings of the Conference of Women, I invite you to speculate on it for a moment. What was happening, Mr. Chairman, was that these women, in the course of doing their duty, were being used by the pre-election machine of the Tory Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, just by way of checking it out—I have not done this before—when the Minister requested the speakers and the reaction and the size of the audience and everything else so that he could arrange for the press and the publicity and the attendance of a local MPP, was there any single Opposition member ever invited to one of these meetings? Let us put it this way. Were all Opposition members invited to any of the Conference of Women's meetings to share in all of this ostensibly non-political publicity? Was there a single member of the Opposition invited to any one of these meetings?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: No, of course not, Mr. Chairman. What was happening was, as usual, the public affairs of this province were integrated into the Tory machine and only the Tory members were invited to the meeting, so that the women who were serving the high interests of the economic needs of the province of Ontario were a very integral part of the Tory publicity.

In other words, if I may just sum it up, Mr. Chairman, it is a story of how the Ontario government—chapter one of the story I tell the hon. Minister of Mines—led the 500,000 members of the various women's organizations up the garden path and left them standing there. To put it bluntly, it is the story of how the government used the women of this province to serve their own political purposes in the month leading up to the election and then, without so much as an explanation, without so much as a thank you, dropped them in a callous manner and they never had another meeting.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No political party could ever lead 500,000 women up the garden path—

Mr. MacDonald: Now, I think it is about time the province knew a bit about just how this government is operated, Mr. Chairman. As my hon. colleague from Woodbine said, prior to this election last September 25, this party had pretty good public relations. It was presenting a pretty good image and maybe it is only a coincidence it has been stumbling and fumbling all over the lot ever since the hon. Robert Macaulay left.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me go on to chapter two of the Conference of Women, because, Mr. Chairman, it became very obvious to a number of people in the government that after they had so badly treated these women who, in the words of the hon. Minister this afternoon: "I pay tribute to the women who made the trade crusade a success"; after they had revealed, following September 25 how callously they had used the women politically and then dropped them, there was a great deal of disaffection. In the event you want to try to pinpoint the source of my information let me say that I have called up and I have spoken to virtually everyone who was on the original advisory committee and I got the same story, with variations, from every one of them.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Did you ask them if they cared?

Mr. MacDonald: I was thrown for a moment when the hon. lady from Hamilton Centre turned and asked me if I asked them if they really cared. I thought I was getting into Bob Macaulay's category.

But they had to start to rebuild the advisory committee of the women, so they got Mrs. Lymburner, who I think had been chairman of the advisory committee before. In the early part of February the hon. Minister held a press conference and he is

reported in the *Globe and Mail* of February 7 as saying—or the story reports—that the role of women in the Ontario Trade Crusade will continue this year.

The broader programme calls for a paid chairman and an executive secretary.

And later on the story states that:

Mrs. Lilah Lymburner, of Port Colborne, chairman of the conference, will receive what Mr. Randall termed an honorarium of \$4,000 a year. She emphasized at a joint press conference with the Minister that the conference is not a club; I expect at least 50,000 women will become involved in this.

Still later down, the story says that Miss Fell, a provincial civil servant, will receive a salary of from \$5,200 to \$6,300 range; she was taken in as a full-time executive secretary.

Now, I would like to put a question to the hon. Minister. When did Miss Fell resign?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Miss Fell took the job and found it was not the kind of job she wanted and she asked to be transferred back to her job in The Department of Lands and Forests. I do not know whether the young lady has gone back or not as yet, but I understand she is going back.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, thank you.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the one full-time person—because Mrs. Lymburner is on an honorarium and is not necessarily a full-time person—the one full-time person in chapter two has already left. She has left, I submit, because the programme so far is so unsubstantial by comparison to what she was led to believe that she figures that after 23 years in civil service she does not want to revert at this stage to being a mere clerk-typist. So she has gone back to her job in the civil service and the post will have to be filled once again.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I have said at the outset of my remarks that I think there can be a role for women to play in this thing. I think the record of this government in abusing and using the Conference of Women for their political purposes before the election and dropping them afterwards should be condemned in the strongest possible terms. I am curious to know what is going to happen in the new chapter.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I could not do that with my women, they will not drop me.

Mr. MacDonald: For example, a year ago the hon. Minister announced that there was

going to be a division of women in The Department of Economics and Development with a director. Now I would like some clarification from the hon. Minister, and perhaps we should take these questions one at a time; is there a division of women in The Department of Economics and Development or has this been washed out as part of the liquidation of chapter one of the Conference of Women?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mrs. Lymburner is heading the division.

Mr. MacDonald: There is actually a division?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if there is a division of women, how come it is not listed at all in our estimates for this year? All you have is the Conference of Women as item six in the main office vote.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. We call it the Conference of Women, but it is a division of the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, perhaps we are just quibbling over words.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think we are.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the hon. Minister indicate to me what is the composition of the new advisory committee and what are the projects that they are now going to launch in this year's programme? Specifically, for example, have they resurrected all of that range of committees on which a great deal of voluntary work was done by people who thought they were making a real contribution for a non-political cause last year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would you like me to answer the question now?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: First of all, Mr. Chairman and hon. members, I agree with you, I think Mr. Macaulay was a terrific salesman and did an excellent job of getting everybody into the act. The success of the programme last year certainly indicates so when we look at the number of unemployed we have in this province—less than 3.3 per cent, actually 2.5 per cent at the end of last month—and the gross provincial product was up 6.9 per cent. All this had a bearing on the prosperity of this province.

I mentioned this afternoon that there were 308 items imported here in 1962, and last year 208 of these showed a considerable re-

duction, which indicated the women had taken the programme seriously, were looking at the label and were comparing price and quality with imports and decided to buy Canadian-made goods.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might also mention, as I did again this afternoon, that we not only helped provide the 60,000 job opportunities, we provided twice that. At the end of March this year, there are 124,000 more people working in this province than there were last year.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I say, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot argue with success and the women's division in my estimation had a great deal to do with the success of the trade crusade programme.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: It is all very well to have a political speech with this wired-for-sound applause from all the back seats, but I wonder if we can get down to the important substance of this.

Will the hon. Minister indicate why the advisory committee was never called together after the election?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was just trying to remember—I heard your speech on the radio a few months ago and you read the same thing word for word tonight, so I would like to repeat some of the things that maybe the hon. member had forgotten. I would like to read the facts for you. I would be glad to tell you what the Conference of Women is doing and has done. I think perhaps these facts will be rather enlightening to all of us.

When the women's programme was first planned late in 1962, Mrs. Muriel Wright was employed at a salary of \$6,600 per year outside the civil service to organize the programme. The Conference of Women was established under the chairmanship of Mrs. L. Lymburner who is, of course, still the chairman. A small executive committee was brought together by Mrs. Wright to assist in the organization of the work, and committees were established. The government's objective then, as now, was to involve the women of this province in our trade crusade drive to provide jobs for their sons and daughters. Do not think for one instant that they are not interested in such an important objective.

The executive committee met monthly, initiating projects such as fashion shows,

trade crusade weeks at the arcade, a conference in the Niagara Peninsula. Mrs. Wright went to Europe to explore the possibility of fashion shows there. Many talks were given to women around the province, and other meetings were held.

Several women dropped out of the executive committee during the summer for one reason or another. For example, career women found it difficult to attend meetings during the day and others could not attend regularly; I think that is true of most women's organizations.

There was a tendency to concentrate on activities in Toronto and, according to the deputy Minister, the organization and methods services—which is a unit of The Treasury Department—reviewed the Conference of Women organization and made recommendations. These recommendations were presented to the deputy Minister in a report dated September 30.

The report recommended that two civil service positions be set up for women to ensure closer co-ordination and co-operation in the department. These recommendations were accepted and, after discussions with the civil service commission, it was decided that only one position should be established within the civil service but that the chairman of the Conference of Women should be paid; and you know what the pay is.

The Department of the Civil Service reviewed the position and decided on the salary range of \$5,250 to \$6,300. The position was advertised on November 16, 1963 as competition No. 1,854, and ten applications were received. The position paid considerably less than the \$6,900 which Mrs. Wright was now receiving, and she did not participate in the competition.

I should point out that every civil service position must be filled by competition. At this stage I was appointed as the Minister of the department and of course matters were held in abeyance until I had the opportunity to review the situation and give my approval of the programme. This I did and the successful applicant in the competition was appointed and is now with us; since then Miss Fell has resigned and gone back to her old job.

For the record I would refer to several dates which will show that there is no foundation to the charge made by the hon. member for York South. I have already referred to the OM study, which was completed on September 30. The former Minister sent a long memorandum to the deputy Minister on October 7, just prior to his resignation, in

which he set out his views on the conference. He also was concerned about the lack of co-ordination, stating that it was not his intention to have two programmes in the department—one for everybody, and one for women. He stated that the programme of the Conference of Women should be more closely integrated with those of the department. He also felt that there should be a female industrial development officer in the department, and that the executive committee should be in an advisory capacity to the Minister, among other things.

A possible reorganization and reorientation of the programme was discussed with the chairman, Mrs. Lymburner. The deputy Minister also took into account the views of several of the ladies who had been closely associated with this programme. For example, in a letter dated October 29, to one of the members of the executive committee, the deputy Minister comments as follows:

Over the past two weeks I have spent considerable time in an endeavour to clarify the future role of the conference and to make sure that it will be established on a firm and permanent basis. I believe I have made good progress, and this includes the establishment of one of the two permanent positions in the department which specialize in women's activities.

I have also held talks with Mrs. Lymburner and we are in substantial agreement as to the future role of the Conference of Women.

Meanwhile, promotions sponsored by the Conference of Women are proceeding. The conference has sponsored a booth at the Canadian National Exhibition and it has sponsored a daily fashion show. There were active negotiations with the federal government to sponsor a fashion show at the Canadian fair in Philadelphia during the week of November 12.

A major promotion was organized in connection with the Royal Winter Fair, November 21, whereby a fashion show was sponsored, and leading buyers from major United States stores were flown in for the event. This promotion, the success of which was due to the great deal of work put into it by Mrs. Wright, received wide recognition. For example, stories and pictures written by departmental staff on the event were carried by more than 200 newspapers throughout the United States. I have copies of the stories which appeared in 25 of these.

On January 7, I replied to a letter which I had received from one of the members of

the executive committee who had tendered her resignation:

"I was sorry to receive your letter of resignation from the Conference of Women. While there had been no meetings of the original committee for some time, please be assured that the Conference of Women has my full support. There is much to be done and it is my intention to make sure that we have a sound, firmly established organization to carry out the programme of the Conference of Women.

"Much closer co-operation in the work of the department is desirable and I appreciate the problems faced by Mrs. Wright and the committee in the past month. A great deal of excellent work has been done in the past year on behalf of the government.

"May I thank you sincerely for your personal efforts as a member of the executive. Your resignation is accepted with regret and you may be assured that we are most appreciative of the contribution you and the members of the conference have made in the past."

In planning our budget last fall, an amount was included to cover the administrative expenses of the conference for the coming year. Further amounts, for example the promotion of trade crusade weeks, which are of interest to the Conference of Women, have been included in the trade and industry branch appropriations. It was decided that an expanded advisory committee should be appointed to give representation from all parts of the province. This has been done and the ladies appeared here in the Legislature while attending a meeting here last month.

There are many things we have planned for the Conference of Women. The programme is under way. We will have a "Canadian Week" in Kitchener on May 25. We have other fashion shows coming up and the programme is working. As far as I am concerned it is going to be a large part and parcel of our trade crusade programme.

There are going to be changes in personnel. I do not think you can get so many women together without some dropping out. We have 22 in the new advisory committee right now. I am quite sure that with the family problems these women run into—they are all married and most of them have small families—we will lose some of them before the end of the year. So I am quite sure there are going to be some changes in the advisory committee, and the committee previous to this is no exception.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the women we had previously working with the trade crusade group have done, in my estimation, an excellent job. While I am quite sure that there may have been some dissatisfaction with the odd one, certainly I am not going to deprecate any woman who made a contribution to the trade crusade week; and on that statement, sir, I stand.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister did not answer my question as to why the advisory committee was never called together again after September 25.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to answer that for the hon. member right now, if he likes. Mrs. Lymburner at that time was an honorary chairman, and had a business of her own. I have a letter here from her, Mr. Chairman, written to Mr. Macaulay, and it reads:

Sir:

I felt I should tell you that I leave Toronto by TCA this evening of September 30 for Winnipeg on a speaking tour which will take me from there to Fort William, Port Arthur, Sault Ste. Marie and back to North Bay, returning to Toronto on October 12.

That is why the meeting was not held. Mrs. Lymburner was away.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my point is this: It was never held. I do not want to belabour this much longer, except that it is all very well for the hon. Minister to pay tribute—and tribute which should be paid—but the original advisory committee was allowed to disintegrate. Perhaps it was part of the interregnum while the new hon. Minister was getting established. I am not going to try to elaborate now why all the things happened. But many of the women were not even thanked for the contribution they had made. Sure, one woman resigned, and she got the letter of thanks the hon. Minister has just read. I think there was even a highly amusing incident in another case where another member of the original advisory committee was thanked for her letter of resignation when she had not submitted it. The confusion was really greater than you could imagine.

However, the hon. Minister now says that the advisory committee has been enlarged to include women.

Let us face it, the new advisory committee—I think I am correct, in fact I am certain I am correct but if perchance I am

wrong let the hon. Minister correct me now—other than Mrs. Lymburner, has only two of the original group on it. So they were just dropped, with no explanation, and a new group is being brought together. It is a closed chapter and the sooner it becomes a closed chapter and we forget about it, the better. But it is a pretty sorry chapter, in terms of using and abusing a group of women for your political purposes, and then dropping them in this fashion when they had made a real contribution.

The hon. Minister has indicated the programme of work they have lined up for the next year—regional conferences I presume instead of this kind of, monstrous kind of conference they had down in the Royal York Hotel a year ago. But there is one basic point I want to make. When you get women working in what is the consumers' field—I am a little curious as to what are the various jurisdictions of organizations attempting to do work in this field.

For example, as the hon. Minister knows, one of the government departments makes a grant to the Canadian Association of Consumers, Ontario Branch. They are attempting to do one phase of work in this field. There were a great many people who were suspicious of the advisory committee's new establishment because it was going to be concentrated primarily in the rural areas in the Women's Institutes, where Mrs. Lymburner's past experience tended to be concentrated because she, I think, is the past president of the Canadian Women's Institutes. I am told that the new advisory committee is made up of people whose names were submitted by local chambers of commerce and community groups of this nature, so that it is one that represents city as well as country. Indeed, I understand, among them there are some good Liberals, so let me say to my hon. Liberal friends: do not complain that this is a Tory organization.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): They are all good.

Mr. MacDonald: There are Liberals anyway.

An hon. member: Stick to the issue; stick to the point.

Mr. MacDonald: But what is the exact delineation of the responsibilities of this body as compared with the CAC? Is this body going to get into anything of the field of the Canadian Association of Consumers? Because, if it is, I submit to you that we are beginning to spend money in a duplicated fashion and wasting it. Can the hon. Minister give me

some assurance that we are not going to get into a duplication of works?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I will be glad to. Let me draw a comparison. In the economic council we have a committee engaged on research. When we set up the first committee and asked the chairman to take over, we found there were nine different groups engaged in research in this province, Mr. Chairman, so I suggested to the former Minister, before we start another group out doing a research job, we should find out what the other nine are doing, so that we do not duplicate our efforts. I might also say that, in the Windsor committee, we also found, when we set up the economic council, there were 27 reports since 1957, on what is wrong with Windsor. So before we compiled another report, we examined the 27 reports we already had. And I would say to you, sir, that the women's organizations we have set up now will try to co-ordinate their activities with the consumer groups, and with any women's groups across this province and try to sell them on the programme of a trade crusade and the need to work with us with our trade crusade programme—on fashion shows and promoting Canadian-made products and as I say, looking at the label.

Just to give you one example of how it would work: I was at a fashion show at the Constellation Hotel just a week ago; there were over 300 people in there and the show was put on by a local shopping centre. Our Conference of Women appeared there and we get a chance, we believe, while talking to these people who gather groups of women together, to tell them the story of the trade crusade and why they should look at the label. And again, I just want to emphasize that they are passing along the same information that I do, and that is: We do not tell them not to buy imports, we just simply tell them to look at the label, if the quality, if the price is comparable, buy Canadian. That is going to be their punch line.

Mr. MacDonald: I thank the hon. Minister for his explanation and I think we can do nothing more now than hold a watching brief over chapter two of the Conference of Women and wish it the best in its work.

As a footnote to this discussion of women, and on the comment that the hon. Minister made this afternoon that he was reducing a great deal of the advertising programme in connection with the crusade for trade, I think it is well for the House to be informed as to what some people thought of the advertising that it had in the past. I have here, for example, a column that was carried in the

Toronto *Telegram*, written by Nancy Phillips on February 28, 1964; it is entitled:

IT IS A DOWDY BILLBOARD

My vote for the dowdiest-looking woman in Toronto goes to a would-be fashion-plate. If you drive up Yonge St. past the liquor control board building—just north of Roxborough—you'll see her gracing a large Ontario Government Trade Crusade billboard.

The only message on the sign is: "Look For Made in Canada" which of course is another way of saying why buy imports when the national product is just as good or better? But the lady thereon who represents—presumably—a discriminating shopper is sporting an outfit that Minnie Mouse would be ashamed to give to the TSO rummage sale.

The whole thing reeks of Hicksville. Not only is it an affront to a city which boasts some of the nation's best dressed women, it's also a sad comment on the taste of our trade crusaders.

My point, gentlemen, is that any woman who dresses like your billboard gal is incapable of making intelligent decisions. About labels, anyway. So, maybe it is just as well that you are cutting down on your advertising programme, if that is the reaction it has produced.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to comment on that. I have been covering appliances for 35 years and any time you put out any kind of an ad that does not have a particular appeal and nobody looks at it, you are wasting your money. I can recall buying a television programme, the first all-Canadian television programme in Canada, called RCMP. After the first showing we got hundreds of letters from our dealers insisting that the acting was lousy and the dialogue was putrid and it was an amateur show, but in every case they said they liked the commercials. Now that year our sales went from \$35 million to \$42 million, so we were delighted to have such a bad show. Now, as far as Nancy Phillips is concerned, I respect the lady's opinion, but all I would say to you, sir, is that we have had hundreds of people call in and say they have had a look at the billboard and they have noticed what Mrs. Phillips said about it and as far as I am concerned, I could not care less what any fashion writer said, as long as the people look at the billboard and get the message. And that is exactly what I am getting.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on vote 401, what fascinates me is this figure of \$750,000

for advertising, exhibits, conferences, special services and publications arising therefrom. Now in discussing this, I say as I have said before that I have a great deal of regard for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and if he will devote his many fine qualities to the benefit of all our citizens—my criticism is not personal, it is on policy.

Now, this department that he heads up, as a back benchner I would suggest it is a relatively new portfolio, and after watching how it dovetailed into the election last June, July, August and September, and stepped up with increasing tempo close to election day—for every television commercial with the hon. Prime Minister was preceded by a promotion on the crusade business—I felt that my tax dollars were abetting his election. I did not like that. Now I would hope that this is not in any way going to be a gigantic PR machine for this government but I think, as things will develop in this portfolio, going along with the machine of ladies you have working for you, that the image of the government will not suffer, believe me.

We have this figure of \$750,000 and repeatedly I believe that every time the government gets in trouble we have a column in the *Toronto Star*.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: You do not have to read any columns—

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, George. It is written by Dalton Camp. I understand he is a top brass in your party machine—top man. This is a cosy arrangement, Mr. Chairman. In the last year, Mr. Camp, who runs an agency—he is a top Tory—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: He is in our camp.

Mr. Sargent: He received \$153,000, and \$119.75 in one department—it is the hon. Minister's department. On another bid he received \$9,920 for publications. We will dodge down a bit further on B-15 last year, in the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission—he received \$67,000.

An hon. member: We are supposed to be on—

Mr. Sargent: Well, we will get to that in a minute. Then further down on maintenance, he gets another \$6,152. Now this is a very cosy set-up, where the president of the Conservative Association can run an agency, then if his government gets in trouble, can have a full shot on the editorial page of the *Toronto Star* to back up their—now this is handy, it is real dandy—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What is wrong with it? Give us the details of your organization in Owen Sound.

Mr. Sargent: I would tell the hon. member for Forest Hill that he has a four-column spread on the editorial page of the *Star*. "In This Corner," is the title of the column, by Dalton Camp. Now, I imagine it is the same Dalton Camp.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): I think you will probably find that the *Star* pays him for that.

Mr. Sargent: Well I guess the taxpayers of Ontario are paying for it when you see these handouts and agency commissions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Now, I would suggest to the Ontario government and to the hon. Minister that we are looking at a giant PR machine insofar as further facts are concerned, that have developed from the Owen Sound fiasco, when the government—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I would suggest to the hon. Minister that the facts as they unfold and the facts presented to this House before on the Owen Sound situation and fiasco as it developed, that this Owen Sound group—and this may be ODA but it leads up to the point, Mr. Minister — that this machine, that I believe you head now, is the basic conception. Whoever dreamed it up, it was a giant PR machine to hold this government in a favourable image. And I would suggest to you that the hon. Minister—and I wish that Mr. Macaulay were here tonight, sir, because I see that last year he spent \$12,000 of our money in travelling expenses. Now, that is a lot of money, and I would like to know the area that the hon. Prime Minister will entertain in that a person can be a member of this House and not ever show his face here. I think it is important to all of us who try to do a job, to attend a session. When a man holds a seat in this House and never appears here, I cannot ask the questions properly to this hon. Minister here, when the hon. Minister is not here to defend himself.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Do you want us to keep an attendance record?

Mr. Sargent: Well, as this unfolds—going back to the field where our money was used

to promote the Conservative Party in the last election—I wish to ask the hon. Minister—and it is not his baby, but he will have to assume the mantle now—that after this programme had been launched, the Owen Sound management of the firm approached Mr. Etchen, who was one of the top brass of the ODA—

Hon. Mr. Randall: On a point of order, we are on vote 401.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest the business is advertising.

Mr. Chairman: I am asking you to deal with vote 401, advertising, exhibits, conferences, special services and publications arising therefrom.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I suggest there is a wide area for discussion. This is advertising that I am bringing up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: You are dealing with 406.

Mr. Sargent: I am dealing with advertising on 401.

Mr. Chairman: Continue.

Mr. Sargent: As the hon. Minister will tell you, public relations covers a big sphere. So, anyway, the Owen Sound management approached the ODA and asked them if they wanted to close the plant on July 15. Now, at that point \$80,000 of the province of Ontario's money had been expended in this operation.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The \$80,000 that you speak of, was that in advertising or was it—

Mr. Sargent: I would suggest that it is advertising, yes; it went into the Owen Sound plant.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Will you direct your question to the Minister on that basis?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, my question is to the hon. Minister. At that time \$80,000 had been spent and pledged by the Ontario government. This had been used up and when they approached Mr. Etchen he refused to close the plant and said to leave it in operation. The plant was left open until two days after the election and the information I gave the House on the last point that a Mr. Marshall had called to close the plant down—it was a Mr. Mitchell of your staff.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is the second time I have heard that.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I know, but I am clarifying the whole issue now, George.

An hon. member: With respect to the advertising end of it?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir. It is not a laughing matter, it is \$170,000. And so, two days after the election, Mr. Mitchell of your staff called to close the plant down. That is a matter of record. I talked to Mr. Mitchell on the 'phone last week and he confirmed that he had made that call. And Mr. Macaulay told this House, or the present hon. Minister told this House, that the order came to close the plant on October 21. Now there is a great variance of truth and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if \$170,000 has gone into this operation and it was used to support this government in the election drive, I say it is basically not in the public interest. And I say therefore this could be conceived as a PR machine for the government.

An hon. member: Well, it did not work.

Mr. Sargent: That is why they closed the plant down.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on this item of advertising, I spoke on this last year and what I said then still holds. I feel that the government is spending far too much money on advertising, \$759,000 is a lot of money, and the unfortunate part about it is that most of this spending, practically all of it, is used really for political patronage. Now I do not care what political party does this, be it provincially or federally; I say that basically this is wrong in principle. And it is about time the public woke up to the fact that political parties are using this type of thing in order to pay for election programmes or to pave the way for a campaign that is bound to come sooner or later.

The very fact that under this item one particular advertising agency alone, Dalton Camp Associates, gets nearly \$250,000—last year it got about \$200,000 that we know of—shows that this money is being paid and used for political purposes. It is not the business or the purpose of government to have these fancy billboards all over the province. Last year it was moose heads and hippopotamuses, this year it is a dowdily dressed female. This is a waste of public money; and it is, in essence, a political payoff, Mr. Chairman.

In other words, they are rewarding those who have helped them during a campaign which has just passed. Last year it was for getting in preparation for the campaign.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is the biggest untruth I have ever heard in this House.

Mr. Trotter: This is an absolute fact. All you have to do is read the public accounts. Mr. Camp is the greatest beneficiary in the payoff; but there is the Lovick agency, McConnell Eastman—all the well-known active Tories are being paid off with thousands upon thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money. And I say it is wrong.

I know you fellows think it is a big joke because this time it has worked. But again I want to emphasize for the record, Mr. Chairman, that this, in essence, is a waste of money. It is most obviously a political payoff. I am surprised it has taken a year for a shrewd member like the hon. member for York South to wake up to the fact that these dinners, and all this work among the women, was nothing but a preparation for an election campaign. A year ago I tried to tell this House that, and they thought I was trying to make a mountain out of a molehill; but the truth is that this is exactly what is being done—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, really now, the hon. members opposite ought to try to contain themselves a little bit at any rate. The rule, of course, is quite clear—that my hon. friends across the way cannot interrupt when a speaker is speaking in this House. Yet they are doing it continuously, not only continuously but loudly and boisterously; and one of those is enough, but when you get all three of them together it is too much. I would ask you to rule that they do not interrupt the speaker.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the members to refrain from interrupting while the speaker is on his feet trying to make statements; I think the business of the House would move along in a faster manner.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Trotter: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of order?

Mr. Boyer: No, I wish to ask a question of the hon. member.

He has given several large figures of money which he says are paid to certain individual firms. Why does he not admit that

this money is used to pay for advertising in media—in newspapers, magazines, radio programmes, television programmes; that is the purpose of these expenditures? The hon. member has said this money is given to a certain company; it is not, it is used for the payment of those accounts.

Mr. Trotter: Why, sure. The agency makes around 15 per cent at least, and in the meantime the remainder is spread around where it counts more: \$17,000 for a dinner, or money to different newspapers throughout the area in advertising. Government advertising is all part of the angle. You are paying them 15 per cent and then some. The hon. member knows nothing about the advertising business.

An hon. member: What do you know about it?

Mr. Trotter: I repeat it is a political pay-off. Dalton K. Camp is one organization—for which he gets a good percentage. He then passes it out to those newspapers and radio stations who are friendly to the government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that you can buy the newspapers?

Mr. Trotter: That one man alone passes out, by getting this commission, \$250,000 on this one department alone. I say that it is a prime disgusting waste of the taxpayers' money, and you are misusing the money and misleading the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the member to direct his question to the Minister of this department.

Mr. Trotter: Well, the hon. member was asking the question; I was giving him the answer, Mr. Chairman, which he obviously should know. He should not be vice-chairman of the Hydro if he did not know the answer to that question; because while I am on this subject, this hon. member who asked me the question is vice-chairman of the Hydro, which spends about \$1 million a year passing out the money, the same way as they do with Dalton Camp. The Hydro was one of the big wasters in advertising in the province of Ontario. It, too, resorts to political payoffs, obviously.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? I wonder if the hon. member would repeat those statements outside the Legislature?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I asked a question, Mr. Chairman. Would the hon. member repeat that outside the Legislature? I don't think he does.

Mr. Trotter: I did, during the election campaign. I have said this on a number of occasions. This is so obvious, so obvious.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Let us get back to vote 401.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on advertising on this 401: With regard to the amounts, we are all aware that the amount is not net—it is 15 per cent, and two per cent off for the agency. But there are a number of things, Mr. Chairman, in this department—

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, may I point this out? I think the hon. member would agree that 15 per cent is paid by the media to the advertising agency. The hon. member for Parkdale—I do not know whether he intended to say this, or not—inferred that the government somehow or other pays 15 per cent to the agency. That, of course, is not the case.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member is quite wrong there; the government pays the agency and the agency pays the media.

Mr. Boyer: Yes. And the media pays the agency—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague is quite right, it is the extras which count in this business. I am talking, first of all, about the money for the media, allotted to the amount of \$750,000; then we have the items for the publications, and such things as this report of the advertising firm headed by Dalton Camp. The National Progressive-Conservative Association president was given the government advertising contract for two Ontario historic centres, without a tender, four years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We must deal with vote 401 under The Department of Economics and Development.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about The Department of Economics and Development, sir.

Now, Tourism and Information Minister James Auld acknowledged in the Ontario Legislature yesterday that Dalton K. Camp and Associates still holds the contract for promoting the St. Lawrence Parks Commission, which operates the Upper Canada Village—

Mr. Chairman: Order! This has nothing to do with vote 401.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it comes in to show that this contract was given. It is under this department and was given without a tender.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): There is no tender for advertising. They all charge the same.

Mr. Sargent: It may be done that way in the hon. Minister's business but in our business it is done on a fairly legal basis.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows perfectly well that every advertising agency has exactly the same rates, whether they be Liberal, Conservative or NDP—and I do not think the NDP is in the advertising business.

Mr. MacDonald: They are.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough North has the floor.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, as one of the few members of this House in the advertising profession, I think that I should say a few words about this clouded picture being portrayed of advertising.

First of all, the agencies which have been mentioned as having government accounts are some of the finest advertising agencies in this country. These are agencies which have proven they can produce advertising campaigns to do the job which they were called upon to do. I think I should point out here first, that you never tender for an advertising agency. There is not a commercial company or a business which ever asks for tenders from an advertising agency.

What is done, Mr. Chairman, is that they are asked to make a presentation. They are given the problem: "What is the situation. Why are you going to advertise?" They are asked then to bring in a suggested programme as to how they would approach this problem. They bring in layouts of the advertisements, and so forth. Then the person who is buying the campaign, be it the government or a company, decides if they like the approach of the agency, if this is the approach that can do the job. Then an agency is picked on this basis.

Every agency charges the same, except for one or two who are now actually charging their clients fees, but this is not a generally accepted principle in the advertising business right now. The agencies basically make their money by the 15 per cent that is rebated to

them from the rates that media charges for the space, or the television or radio time, and this 15 per cent and two per cent discount for each is a standard rate.

Let us look at the statements that have been made here tonight—one of them being, I think, that the money spent went to publications that were favourable to the government—I think that this is a slur, a very sad slur upon the fine men—

Mr. Trotter: You are naive.

Mr. Wells: It is a slur upon the fine men that work in these agencies and select media, Mr. Chairman, because I know many of these men personally and I work with many of them. I know personally that they do not pick media on this basis. Media are picked—radio, television or print media—on the basis of "Can it do the job?" "Has it got the audience?" "Is it the best buy?" I know from personal experience that these criteria are applied to government advertising as well.

I think that this picture can become very muddled. I am reminded of a statement—I think it was in *Marketing* magazine recently—that \$332,000 was being spent by the federal Department of Labour to publicize this new social security number programme; you know those advertisements with all the different people standing in a row. It went to MacLaren Advertising—

Some hon. members: Oh, no, no.

An hon. member: Was it tendered?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Troy: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. The last remark of the hon. member for Scarborough North has no connection with this government at all. He is talking about the federal government. Will you strike that out?

An hon. member: Strike it out.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could bring this to a close by pointing out that I feel somewhat, with everybody participating, like the young lad who tied the two cats' tails together and hung them over a clothes line. I sit here and enjoy the fight.

I want to assure hon. members that I do not think any government, anywhere, can operate a business as large as this without an advertising programme in many areas and I do not think hon. gentlemen across the floor believe it could be possible to operate a government like this—you have to have a

promotion and a sales department to sell the province and that is exactly what we have in this programme of ours and I gave you my assurance this afternoon that I have checked the advertising programme very thoroughly. We are diverting some of our domestic advertising dollars into markets where we believe they will do the most good in getting foreigners to buy Canadian-made goods.

Prior to this we had first of all to convince Canadians to buy Canadian-made goods. That is one of the reasons for the diversification. I might say to you that as far as the advertising dollars are concerned, this \$759,000 is not all advertising. There are many things that go into making up an advertising account as most of you know, and I am sure that if you are in the legal business, you have to have your name in the telephone book and your sign outside. That is promotion, that is advertising and this \$759,000, of course, is broken down into many items, and consumer advertising is one; for domestic and international it is—

Mr. Bryden How much for consumer advertising?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Consumer advertising? We have \$350,000 and we have—

Mr. Bryden: How much does Dalton Camp get out of that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Dalton Camp is not the advertising agency for this department this year. We had five agencies that want to do our work and I did exactly as I have done all my life. I asked them to submit a proposition to us and we chose McConnell, Eastman and Company Limited. They had the best presentation. So that is the way advertising in my department is done and I am pretty sure that is the policy of this government and many of its departments.

Now, if there were 22 advertising agencies in this province I am sure 11 of them would be looking for Conservative business and 11 would be looking for Liberal business. I have heard the comment tonight about the advertising agencies and I can tell you that these people are very reputable. There was an article in the *Telegram* just a little while ago—and I know that the hon. member for Nipissing said it does not apply to his party—but there is an article here which says:

The major part of the federal government's \$9 million a year advertising business has been switched from Conservative to Liberal agencies since the Liberals came to power, it was revealed today.

I am sure also that if you read the newspapers tonight you will find Mr. Lloyd making the same charges against Mr. Thatcher out there, that he had too big an advertising programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can assure hon. members that there will be no wasted dollars as far as I am concerned but we are certainly going to spend those dollars where they will do the most good for the province of Ontario. I think that 100 years from now—whoever has this portfolio—will be spending money on advertising to promote the interests of the province and its economy.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister what proportion of this \$700,000 vote goes for billboard advertising. Could he tell me that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will give the hon. member the breakdown: exhibition and displays, \$55,000; summer and fall fairs, \$34,000; films, \$25,000; conferences, \$20,000; publications and reports, \$45,000; trade crusade week, \$25,000; international fairs, \$100,000; and I mentioned domestic advertising, \$300,000. Billboard advertising would be included in the \$300,000 we talk about.

Mr. Oliver: Does the Ruddy Company handle the billboard advertising?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it is Outdoor Advertising plus two or three more in the city of Toronto here. We use, I believe, more than one. However, the signboards are not owned by the advertising agencies. They are owned by different sign companies.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I have often observed the different signboards that are used. Most of them are Ruddy Company, at least in the Toronto area. Was the hon. Minister encouraging people to buy Canadian? I do not know if he is aware of it, but the E. L. Ruddy Company is owned by General Outdoor Advertising in Chicago, Illinois. You are paying the Americans to advertise "buy Canadian."

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand we spend \$25,000 in billboards and we use all companies and I think the reason for using all companies is that those signs, as you know, are purchased—the top of buildings and corners. They get a lease on those corners and the billboard is owned or pretty well

controlled by the advertising company, whether it is an American subsidiary or Canadian, but I am advised we use all the advertising outdoor companies for the billboard advertising and we hope to get the best displays in the best centres, where we get the most readers.

Mr. Troy: I am glad that the hon. member for Scarborough North spoke, because we know now who is responsible for the hippo, anyway. May I ask the hon. Minister, who was your representative of the women's conference from the city of North Bay?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have one from Timmins and one from Kirkland Lake. There is nobody from North Bay.

Mr. Troy: Oh, say, discrimination again.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Send us a recommendation.

Mr. Troy: Is it for a fashion show? Certainly I can give you some very good ones.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It will be welcome.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 401 carried?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before you leave vote 401, the hon. member for Grey North made a passing reference to travelling expenses. I would like to pursue the matter a little further. As one goes through the public accounts for 1962-63, one finds that the travelling expenses for the Ministers in most cases were between \$1,000 and \$1,500. The travelling expenses for the hon. Prime Minister that year were \$1,800. For the hon. Minister of Economics and Development they were \$12,242.24. I would like to ask the present hon. Minister if he intends to continue to be a major patron of the airlines of the world as his predecessor undoubtedly was?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can answer that question better by saying if the House had adjourned earlier this year, I would be on my way tonight to Russia. I say yes, I will be doing a lot, I hope, of international travelling on behalf of the province. I believe this is what should be done when the opportunity presents itself to open doors for our Ontario products and I fully intend to get into international markets as often as I can. I think it will be proven that Mr. Macaulay's visits last year certainly paid off and I would think I would be very remiss in my responsibilities to the government if I did not get into international markets.

Mr. Troy: The hon. Minister, sir, in his opening remarks referred to an industry in northern Ontario to which a considerable amount of money had been lent in promotion. Where is that industry located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We did not grant any money to—

Mr. Troy: I did not mean a grant of any money, but you spoke of an industry in northern Ontario about—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the hon. member for Grey North was speaking of a company that got a loan from ODA.

Mr. Troy: No, your own, sir. You referred to it, a mention of \$400,000 was included in your speech. You said a northern Ontario firm.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. That was a loan from Ontario Development Agency to a company that applied to us for a loan.

Mr. Troy: I am not asking the name of the company, but where is it located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sapawe, Ontario, the Mathieu Lumber Company.

Mr. Troy: Oh, that is—he was here not very long ago!

By the way, sir, would you have the files, I presume you have, of the former Minister of this department? I recall he visited my home city on September 21 and he made two speeches on that occasion. In his address to the people of the area, he said we were going to have two industries in North Bay. He said I cannot tell the names now, I cannot divulge, but there will be two industries. Now have you anything in your records about those industries and when we may expect them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can give you something on that. That will be under the trade and industries vote. If you will let it go until then, I will get it for you. Under vote 411.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister what is the period covered by the date of issue of the latest annual report of this department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sorry, I did not hear your question.

Mr. Bryden: I was inquiring as to the period covered by and the date of issue of the latest annual report of this department.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have the annual review of the department, and it will be out tomorrow, for 1963.

Mr. Bryden: Annual review you call it. Is that what is described as an annual report for all other departments?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Right!

Vote 401 agreed to.

On vote 402:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): On vote 402, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the report of the Windsor Economic Committee of the Ontario Economic Council.

Sir, every year since I was first elected to this honourable House, and that was in 1959, I attempted to point out to this government that my area has been plagued for too long a period of time by unemployment and that this government should do everything it could in an attempt to overcome this cancerous situation, this hard core of the unemployed. This problem needed, yes, merited, special attention.

After four years of prodding and after pointing out in my reply in the debate on the Speech from the Throne on December 19, 1962, that the employment index in my community was still dropping until at one time it was the least desirable of any Canadian urban area and at a low of 70.2 in July of 1962, only then did the hon. Prime Minister rise in this House and finally agree that the Windsor problem was acute enough to merit that extra bit of attention. As a result he said, and I quote:

I have asked the Ontario Economic Council to set up a committee under its aegis to conduct a full-scale inquiry with a view to formulating long-range policies to make maximum use of the advantages of that area.

On January 3, 1963, six members were named to this Windsor Economic Committee. On January 18, four were added, making a total of ten.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House, the composition of this committee. The composition is one to which we should pay special attention, because it does not represent one side of a picture at all.

For example, the chairman is Mr. Leroy D. Smithers, president of Dow Chemical of Canada. The second member is Mr. Henry C. Johnson, president of the Phil Wood Industries Limited. A third is Mr. R. H.

Long, president of Bendix-Eclipse of Canada Limited. A fourth is Mr. R. W. Todgham, president of Chrysler of Canada Limited. We can see that we have four outstanding men from the business world.

A fifth was Mr. George Burt, the Canadian director of the United Automobile Workers.

A sixth was Mr. Hugh McConville, past president of Local 195, United Automobile Workers. A seventh was Mr. Frank Quinlan, president of the Windsor and District Labour Council. The eighth was Mr. Henry Reynold, president of Local 200, United Automobile Workers. Now here we have four labour representatives.

To that committee we also had Mr. J. Blake Gertz, professor of the School of Business Administration at the University of Windsor; and as secretary, Mr. Murray Elder, industrial commissioner of the Greater Windsor Industrial Commission.

Nineteen briefs—not 27 as the hon. Minister mentioned—19 briefs, reports, letters and memos were submitted. Considerable research was also required to provide a document acceptable to all members of the committee and beneficial to the Windsor area. Faculty members from both Waterloo and Windsor Universities provided the additional research and furnished the draft report. After months of study, the committee re-wrote the report.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the House of the contents of this report. When Ford of Canada moved its assembly operations to Oakville, Windsor faced a staggering unemployment problem from which the city has not fully recovered. To make matters worse, satellite industries followed the Ford move. Of significance, is this comment—and I quote from the report:

At no time did Ford or the parts plant blame anything other than the market changes or economic reasons for their decision to move.

Notice, there is no comment as to labour conditions or problems being a reason for the Ford Motor Company deciding to move. It was strictly a matter of market conditions and economics.

During the last ten years, manufacturing employment in the Metropolitan Windsor area dropped from a high of 43,000 in 1953 to a low of 27,000 in 1961. This drop meant an annual loss of about \$14 million in pay-rolls. There is still the threat or fear that other industries may leave in the future.

During this last decade only small companies have moved in and set up operations.

About 25 years ago, Windsor was the cradle of industrial unionism. Because of the resistance to recognition of unions by automobile companies, Windsor became a centre of a struggle for the union recognition which is now provided for in the laws of all provinces.

The national press, as the result of this struggle, continues to give a disproportionate amount of publicity to any labour-management dispute which occurs in Windsor, regardless of its magnitude. Because of this publicity, Windsor would appear to have a poor reputation from a labour-management relations point of view. Yet fewer days were lost in Windsor through work stoppages on the basis of population than in the Toronto-Hamilton area during the period of 1957 to 1961, the latest period for which statistics are available.

And I quote now from the brief:

It is our feeling that the problem of labour-management relationships has been much overemphasized.

The migration of industry from the area during the last ten to 12 years has tended to focus attention on this labour-management relationship factor. On the other hand, there are a number of companies which have relocated, whose management have said that labour relations were not a factor in their final decision to move from the community. Many manufacturers within the city have also said that they enjoy labour-management harmony, which repudiates further the city's reputation for poor industrial relations.

How does a community erase the past reputation? Apparently only the hiring of a public relations expert is the answer.

One of the recommendations made by this committee is that The Ontario Department of Labour should provide at all times a high priority for consideration of labour-management disputes in the Windsor area, so that the appointment of conciliation officers and boards may be made quickly. Surplus manpower areas might well receive Department of Labour priorities so that remedial conciliation and arbitration processes could be available quickly to prevent further aggravation of this problem.

The public, Mr. Chairman, sees Windsor as a high labour cost area because of the dominance and influence, actual or otherwise, of the automotive industry. This may have been true in 1951, but today there are at least four other cities with higher labour costs. One of these, with approximately 33 cents an hour greater labour costs, has an employment index of 137.1 as opposed to Windsor's today of 83.1.

Then again there is the predominance of male employees in the larger Windsor plants, which makes Windsor's position in this comparison somewhat distorted. Communities with which Windsor is frequently compared have larger female work forces.

Mr. Chairman, turning to the topic of unemployment, the report states:

Unemployment is the end result of a number of conditions affecting the area, many of which are beyond the immediate control of local government.

And the report underlines:

—many of which are beyond the immediate control of local government.

Senior governments can help to alleviate unemployment.

At this point, may I state that the federal government's tax incentive, depreciation allowances, home purchase subsidies, auto parts incentive programme, have relieved the situation substantially. However, the National Employment Service report for the end of March, 1964, shows that there are still 5,578 claimants for unemployment insurance. This figure, mind you, is a marked improvement over those of March, 1963, one year ago, when 7,564 persons were out of work, an improvement of almost 2,000.

Good weather, local winter works projects, and the general upturn in the automotive industry have helped. Just imagine how more critical would the Windsor picture be if it were not for the industries and businesses across the Detroit River. Detroit is the third biggest employer, after Ford and Chrysler. It was estimated by the U.S. Customs in May, 1961, that there are about 4,028 Canadians working in Detroit.

Federal and provincial governments should always remember that tariffs, freight rates, sales and excise taxes, are very important factors affecting the Windsor area employment level. In fact, there is considerable evidence that Windsor suffers from inequitable freight charges.

Mr. Chairman, the report has a very important recommendation which I would like to bring to your attention at this time, and I quote:

Unemployment can also be partially relieved by according Windsor every consideration with respect to the location of institutional facilities in this area.

In this connection the establishment of permanent expanded facilities for the Western Ontario Institute of Technology, an institute which has already, though limited in scope by

its makeshift temporary quarters, has proven its value both to the economy of Windsor and the economic development of the province.

There is also a definite need for trades training facilities in Windsor at the adult level.

Here are two institutions that are needed, not only in the local area but also to enhance the economic development of Ontario.

We have already seen the beneficial, social, cultural and economic effect that the present University of Windsor has had and we can foresee the marked advantages of a greater, greatly expanded University of Windsor.

Institutional expansion would be a sort of diversification from the consideration of Windsor being a one-industry town.

The report continues into a study of municipal efficiency and states:

This is the area of primary importance needing urgent attention. In fact, we believe that unless the greater Windsor municipalities pool their resources and community planning, civic administration and economic development, all other efforts likely provide less adequate solutions to the area's economic problems.

This report goes into some detail on the effects of unco-ordinated action in the Windsor area because of political fragmentation and arrives at general conclusions that are similar to those reached in the studies of many different urban areas in North America. It reports on two water supply systems, one recently put into operation when the pumping capacity of the city of Windsor system had more than doubled, the pumping capacity to meet the forecast demand for Greater Windsor up to the year 1976. It reports on sewage disposal and mentions an engineering study by Gorre and Storey, prepared for the city of Windsor, that indicates \$1 million could be saved in the next decade by joint provision of sewer services for the entire urban area.

It reports on the lack of overall development control as a result of land use in the Windsor area, sir, that has been dictated primarily by real estate speculation and inter-municipal competition for industrial and commercial assessment. Now I quote:

As a result an irrational and generally unattractive and uneconomic pattern of land use has evolved.

Planning, to be effective, must be integrated.

It reports on the industrial-commercial assessment to residential showing Windsor's to be

60-40; Sandwich East, 37-63; Riverside, 8-92. One of the footnotes in the report on page 39 is worthy of note because it mentions:

If it were not for the present structural provincial grants any suburban municipality, except Ojibway, would be labouring under a financial handicap.

The industrial assessment of Ojibway is in no way contributing to the welfare of the rest of the urban community.

As for possible solutions to enhance municipal efficiency, four approaches were considered. One, intermunicipal agreements; two, intermunicipal boards; three, two-level metropolitan government; four, complete merger.

The Ontario Municipal Board interim report citing economy as a reason for not granting the city of Windsor the annexation it requested was studied. The anticipated loss in provincial grants appeared to be the major obstacle to metropolitan merger.

In 1935 the ruling of the judicial committee of the Privy Council of England on the amalgamation of the Windsor area at that time, stated:

If local government in any particular area becomes ineffective, it is not only right but it would appear to be the duty of the provincial Legislature to provide the necessary remedy so that the health of the inhabitants and the necessities of organized life in communities should be preserved.

The reports reads:

We believe that local governments in the Windsor area acting separately cannot best create the kind of community that people want and industry prefers. The economic situation in the Windsor area is critical and the provincial Legislature should provide financial assistance to facilitate the remedy.

Before I resume my seat, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that since this report has been made public significant announcements have been made that will have a marked effect on the economy of the area within the next 12 months. General Motors has shown its confidence in this area by announcing a \$20 million interior trim plant. This plant will employ an estimated 1,750 people and will be a real economic transfusion. Labour, business, industry and municipal government hail this announcement and have expressed their appreciation to General Motors for this expansion.

This is one new industry that is bound to attract to the community new satellite industries and further enhance labour opportunities.

Every day one sees the willingness of American capital to invest in manufacturing, retail trade and in real estate, but the Bay Street people today still look with a jaundiced eye but I may add a less jaundiced eye, at Windsor.

Today there is a new Windsor, a new spirit, a new climate, a new awareness, a new sense of pride. Today the credit rating of the city of Windsor is among the highest in Canada while the debt per capita is the lowest of all major Ontario cities.

Mr. Chairman, may I summarize the recommendations that involve the provincial government:

1. The Department of Labour provide at all times a high priority for consideration of labour-management disputes in the Windsor area so that the appointment of conciliation officers and boards may be made quickly;

2. That special consideration be given Windsor with respect to the location of government and institutional facilities in the general area;

3. That consideration concerning the possibility of establishing an industrial relations research centre at the University of Windsor be made; and

4. Amalgamation is a necessity as the area cannot afford to continue its multiple political jurisdictions, its uneconomic patterns of growth and servicing and its inner municipal competition for industrial and commercial assessment.

These are all recommendations as contained in the report. I would like the hon. Minister to comment on this report and inform this House what the government's intentions are concerning the recommendations.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the report was prepared in roughly a year and I think there was a lot of work done, as the hon. member has pointed out. I think it was a good report. I think it even acquainted the people of Windsor with the fact that things were not as bad as most people—even some people in Windsor—were painting them. Windsor certainly is a very thriving and industrious city.

Indeed, I think the very fact that General Motors have indicated that they are going to put a plant down there, indicates also that they have confidence in the future of Windsor like many other plants that have set up business there in the last year.

Now, insofar as the recommendations that the hon. member has suggested, I am in no

position tonight to say what the government will or will not do—

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may correct the hon. Minister, these are not my recommendations. These are the recommendations from the report.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As far as the recommendations are concerned, as you know the report went to Windsor about a month or so ago. We have not talked to the Windsor people since then. We will be talking to them, I presume, very shortly.

We have already had a few letters from the surrounding areas on the basis of amalgamation. You appreciate some are for it and some are not. That is a matter for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) to take into consideration.

But insofar as the recommendations made, we have not had the opportunity of studying them with the various hon. Ministers, but I can assure you, we are very much interested in the problems of Windsor. Insofar as my department is concerned, we certainly intend to take a good look at the report, stay with it and see if there is anything we can do to improve the working conditions down there and also to improve the replacement of industry there.

As I pointed out this afternoon, we have a regional development programme which is developing, and certainly Windsor, and Cornwall at the opposite end, are two cities we have in mind. So I can assure you the report is not going to be forgotten so far as we are concerned. We are certainly going to be looking at it, and studying it with those other hon. Ministers who are involved, who probably have more to do with the three items you mention here tonight, than I would have.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I thank the hon. Minister for his reply, because if we do not get some type of action from the government, I will make my sixth plea next year.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, if I understood the hon. Minister correctly, he stated that the economic council in co-operation with the Ontario Research Foundation, I think he said, is now studying the question of automation. Did I hear the hon. Minister correctly? Is my recollection of it correct?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think what was said this afternoon, sir, is that we are studying this with the federal economic council and

that we hoped to get in other provincial bodies who have a similar problem, who would like to work with us on a national basis. We will be discussing it with them very shortly.

Mr. Bryden: Now that the hon. Minister has refreshed my memory, I remember that is what he said. Well, what I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, is what has happened to the foundation on automation and employment, which was at least forecast in the report on the automation conference held last September?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I made a statement about this in the House some weeks ago after a meeting had been held with the Economic Council of Canada and the Economic Council of Ontario. I believe, and I am remembering the context of my remarks, that at least two other provinces were involved then as well, and we were working out with the Economic Council of Canada, a national approach to the problems of automation, and in the interim, while these negotiations are continuing on, the establishment of the foundation here, which we had originally envisaged as being purely an Ontario approach to the problem, is being held in abeyance, with the knowledge, the full co-operation and agreement of the steering committee that we had set up to establish the automation foundation. In other words, there is an opportunity for us to get some co-operation on this problem on a national basis from the start we made here last September, out of which came the idea of our automation foundation in this province. We have the necessary funds voted to carry on either the establishment of the foundation or the co-operation with Dr. Deutsch and his council at the federal level. We have not lost sight of the establishment of the foundation here, but if we can work this out on a national basis, we think we may have a better approach to the problem.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I would certainly agree with the hon. Prime Minister that any co-operative action that can be elicited in this field will be desirable, but I do not see why delaying action on the part of Ontario will contribute to the possibility of co-operation.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We are not delaying action, we are directing it in another direction. I will send you a copy of the statement I made in the House here.

Mr. Bryden: I do recall the statement. Of course, at the time, as with most of these statements—of which we get an average of one

or two a day—we had no chance to comment at the time.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, we try to keep you informed.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, I realize that, but we do not get any chance to comment at the time. I would like to pursue this a little bit further. As I understand it, all that is being studied is the feasibility of study.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, that is not so.

Mr. Bryden: You are studying the problem of automation?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Right, and the two councils together are doing this—that is the Ontario Economic Council and the Economic Council of Canada. We are ready to go ahead and establish the foundation here but it appeared that in co-operation with them, we might get a better approach to it, so that what we had planned in establishing our own foundation is held in abeyance until we see where this new development is going. This new development has come out of recent meetings, held on a national basis, but as I say, if my memory serves me correctly, I think there are two provinces involved and we feel this is a better approach than the approach we started here in the province by ourselves.

Mr. Bryden: But regardless of what might happen in terms of intergovernment co-operation, I still think that there is a role for major study in this province and I would think that a specialized agency would be better equipped to undertake it than the Ontario Economic Council, which has a great many matters under consideration. I do not suppose there is any point in belabouring the matter. The hon. Prime Minister has stated the government's position—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I think I can say this, Mr. Chairman. Really the hon. member and the government are seeking the same answer and we are seeking it in the most efficient way we can. Our intent is to come to grips with these problems and solve them; that is why we held the conference last September. It was as a result of that conference that the idea of the foundation arose. Well, as you know, through the change in government, there was a change in organization at the federal level and we intend to pursue our studies here. We have allocated funds for it but we also intend to do it on what we consider to be the most efficacious

basis, but we are proceeding in what we consider to be the best fashion.

Mr. Troy: On the economic council. I was interested, Mr. Chairman, in the article in the *Monetary Times* about northeastern Ontario by the deputy Minister of this department. As you very well know, Mr. Minister, the economic council and the tourist committee were set up, I believe, two years ago, and in that economic council, there was a northern development committee. According to this article of the deputy Minister's, the council was studying airport facilities in northeastern Ontario municipalities with a view to possible establishment of intermunicipal scheduled air services. Probably the hon. Minister knows also that we on this side of the House have been suggesting intermunicipal air service for some time. It mentions, too, the feasibility of a study of Moosonee harbour, now underway to determine whether this port can be developed for shallow draught vessels. The committee is also checking the possibility of developing an all-weather air strip for Moosonee. The tourist committee is presently preparing recommendations from a survey of the northeastern Ontario tourist development potential and the research foundation is conducting various research projects in an effort to create new industrial activity in the region.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, when we may expect these reports of the economic council and its subsidiary committees, particularly as they concern northeastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might say that these studies were initiated, as the hon. member knows, in the early part of last year and as the hon. Prime Minister pointed out a few minutes ago there was a change in government. We have been talking to the federal people; it is a joint partnership programme we will be talking about insofar as the air

services or air fields are concerned in northern Ontario. Those discussions are still under way.

I would assume that in the next few months we should have a definite opinion from the council as to whether we can or cannot proceed with the transportation service. Many factors have to be looked at. One is, who is going to run the airline? Who is going to take care of the fields and who is going to travel? And these studies cannot be done, as I think it will be appreciated, overnight or over a few months, but I can assure you that the economic council is pushing these projects through because we have others for them to get cracking on and I would think that we will have some further information on these within the next few months.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will commence with the Budget debate and if there is time left in the morning we will return to the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.35 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, April 24, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Friday, April 24, 1964

University of Guelph, bill to incorporate, Mr. Robarts, first reading	2441
Mothers' Allowances Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	2446
Ontario Housing Corporation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Randall, first reading	2446
Sheridan Park Corporation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Randall, first reading	2446
Tabling report, Mr. Randall	2447
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Villeneuve	2447
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Villeneuve, agreed to	2463
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2463

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 1964

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the university of Guelph.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments about this bill, dealing as it does with an historic occasion. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), who seconded this bill, will also make a few comments.

As hon. members of the House are aware, from the remarks I made on Wednesday last in relation to the Acts concerning the overall functioning of our universities and the creation of a Department of University Affairs and the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation, as well as the statements and remarks contained in the report of the advisory committee, we are in the province engaged in an unprecedented and very massive programme of university expansion which is needed to serve the needs of the province.

This expansion has taken a variety of forms. We have taken old universities and have added new facilities and new staff. In some cases our older universities have increased two or threefold. We have created new universities. Some colleges, which through their early history and early part of this century were affiliated to larger universities, have attained new and independent status themselves, and have begun programmes of expansion. New universities which have no prior affiliation have been created, and are now in varying stages of development.

This bill to create the University of Guelph marks another substantial step forward in the programme of provincial university expansion and in a real sense this will be a combination of the long established affiliated college which has certainly come of age and which will now join and be affiliated with a brand new university.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture will outline to you the history of the federated colleges, but it is sufficient for me to say that the beginnings of the federated colleges go back over 100 years. During this long period of time they have served this province well. In fact I think it would be fair to say they have served this country well. Certainly they have served the whole field of agriculture in our rural communities with distinction. And nothing, Mr. Speaker, either outlined in this bill or contemplated for the future, is intended to change the traditional role which has been filled by the federated colleges.

Through the greater part of this 100-year period the colleges, starting with the Agricultural College and after that the Veterinary College, have enjoyed affiliation with the University of Toronto, which in the beginning was, of course, the provincial university. This has been a fine and, I think, a mutually beneficial association.

Graduates of the colleges have received University of Toronto degrees, and many have gone on to do specialized work in their chosen fields within the University of Toronto. The principals of the Agricultural and Veterinary Colleges have, through these many years, been active members of the senate of the University of Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, this very historic affiliation which has lasted over so many years will come to an end. This is an inevitable step, as these colleges prepare for the new role they will play in the educational life of our province.

Hon. members will recall how, in 1962, legislation was introduced concerning the colleges. That legislation had, as its purpose, the strengthening of both the administrative organizations and the research facilities contained in these colleges. At that time I

pointed out that these institutions were basically developed for the benefit of the agricultural community of the province and that, in their present form—in the form in which they were then—they did not fit the general pattern of university development.

I indicated at that time that careful study was being given to granting university status to the colleges and, when that study was completed—about one year ago—I was able to announce that a new university would be created on the Guelph campus.

Now, with the unprecedented demand for university accommodation we face at the present time, it became inevitable that the basic facilities of these colleges, with their truly unparalleled capacity for rapid expansion, would have to be shared on a broader basis by the people of our province. We were of the opinion at the time the decision was made, and subsequent evidence has further supported this view, that with the excellent facilities presently forming a base there, we can expand much more rapidly and more economically in this area than has been possible in some of the other new universities which have been created in recent years.

As a result, it is estimated that it will be possible to accept 500 additional students in arts and science in 1965, and for the university, including the colleges, to reach a total enrolment of 6,000 students by 1970-1971. Now we can carry our projections further; and, of course, the further one projects perhaps the less certain the results become. It is anticipated that further extensions and expansion may make it possible for the university to enrol up to 15,000 students by the 1980s.

To be of greater service, it will require more than a decision to change the status and add facilities. It requires the creation of a truly new institution and that is what this Act will allow. An important section of the Act provides that the existing federated colleges will become part of the university. As a result, for the time being at least, the colleges will maintain their present association with The Ontario Department of Agriculture, and matters such as status of staff, organization for research activity, and provision of operating funds and so on, will remain unchanged as they relate to the colleges. However, this relationship will, in time, change.

But many adjustments must take place, and it is assumed that inevitably the university will assume greater responsibility in such areas as these I have noted. But to make

the necessary changes will take time, will take very careful study, will take negotiation, and a good deal of effort—because much is involved. These matters really are quite complex. On the other hand, the circumstances we face in requiring additional university spaces in our province makes it necessary that we make a start and that we press on with the job. This Act being introduced this morning will permit us to achieve this latter objective I mention. At the same time it will permit an orderly approach to the problems of integrating the existing colleges with the new institution.

However, as I have said on other occasions in this House, I would repeat my assurance to the people of the province, particularly those living in the rural areas, that no matter what agreements are reached, nothing will jeopardize the position the colleges hold as the foremost agricultural institutions on this continent. I think that we can be very proud of these institutions and what they have done over the years. As I have said before, there are many people trained there who do not use this training in the province of Ontario, but we are determined that the character and the function of these institutions will continue.

There has been sufficient experience, not only here but in many parts of the United States, to show that an institution whose beginnings are orientated towards agriculture can be expanded for greater service in other disciplines without prejudicing the original objectives. Indeed, I think if we handle this situation properly the position and the programmes of the federated colleges will be strengthened rather than in any way weakened, and this is our intent.

In the bill are named certain persons whom we have requested to serve on the board of governors, and to them will fall a very large responsibility. I notice that Mr. T. A. McEwan from Guelph is here today attending at the birth of this institution. He has been very active over the last few years in the preliminary work that has been done; and Dr. J. D. MacLachan, who will be the president of the university, is here as well. And I would just mention that their efforts have been very beneficial to the government in bringing us to this point where we are this morning, where we can introduce this bill secure in the knowledge that the background work has been done and that problems have been delineated and many of them have been solved.

The men whose names are in the bill have all signified that they are prepared to serve on the board of governors. We have con-

fidence that under their guidance the university will build on the traditions there already, that have been established over the years, and we feel quite certain this new institution will meet the challenges that lie ahead, in the same fashion that it has met the challenges in the past.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence to say a few words this morning. It may be somewhat unprecedented to speak on the introduction of a bill as a seconder of such a bill, but I believe this is such an historic moment in the province of Ontario as far as agriculture is concerned, that I would like to say a few words as the hon. Prime Minister has suggested I might.

This university, as has been so well expressed by the hon. Prime Minister, is much different from the establishment of other new universities. The University of Guelph will devolve on a campus that is steeped in history and accomplishment with facilities, with buildings, with staff, and with an already established world-wide recognition. It is an historic moment for the city of Guelph itself, which has long been a college town and has benefited from the college being established there and will benefit even more, I believe, in the future as a university city.

The university will grow and will expand from an agricultural nucleus and from an agricultural concept. The new Wellington College will embrace arts and sciences, as has been suggested and proposed by the hon. Prime Minister in the bill which he has introduced. The students in these faculties will benefit from their contacts with agriculture and the academic experience of the agricultural students will be further enhanced through the broader campus interests. To my way of thinking, this will lend itself to an improved understanding and relationship between rural and urban students, which will carry over into their positions in life wherever they may find themselves as time goes on.

It is important to agriculture, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in this transition period, that the ties of the Ontario Veterinary College, the Ontario Agricultural College and Macdonald Institute, remain close to The Ontario Department of Agriculture. Many essential agricultural policies have been developed and are administered through the college at Guelph, or the various colleges at Guelph. A sudden break in this linkage that has been so well established, should be avoided. It must be emphasized, however, that the academic aspects of the Guelph colleges have had and will continue to have, complete freedom of

expression. I am referring to those programmes carried on at the colleges involving The Ontario Department of Agriculture services to farmers and to research, as well as other academic services that have been provided. The Ontario Agricultural Research Institute, with its important co-ordinating powers, will continue as in the past.

It is important to the staff of the Guelph colleges as well, that they are not suddenly cut off from the public service until such time as agreements can be reached on matters of superannuation and of salaries and such. This has been the concern admittedly of a great many staff members at Guelph who have become staff members under certain conditions which they believed would continue and who had planned their investments, and so on, in the light of the superannuation benefits of the Ontario public service.

The agricultural committee of this House has had an opportunity from time to time to visit the Guelph colleges. I believe at this historic moment, when they are passing into a new phase of existence; that it is only right that we place on the permanent records of this province certain matters concerning their history and their accomplishments.

The Ontario Agricultural College was established in 1874, as the School of Agriculture, under The Department of Agriculture, and began teaching that year. And then in 1880, the Act of incorporation was passed on the name, changing it to Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Farm. The Ontario Veterinary College goes back even beyond that date to 1862, when it was established as Upper Canada Veterinary School here in the city of Toronto. In 1896, the name was changed to the Ontario Veterinary College. In 1909, an Act was passed bringing the Ontario Veterinary College under The Department of Agriculture. And then in 1922 the college was transferred from Toronto to the OAC campus.

We are pleased to note that it has been considered the only English-speaking veterinary college in Canada since that time. We note with a great deal of interest—and with extreme satisfaction—that a new veterinary college is to be established in western Canada at Saskatoon and will be open to receive students, I believe, this coming year.

The Macdonald Institute was established on the OAC campus in 1903 and has been identified with the OAC until 1962, when an Act for the Federated Colleges gave the institute status as a college itself. The Ontario Agricultural College carries on a number of different courses: the undergraduate course,

the diploma course in agriculture, which carried on except during the very early history and for the years 1944 to 1946, inclusive, the war years. The two-year diploma course has provided a very great training, I think, for the young people of the province of Ontario who do not wish to continue on to the VSA degree course that was established in 1888.

The affiliation with the University of Toronto took place in that year and established the first degree conferred. And then the graduate studies began in 1926 with the MSA degree programme under a joint committee arrangement with the University of Toronto.

I think it is interesting to note that the total number of graduates to date in the diploma course in agriculture from the OAC has been 3,391. In the Bachelor of Science agriculture degree there have been 4,658 graduates and from the Master of Science agriculture degree, 495. The Ontario Veterinary College began in 1862, as I mentioned earlier, a two-year course leading to the veterinary surgeon degree diploma, which continued until 1909. An optional third year was added leading to the Bachelor of Veterinary Science degree from the University of Toronto.

In 1919 entrance requirements were upgraded and changed to a four-year course leading to the Bachelor of Veterinary Science degree from the University of Toronto and in 1946 the degree changed from Bachelor of Veterinary Science to Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.

In 1949, this again changed from a four-year to a five-year course which eliminated any graduates in 1953. In 1930 Veterinary Science and Master of Veterinary Science degrees were established under a joint committee arrangement with the University of Toronto. The first Master of Veterinary Science graduated in 1957 and the first DVSc in 1958.

The total number of graduates to date in the undergraduate—that is Bachelor of Veterinary Science and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine—are 6,073. The graduates' studies and graduates in these courses amount to a total of 40.

A word about Macdonald Institute I feel is quite appropriate because here a variety of courses have been given, including manual training, nature study in the earlier days and then leading into home economics. The courses vary from three months to two years. The last diploma graduation was in 1962. A degree course in Bachelor of Household

Science was initiated in 1948. There are no graduate courses at Macdonald Institute.

It is significant to note that the total number of diploma course graduates from the Macdonald Institute are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 8,000, who have attended these various types of courses.

It is very difficult to make a fair comparison with the number of agricultural diploma graduates. The degree course at Macdonald Institute has graduated 412. While most of the graduates of the Macdonald Institute have come from the province of Ontario, have originated here in Ontario, others have come from all over the world because Macdonald Institute, like the other colleges on the Guelph campus, is recognized on a world-wide basis.

Conversely, the graduates are distributed throughout the world, and I might say that at present the demand for graduates from Macdonald Institute far exceeds the number available. In fact this is true of all the three colleges. I think it lends support to the fact that we must do everything possible to increase the facilities, the educational facilities, in connection with Macdonald Institute as soon as it is possible to do so.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, a word about research and the services that have been provided at the Ontario Agricultural College and Veterinary College. These colleges have always maintained a close identity with rural Ontario. The demands for research in agricultural problems, particularly since World War II, have resulted in major adjustments in work programmes. Though Macdonald Institute is still primarily identified with teaching, 60 per cent of the operational budget of the three colleges is devoted to research and the allied services primarily directed to the welfare of the agricultural public and the agricultural industry of Ontario.

As mentioned before, the Agricultural Research Institute will continue to act as the co-ordinator of the research needs of agriculture in this province.

While we have reached a milestone in agriculture this morning by the introduction of this new bill, Mr. Speaker, under which the Ontario Agricultural College and the Ontario Veterinary College and the Macdonald Institute, are combined along with the new Wellington College to form the University of Guelph, these colleges have had from time to time students from most countries in the world. I have been advised, and I know this to be true, that wherever one goes throughout the world, one can

find graduates of Guelph as it is looked upon throughout the world as the source of students and of graduates who have contributed so much to the development of agriculture on a world-wide basis.

While the Guelph college can look back with the pride of accomplishment on what has been done and the contribution that they have made to agriculture in Ontario, and to Canada, and to the world and food agriculture picture, they can look forward, indeed we can all look forward, Mr. Speaker, with even greater enthusiasm in the sense of future accomplishment to the new era of even greater influence through the establishment of the new university at Guelph.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, permit me to comment on the introduction of this bill on first reading.

I would like to assure you, sir, that the Liberal Party is delighted with the introduction of the bill and supports its principle heartily. There is no doubt, also, that you will permit me to remind the hon. members opposite that the reasons for the incorporation of this new university have been presented to them strongly in the past, not only by the present sitting hon. members on this side but by some of our good friends in the Liberal Party who are no longer present. I think, sir, particularly of the former member for Oxford, Gordon Innis, who was a graduate of this university or, at least, this institution, some years past. It is felt that the incorporation as a university will greatly benefit the growth of the institution and the rural community as a whole.

We are also pleased that both the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Agriculture have asserted once again their belief that the essential agricultural nucleus of this establishment must be preserved, for the benefit not only of the agricultural industry, but certainly in its connection with the communities throughout Ontario, but that it might also very well serve in one important area whereby the new university can expand along the lines that have already been referred to.

We think on this as a red letter day indeed, not only for the government but for all hon. members of the Legislature as we give this bill first reading. No doubt in some further discussions of it the possible way in which we hope the development of the new university might be directed might be discussed in the House, but we wish it nothing but the best on this, a red letter day.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will permit me to say a brief word in connection with this historic day too. I have just received a note from one of the hon. members of the front benches asking me if I was not regretful of the fact that I did not graduate from this great institution. I would say to him that I am somewhat regretful, but perhaps I can give him some reassurance when I tell him that I graduated from one of its sister colleges, Macdonald College in the province of Quebec, at least as far as teaching is concerned.

Indeed, in that connection, if I can add another small comment, the hon. Minister expressed a very desirable objective in that bringing the agricultural students together with other students would establish the kind of rapprochement and cross-fertilization of ideas and contacts—all of which he thought would be good. But my recollections of the battles that went on between the "aggies" at Macdonald College and others at the college does not altogether square with that hope of his. However, perhaps in the future we can do somewhat better.

The only comment I want to make at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is that I agree with the hon. Minister that we can look back with the greatest of satisfaction on the achievements of OAC in all its various forms down through the years. I look forward with even more excitement to its future, for this reason—one of the worries in the minds of people who are most deeply interested in higher education today is that our institutions of higher education should be something more than glorified secondary schools.

In other words, they should not just be teaching institutions, they should be research institutions. They should be adding to the repository of knowledge and wisdom rather than just disseminating it. One of the astounding things about OAC, as the hon. Minister has just reminded us, is that in certain of its facets 60 per cent of its activities have been in research. Now if we could have had this kind of balance of activity in all our universities, all of our universities in Canada, even our greatest, would be much greater.

Indeed, to my mind one of the most incredible facts of OAC in the past is that this kind of an institution, with all of its research capacity, in part because of its relationship with the University of Toronto, has never given courses for PhDs. I do not know how you can describe this as

anything other than a tragic missed opportunity. When we visited OAC just a month or two ago, we were reminded that OAC is a Mecca for people in many fields who are PhDs, to come and study at OAC and see what they are doing. Yet this institution has not been provided with an opportunity to teach at the postgraduate level and provide PhD degrees.

Now, this is something on the opposite side of the ledger, so to speak, of OAC's relationship with the University of Toronto. In some respects that relationship has been good. But I think it has been that relationship that has inhibited postgraduate work that is so necessary in the future. As an independent institution they can now move into this field.

So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, at the moment I see nothing other than to concur with everybody in acknowledging the historic nature of this day and to look forward, with an even greater degree of excitement, to the possibilities of the future rather than the achievements of the past.

THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the main features of the amendment are that at the present time an allowance may be paid to a mother whose husband has deserted her and has not been heard of for six months or more. This proposes to reduce this waiting period to three months.

Second, the Act provides that an allowance may be paid to a mother whose child was born out of wedlock if the mother is 18 years of age or more and if her child is at least six months of age. This amendment would permit payment of the allowance when the child has reached three months of age.

Third, the Act now permits the payment of an allowance to a mother whose husband is in prison, providing he has already served a term of six months or more. The amendment would permit a wife to apply for the allowance at any time after commencement of the term, providing the husband has a term of six months or more remaining to be served.

Fourth, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, the allowance may be continued on behalf of a child who is more than 18 years of age if he is attending a secondary school and is making satisfactory progress with his studies.

It is proposed to extend this provision to cover a child who reaches 18 years of age while in attendance at an educational institution other than a secondary school, but only until the completion of the required term of attendance at such educational institution during the year in which he attains the age of 18 years.

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I covered this yesterday but I will review the matter again for the hon. members. It is proposed by this bill to establish the Ontario Housing Corporation, to be responsible for all housing matters within the meaning of The Housing Development Act, RSO 1960. The proposed corporation will replace the existing housing branch of The Department of Economics and Development.

The purpose of establishing the corporation is to take advantage of pending federal legislation which will give provinces greater freedom to assist municipalities in meeting their housing needs. By using more diversified methods of providing housing, and by reducing the administrative procedures involved in the development of projects, the corporation will substantially increase the supply of housing for families of modest income.

SHERIDAN PARK CORPORATION

Hon. Mr. Randall moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the Sheridan Park Corporation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate again what was said yesterday with reference to this bill. It is proposed by this bill to establish a non-profit corporation in accordance with the original proposal to acquire approximately 160 acres of land which lie adjacent, part on the east and part on the west, to lands already owned by the Ontario Research Foundation. The purpose is to ensure that adequate, orderly developed lands will be available at reasonable prices to attract research facilities to the centralized research complex. By establishing the corporation, the government is recognizing the

paramount importance of industrial research and development as the basis for expanding industry, and therefore the province's economy. The proposed bill will permit the development of the first research complex of its kind in Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

Now that the court has rendered a verdict on the Farris perjury charges, will the hon. Attorney General release the NONG report and indicate whether further charges will be laid?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I would say that the conviction in the Farris case is subject to review by the court of appeal. I understand that an appeal is actually going forward. Other charges have been and are being considered. Under the circumstances at the moment, the report will not be released at this time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I beg leave to present to the House and table the Ontario Research Foundation annual report for 1962.

And while I am on my feet, I would like to point out to hon. members that they have on their desks this morning the *Ontario Industrial Review* for 1963. I think they will find it not only interesting but most informative.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, one of the items I want to raise during this debate concerns the facilities available to retarded children at the Lakehead. I was very pleased when the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) yesterday introduced a bill which will enable the government to provide full financial support for schools for retarded children. I look forward to seeing the details of that legislation and I can assure the hon. Minister now of my complete support. However, there is one additional factor which the government should take into consideration and it was

brought to my attention just recently because of a situation which exists in my riding.

We have a school for retarded children in Fort William which will take children between the ages of five and 18. A group of volunteer workers have organized a small nursery for some of the younger children. They would like to make use of the special equipment in the school for retarded children. I gather that the principal is prepared to co-operate and that a classroom could actually be made available every school day morning, but unfortunately the principal's hands are tied because The Department of Education will not make grants available for children under the age of five. Classroom space can therefore not be made available during school hours.

But, as we know, chronological age is meaningless for these children. In fact, the younger they are the more likelihood there is that they may be helped. I want to urge the government, and particularly the hon. Minister of Education, to rescind that regulation as far as retarded children are concerned so that communities which are fortunate enough to have nursery groups can take full advantage of the special facilities offered in these schools.

Not only would this be the decent, humanitarian thing to do, it makes economic sense as well. With more training started at an earlier age, there is a better possibility of the child growing into an employable adult.

The other matter I want to raise under this same heading concerns the hospital school in Port Arthur. A new wing was added to the Port Arthur Ontario Hospital, and completed last year. Parents in that area, whose children must go to Orillia and Smiths Falls, eagerly awaited the opening of the hospital school but so far they have been disappointed.

Inquiries have brought the answer that the wing is vacant because of lack of staff and funds. There have been resignations from the Ontario Hospital in recent months and general morale appears to be poor. The Department of Health maintains that it is practically impossible to attract medical staff to the Port Arthur hospital school because they can earn more in private practice and the location appears to be undesirable. Certainly, at the moment, the department cannot make any prediction when the new wing may be opened.

Now this seems to me to be an extraordinary situation. Here we have a hospital school, the only one in northwestern Ontario

and The Department of Health says it does not know when it will find the staff to open it. I do not wish to sound biased, but I find it difficult to believe that the twin cities at the Lakehead are such an undesirable location. Staff has been found for Orillia and for Smiths Falls, towns which are considerably smaller in size than the twin cities. I think it to be an insult to northwestern Ontario to suggest that competent professional people cannot be found to staff the hospital school and that they would refuse to live at the Lakehead.

If conditions at the Ontario Hospital are such that professional men and women refuse to stay, then The Department of Health should investigate the situation. In any case, I urge The Department of Health to delay no longer and get the medical and psychiatric staff which will enable it to open the hospital school, so that children from northwestern Ontario can stay in that area and closer to their parents.

Now, it would be understood, I think, Mr. Speaker, that in my remarks to this House that my remarks would be more or less confined to the area which I represent, because of the fact in the first place that we have so very many problems which should be of tremendous interest to all of the hon. members of this House from all over the province. Some of the matters which are so tremendously important to us, of course, concern that same old matter of resources and the use of resources. In connection with that very matter, we get back to the important matter of woods operation and the use of the wood resources which exist in that part of our province. And in connection with this, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members present this morning, certain facts which I think they may, in some cases, have already in their possession and in other cases, perhaps they are quite ignorant of, because they have not had the opportunity to be exposed to this type of thinking, due to the fact that they are so tied up with other matters in their own ridings and their own districts.

One of the things, the uncontrolled cutting of forests on a liquidation basis, has characterized almost all logging operations in Ontario for more than a hundred years. This practice began in the southern part of the province and I can well remember as a small boy in eastern Ontario, down in the Belleville-Kingston area—north of that part of Ontario—that very large operations were carried out in logging excellent lumber, shingles, spruce shingle mills, saw mills dotted all over the country, but that, I believe, does not exist

to any great extent at the present time. We know that the land in that part of Ontario has been almost completely denuded of worthwhile forests. The consequences are manifest in the near extinction of such valuable species as white pine, in serious soil losses through erosion, in growing flood control and water pollution problems and in the lowering of water tables.

During the past generation, the growing timber requirements of the pulp and paper industry in the northern Ontario forest region of the province, have been depleted significantly. Our accessible black spruce stands are gone. There have been no serious attempts, sir, at silvicultural or regenerative measures, with the result that our future forests will be lower in quality than those obligatorily removed from a high proportion of our productive areas. This will add another difficulty in Canadian competition with areas such as the southern United States. It now appears that within 30 years, the pulp and paper industry will have liquidated the remaining virgin coniferous stands within economic transportation distance from existing mills. And to bear that out perhaps, with some figures, Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting to the hon. members present to quote a few figures here. In the Lakehead area alone, in northwestern Ontario, under a heading of land ownership and use, we find that there are 6.1 million acres in Crown land, most of which is licensed to timber companies.

Three hundred and fifty thousand acres is owned by timber companies; 750,000 acres is owned by private individuals, of which about 100,000 acres is actively farmed. In the area we have five pulp and paper mills, four large saw mills, one veneer mill and about 80 portable saw mills. This is where we get to a point where it should be of keen interest to the hon. members. The annual wood-using capacity of industries in our area, in spruce and balsam pulpwood, 750,000 cords; jack-pine pulpwood, 170,000 cords; spruce logs, 20,000 cords; pine logs, 60,000 cords and in hardwoods, 50,000 cords, for a total of 1,050,000 cords.

Now the actual cut in that area—and this is important, I believe—from the company limits we are taking 360,000 cords; by 300 permittees on Crown land, 30,000 cords; from patented land, 90,000 cords, for a total of 480,000 cords, which shows a serious deficiency in the amount of wood which is being harvested and the amount of wood which is required by the industries in that area. This district supplies less than half of the wood requirements of these industries. Therefore,

it would seem apparent that we should make every effort to maintain and increase the forest productivity of the district. Much of the best and the most accessible forest land in this district, is relatively unproductive. This land is close to markets, to roads and to people. It is not necessarily cleared land, in fact most of it contains trees and other vegetation. Often the trees are what we call off-site species, or inferior species and this type of forest has been called "junk forest." This condition was caused by repeated cutting, by fires and by land clearing. Most of this junk forest—the most accessible, particularly—is privately owned. There is little hope or evidence that private owners will ever undertake any large-scale forestry projects. The money and the time make it almost a prohibitive measure for these people to do so. The time element in the first place would be in the neighbourhood of some 60 years and the money to these individuals is just not available.

There are possible solutions that have been studied, and groups who are interested at the Lakehead have made repeated surveys over the past years and just very recently have come up with what they think could offer a solution to this important problem, if the government sees fit to activate it and to study it thoroughly and make the best possible use of a plan which will bring a condition of greater productivity to this area.

One solution is to subsidize and encourage private forestry. No matter how well the job is done, it is doubted if the results would ever be significant in the entire area. Another method, purchase of junk forest land by government and practice of forestry: In both of the cases just mentioned, the first objective of forestry would be to change the junk forest into a productive forest by stand conversion. This is a costly job involving the destruction of the junk forest by mechanical or by chemical means or possibly by fire and the establishment of a new forest by planting trees. This job should be done on a large scale, and preferably in continuous large blocks of land because it involves the use of much heavy equipment. Jobs like aerial spraying of chemicals would also be easier and cheaper on large-scale blocks of land than on small, irregular properties.

The costs of stand conversion are estimated to be up to approximately \$50 per acre. No one knows the exact area of junk forest that should or could be treated. The results of a recent parcel survey of this area have not yet been completely reviewed. Our best guess is that perhaps one half of the private land is junk forest which could receive atten-

tion. The total private land amounts to 750,000 acres—less farm land which is presently in use, approximately 100,000 acres—less land reserved for future farming which should be given consideration in this area, about 200,000 acres. The balance, for the use of forestry in this particular area alone, is 450,000 acres.

Let us assume that 200,000 acres needs stand conversion. If we treated 5,000 acres a year, the job would take 40 years. The cost per year could well be about—well, on the purchase of land, 5,000 acres is estimated at the present time at about \$10 an acre, or a total of \$50,000. Stand conversion, including planting 5,000 acres at the figure I previously quoted, is approximately \$50 an acre, or \$250,000, for a total of \$300,000.

Last year a complete land use survey was made of one township in our area, O'Connor township; it was classified as to its best use, for forestry or for agriculture. Although a report on this survey has not been completed, it was possible to pick out a suitable area for a forest project. Concession No. 7 was chosen as the best place to start. This area is ideal from the point of view of forest experts who are employed by The Ontario Department of Lands and Forests. They have looked the proposition over and are in agreement that this could well be done.

The area is ideal for a stand conversion project. It is accessible, close to a population centre, and is practically abandoned as a farm area. There are about seven rural residences on this concession and only one active farm. For our purposes the farm and the rural residences could easily be by-passed. The total area involved is approximately the figure I have just mentioned—5,000 acres.

It is recommended by those who have been intensely interested in this matter that the unused portion of Concession No. 7 in O'Connor township be purchased, that all cleared land be planted with trees, and that all areas of junk forest be converted to productive forest. Direct benefits to rural residents would be in the form of employment for tree planting and other forest work. In the long run, this work would benefit the whole area and provide future employment by providing raw materials for our local industries.

This project will, I believe, if it has not already been brought to the attention of The Department of Lands and Forests, sir, be brought to the attention of that department in the very near future. I believe that the government would do well to give very close scrutiny to this matter because of the great

need, in the very near future, of much more accessible forest raw material from our forests for the use of the industries in the Lakehead area.

We are getting farther and farther away from the supply of raw material from our mills. And if, as I have just found suggested in some correspondence in the last ten days to two weeks, more companies are planning upon establishing pulp mills and paper mills all over this province—in other parts of Canada but particularly in this province—then we are going to need more accessibility to the raw resources, the wood resources. We are going to have to give close attention to the matter of a complete forest regenerative programme.

We believe the government should immediately initiate policy directed toward these following objectives:

1. The production of maximum yields of high quality fibre from all accessible forest soils, both freehold and publicly owned. It is contrary to both provincial and national long-term interest to permit, in aggregate, extensive areas in an idle, unproductive condition. Ownership should not confer this right and it must be recognized that a sound forest policy will necessitate some encroachment upon property rights as currently constituted.

2. The restoration to productivity of all idle municipal and Crown lands by a large-scale reforestation programme, particularly within areas accessible to existing mills.

3. A review of present timber licences to free those limits held in excess of present and contemplated mill capacity, thereby making limits available for further development of secondary industries or the use by secondary and ancillary industries of species and log types not used by the present holders of limit licences.

4. The requirement that the holder of a timber licence must build a basic road structure without which it is impossible to implement a modern forest management plan with sustained yield cutting.

5. The government should share the cost of building such a structure on an amortized basis through financial arrangements, along the general lines which are successfully in effect in the province of British Columbia.

6. The implementation of silvicultural procedures, in conjunction with all logging operations, particularly in the northern part of the province, to maintain the productivity of areas which have been cut over as to species, quality and quantity and to reduce waste resulting from present cutting methods.

7. Large-scale clearing operations should be prohibited. The administration by the province of adequate standards of regeneration, these standards to be established in the light of varying economic and physical conditions in the different forest administration regions of Ontario and, in order to help settlers and farmers, the government should create an authority to assist the creation and operations of pulpwood marketing co-operatives so that prices for such pulpwood might be closer to the real cost of the wood and those operators get a fair price for their product.

In western Ontario at the present time, Mr. Speaker, farming definitely does not seem to be a profitable venture except in very rare cases. Many of the farms are marginal or submarginal, merely providing a home from which the men go to work in the woods, on the lakes and docks, in highway construction and other seasonal or year-round occupations.

Other activities, such as the handling or shipping of ore, are of a seasonal nature; and employment has already been affected by improvement in material handling methods. Western Oil and Gas, by pipeline, has decreased the amount of coal received and distributed.

Due to the appearance of larger lake freighters with speed for a quick turnaround, and mechanical loading and unloading, the stevedore requirements are decreasing. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway was a mixed blessing, for with increased traffic came foreign competition in shipping.

Investigation of the principal employment field thus will still indicate the need for some support to the economy. We do not contend that the rehabilitation of the forest lands adjacent to the lakehead will cure all the ills of the area, but it will provide a modest increase in employment and will, over a period of time, result in an improvement in the forest which will be beneficial to the small land owner, industry and the Crown, and might well form the basis for several new industries.

Rehabilitation measures would follow two general directions. In the first place, through the construction of forest access roads and through suitable arrangements with The Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, small areas of timber which cannot be operated economically by the larger units of industry should be made available to farmers and settlers in the area. This will not only ensure, to the forest-based industries, a maximum volume of work from this most economical source but would provide a guar-

antee of employment for those requiring a supplementary source of income in addition to their farming activities. Providing the revenue obtained from such activities warrants it, this type of operation might be expanded to the point where the establishment of forest villages might be justified.

The second direction in which the rehabilitation programme could move would be in the improvement of forest areas for future wood production. This would range all the way from the reforestation of denuded lands to the improvement of stands verging on or at maturity.

With respect to this area in our part of the country there are some other matters that I think might be of interest to the hon. members here and might be worth further study. In the area that I am suggesting, the area that we think of as northwestern Ontario, there is an area I would say of quite 2,000 square miles, where I know such a very large amount of good, excellent wood is available.

To do justifiably worthwhile work in that area with regard to forest regeneration undoubtedly would take several years, possibly up to 20 or more years.

But in order to bring this about, it seemed to the people who are most aware of the facts, behind all of this problem, there are certain things. A study would involve as a minimum requirement: A close look at and a close study of the apparent need, profitable benefits, boundaries and areas, freehold and Crown lands included, forest product allowable cut and present annual depletion, access development required, nursery facilities available and required—and at the present time these latter are extremely limited in their scope. Further there would be the site classification, estimates of expenditure—and I have just mentioned the matter of the 5,000 acres of suggested area which could be profitably exploited, and continuously so over a period of years, should we regenerate that forest region and bring the wood growth into closer accessibility to mills in the area?

Various organizations could be, or should be, interested in such a project. The federal, the provincial and the municipal governments—certainly including those of the lakehead cities.

Now, the Northwestern Ontario Development Association is intensely interested in this matter and are willing to do anything possible to further its objectives. The Northwestern Ontario Timber Operators Association have also signified their entire agreement with the problem and with the suggested projects and their willingness to go along. The Canadian

Economic Council and so many other organizations would be interested.

Think, Mr. Speaker, of the values involved! With this concerted and sound planning could come about in a greater degree, in addition to the work that has been done by The Department of Lands and Forests in providing recreation areas, tremendously greater areas which could be used for the purposes of recreation along the lines which are presently going on, but expanded in that connection.

On water conservation: We have heard much in this House in the last several days with regard to water conservation, and certainly this is something that should demand our attention here and in the near future. It has been remarked, I think by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy)—one of the hon. members, certainly it seems to me on this side of the House—that in the not-too-distant future water might be one of our most profitable exportable resources.

Fish and game production is another matter which I am sure is of extreme interest to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) and is getting his attention. We do know that in various parts of northwestern Ontario the game population is becoming depleted.

Believe me, sir, I am not talking about moose. I know that we are pretty well supplied with moose at the present time, but there are various other types of game and wildlife which have become seriously depleted. I would hope that The Department of Lands and Forests is giving proper consideration to this problem, possibly withholding the right to hunt certain species of game which at one time were present in large numbers in northwestern Ontario and are now almost impossible or very difficult to find.

Again, various other agencies are very willing to co-operate with the various government departments to bring these desirable results about.

Some weeks ago, possibly a couple of months ago, we had, as many of the hon. Cabinet Ministers will remember, a number of people from northern Ontario who had come down to make submissions to the Cabinet. I was present at the hearing as an interested listener. I believe that the group who came to Toronto, to Queen's Park, at that time, had an excellent hearing from those Cabinet Ministers who were present and that attention undoubtedly is going to be paid to some of the submissions they made and some of the resolutions they introduced at that time.

They are all actually of very real interest to us in our part of Ontario, but there is one that we have a certain area of feeling of hope, perhaps pride, in, and it is developing and could develop to the benefit of tourism and so on, and highways. It could develop into a very worthwhile idea over a period of years.

There is a certain section of Highway 17 from the Canadian lakehead to the Manitoba boundary. It has been designated by The Department of Highways as the Lake Superior route, but actually it leaves Lake Superior at Fort William and goes up into northwestern Ontario and up to the Manitoba border and on into Winnipeg. I grant you that it passes many very beautiful lakes, very lovely country—rugged, wonderful, fine country—but it is not actually the Lake Superior route. The people from northwestern Ontario, people who were here not very long ago, requested the Cabinet to consider the idea of changing the name of that route from the Lake Superior route, a designation which does not appear to properly describe this portion of the highway, particularly when it gets to the western section close to and beyond Kenora. They brought to the attention of the Cabinet at that time the fact that northwestern Ontario was becoming better known by the designation “Northwestern”. This was recently exemplified by the naming of the range of mountains southwest of Fort William as the “Nor’Westers”. It is their official name as of just a few months ago. I would ask the government to give attention to this matter, because, while it may seem of a very minor nature to many of the hon. members who are present in the House at this time, as tourism enlarges, and our means of transportation improves as time goes on—faster cars, better highways, and our gasoline taxes of course—we will gradually get further and further with our explorations. I am sure that when people from various other parts of this continent and other parts of the world visit Ontario, and our part of Ontario, that they will find that the name “Nor’Westers”, or the Nor’Wester route, would have much more appeal to them than the Lake Superior route which they have already passed over from Wawa to Port Arthur.

These things may seem small to some of the hon. members, but I believe they do have a very real value and could have a very real value in future years.

Another matter which was submitted to the Cabinet at the time of the visit of the people from northwestern Ontario was what is called, and this is very briefly gone over,

the great river road. Perhaps some few of you know about this great river road. It is mostly an American project, I will grant you, because it takes in ever so much more of the United States than it presently does of Ontario or any other part of Canada.

As a matter of fact it would only enter Canada in Ontario and this brochure, “From Pines to Palms”, starts out with a very attractive picture of a Manitoba scene on one side at the top of the page and an Ontario scene on the other side. The Ontario scene, in keeping with The Department of Economics and Development, shows a very interesting picture of a bull and a cow moose standing about knee high in some northwestern Ontario water. I think it is very fitting. I am very glad they did not put a lady’s picture on there, as one of the billboards has done just recently. It would have had no appeal.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is the romance of the northwest, bull moose instead of ladies.

Mr. Freeman: Yes, well, we are a rugged people.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How did you like the hippo?

Mr. Freeman: No, we do not go for that, except intellectually. The other picture down this way, shows us various scenes in Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, and so on. But this is a very interesting project, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that it involves a total mileage of just under 6,000, as a matter of fact. It is presently in the 5,600 range of miles, but all areas which have not been completed in the United States as yet—that is thoroughly completed to the standards they wish them to be completed to—but it should be of interest to people in this House to know that this route, this great river road, enters Canada at a point just a few miles east of Kenora and it connects at Longbow Corners. It connects with a section that is wonderfully scenic, very lovely country and the roadway comes down through Fort Frances, and in the very near future I hope that the dream of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) will come true and that the Fort Frances-Atikokan Highway will be open to traffic. Therefore it will make it accessible to all of eastern Ontario as well.

Now, one of the bad features, one of the very serious features about this situation, is that a great number of the people will be

entering Canada from the area of Kenora, Longbow Corners, and in some cases a large number of them will want to return to the United States possibly from such a point as Fort Frances and International Falls. At the present time, I am sure many of the hon. Cabinet Ministers and perhaps some of the hon. members have crossed the present bridge at Fort Frances and International Falls, and I do not think they would take—neither would the American people take—any great pride in that structure as it exists at the present time. In the foreseeable future, this great river road is going to reach the stage of completion and it is going to be required to take care of a very heavy volume of traffic, something it cannot do at the present time. In view of this fact, the Mississippi parkway project, which I just referred to as the great river road, is, as of last year, more than 74 per cent completed and in a very few years will funnel thousands of new travellers through the port of entry at Fort Frances and in the Kenora area. Tourists entering Canada, not only by way of the parkway, but from other routes in the United States are not being properly serviced, due to an inadequate bridge and customs facilities at Fort Frances.

Now we all know that planning, legislation and financing of an international bridge is an involved, and a very time-consuming process, and the people of northwestern Ontario respectfully but in a most pressuring manner, would request the government to give attention to this matter and to enlist the assistance of the federal government in the manner in which it is required to see that action is taken with regard to the erection of a new bridge at Fort Frances - International Falls, something which we will require, something which we, as Ontario residents, could take pride in, in future years, rather than to feel the degree of guilt that we would over the one that exists at the present time.

Now, a few little matters that perhaps may be of interest to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld). I do not know whether it affects the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) at this time too seriously or not in his department, Mr. Speaker, but we have, in several places in Ontario, border-crossing points, which are open during certain seasons of the year for a period of 24 hours but for a great length of time of the year, several times a year, they are open from a period in the morning until midnight or thereabouts. Due to the fact that at the Pigeon River crossing in northwestern Ontario, entering towards the city of Duluth in Minnesota, there is increasingly greater traffic

summer, fall and winter—summer of course with tourists, fall with both tourists and hunters and in winter, as it is now coming into effect, the fact that so many of these people from that part of the United States, Wisconsin and from the state of Minnesota and many from the state of Illinois, are coming into northwestern Ontario because of its skiing opportunities—the country up there is becoming much better known, much wider known as an unusual skiing area. It has been pointed out by experts that with some work that is now going on at the Lakehead with regard to the improvement of a chairlift on the Nor'Westers, the mountains that I spoke about a moment ago, with the improvement of the chairlift to take it to the top of the Nor'Westers, we will have at the Lakehead the finest skiing area between the Laurentians and Banff and I think that opening up an opportunity such as that to skiers—and they are becoming increasingly enthusiastic and greater in number—will bring a tremendous influx of people into the Lakehead during the winter months, when hotels and motels could well use those visitors, and where the general economy would benefit considerably.

Now, there are many other matters, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to speak of with regard to our part of the country, in speaking on the Budget debate, but I know that other speakers wish to be heard from and I would in my brief remarks, ask for the consideration of the government, the various department heads and of the Ministers. Before I sit down, I would like to say to the hon. Prime Minister (M. Robarts) and to the Ministers present this morning, that I have during the short time I have been a member of this House, had occasion to approach many of the Ministers and the senior civil servants and I must say that I have been received with every courtesy and whenever anything could be done for me or the people in my area, it has been done. I trust this co-operation will continue. Thank you, sir.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to deal briefly with a matter concerning the working conditions and the rights of labour of men and women who are employed with the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority. This essentially concerns a matter that went to arbitration and as I go into a few of the details of this case, I would like to show why I feel that the decision of the board of arbitration was essentially very wrong. It is a decision that will affect all employees who work for any public corporation and also does affect the rights of not

only the workers but the tenants who live in these large housing authorities. At the present time, the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority has about 2,000 units and about 4,000 tenants, and I hope in the years ahead that there is going to be a lot more, because I think that the public housing that has been begun here in Toronto and throughout Ontario is an excellent thing for our people and it should be encouraged. But at the same time, as we encourage the public housing we should make sure that they are not ghettos, that the people who live in them are not second-class citizens and also that the workers are not treated as second-class citizens.

Let us bear in mind a public authority has an opportunity to lead the way in how labour is treated, and when they do things against the best interests of labour and the best interest of their tenants, it is time that the legislative assembly of this province took note of it. I might say—and I am glad the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) is in the House today—it is time that the human rights commission took note of how the workers are treated in some instances.

Now I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a little book called *Your Job and You*; it is issued by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority to all of its employees. On page 10 there is a paragraph entitled "Application of Discipline," in which there are 14 items, most of which I cannot disagree with. There are, however, two—one of which I will not deal with in detail. One is this: "Having wages become subject to garnishee, then the employed can be fired."

I think this is a most unfortunate provision. We know that an awful lot of people today, being more or less "sucked in" in signing conditional sales contracts where they are buying appliances, find they cannot pay for them. Many speakers in this House have dealt with this subject. It is most unfortunate, when employees are at the mercy of their creditors, that they know that if they are garnisheed they are going to lose their jobs.

This is quite a common provision which many employers have, but I am sorry to see that a public authority has it. I think it should be discouraged and I hope the hon. Minister of Labour will do what he can to discourage employers who put in their provision of employment that, if employees' wages are garnisheed, they will be fired.

I will say something more about this matter of credit; I hope maybe a bit of it today. I hope it will be on a resolution which is on the order paper, because so many employees

all over this province have been sucked into paying excessive rates of interest then are at the mercy of the creditors and their employers, in fear of being garnisheed.

But my main point in dealing with employees of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority is this one, and it is in section 14. You know, that No. 14 has rather an odious smell to it, because we have heard about section 14 of Bill No. 99 and the rights of individuals. This, too, is section 14; and this is it:

An employee can be discharged for entering a housing unit without authorization, or for a purpose other than the execution of his duties.

In other words, if an employee works at Regent Park South here in Toronto he cannot call on somebody at Lawrence Heights. This can be carried to ridiculous heights. For example, he could not visit his brother, he could not visit his sister, he could not visit a friend unless he got written permission from his employer. I think this is an utterly ridiculous situation.

I could hardly conceive of any employer, let alone a public housing authority, trying to carry this situation out, to the point of being a rather fantastic condition of work. And yet it has been carried out to such an extent that it went to arbitration in December of 1963 and the arbitration board upheld, on a decision of two to one, that an employee of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority can be discharged from his work if even on his own time, he calls on somebody he knows.

It does not make any difference. In one case here a man called on his sister-in-law. You can imagine if a man was calling on a fellow union member, or was calling on somebody from the veterans' lodge, if he was perhaps going out on the annual pledge of his church, giving out pledge cards, he would still have to ask Big Brother, the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, if it was all right to do this. It casts an odium, not only on the employees of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority but also on the tenants, of which there are about 4,000 of them in the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is wrong in principle. I think it should be jumped on hard now. And I certainly feel the provincial government, which has an interest in this Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority—I believe it was an order-in-council of this government which created it—should be

seeing to it that this should be stopped. There may be employees of any concern; there may be tenants in any apartment, anywhere, in any apartment building, who can wander from the straight and narrow path, but why damn every tenant in Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority? Why damn every employee of that authority simply because they have a stupid and asinine rule of employment?

I want to get down to a specific actual case and give the opinions and reasons why this is held by the authority to be a good thing and why, by labour, it is held to be a bad thing. I believe, not only for labour but in principle, it is an extremely stupid and an extremely bad thing for public housing.

Some time in 1963 a man named Gordon Wisdom, who is an employee of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, left his work at one o'clock. He told the caretaker in charge of the building that he was leaving his employment for the afternoon; he was going down to the credit union to see about some matter there. After he had been to the credit union, instead of returning to his employment he had a drink; then, when he was driving his car up the main street, he recognized one of the lady tenants with her children and offered to give her a ride home.

The facts were quite simple: She wanted to do some shopping and he stopped off. She purchased some food, he drove her family home, and he went into the apartment—which was wrong—and had coffee. Now this is what was shown in the evidence—in fact, as it comes from the dissenting judgment of Mr. Drummond Wren, who represented the union. He said at the hearing that the authority had no charge to make against the grievor except that, after working hours, he had returned to the project with a lady tenant and her family and, on the tenant's invitation, had entered her premises where they had drunk coffee.

That is the only matter before the board of arbitration, Mr. Speaker.

However, in defence of its having discharged the grievor for that action, officials of the authority cast reflections on the morals, particularly of the mother and that family. Whether or not the authority has grounds for such reflections, no offence or attempted offence is imputed to either the grievor or the tenant. In other words, in this case, it was not a question of morals, it was just a question of this man, Wisdom, having gone into the apartment. This man, Wisdom, had been once before warned about visiting people in the apartments. He had, on one

occasion, visited his sister-in-law and this was considered an offence by the Toronto housing authority.

I repeat the principle that I feel should be held in this matter of employment by the public housing authority. It is after working hours. Is it none of the business of Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority what its employees do, as long as they obey the law of the land and show up for work in the morning and do their job. It is none of the business of the executive director, Mr. Brady, or anybody else.

There is too much of this business of trying to be a Big Brother.

Years ago, Mr. Speaker, a school teacher, especially in these smaller areas, had to board at a certain home, could not wear makeup, her dress had to be down below her knees, and if anything just was not so-so, the school board interfered. I can remember hearing stories years ago that a bank employee had to lead just the proper life and be sure the manager saw him in church each morning. I do not know if the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden)—I think he started his career in Brandon years and years ago—I do not know if they made him attend church each morning or not but years ago this was the way it was done and the employees were always under the thumbs of the employers.

So here we see this being revived in the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority and I feel that if this principle is established in a system of public housing that is growing and that I hope will continue to grow, it should be stopped because it is most unfair to the employees.

Now, when a tenant moves into the public housing authority, he signs a lease and in that lease it is said that no employee can enter an apartment without the consent of the tenant, even though it says specifically in his lease that the tenant can give the consent, the housing authority comes along and says that they and they alone can give the consent for an employee to enter an apartment.

There are only at the present time, about 75 employees of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority. They are their janitors, caretakers, groundsmen, general workers and a few employees in the office but it seems such a restriction on 4,000 people who are tenants and those people who are employees. Imagine a situation of a janitor being invited in for a cup of coffee. If he accepted he would be fired according to section 14 of the rules of Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority.

I suppose this authority might be even

more shocked if the fellow had had a glass of beer instead of a cup of coffee. The authority is a sort of hangover of a puritanical age which is gone and which these people do not want to pass away. Now, on this arbitration that was heard in December, those who found in favour of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority were Judge Eric W. Cross and a Toronto solicitor named J. W. Healy, and they gave their reasons. Mind you, they found no moral fault with this man, Wisdom; they did not criticize the fact that he maybe had had a drink in the afternoon after he left his employment, but that he was merely in the place. Why did they say that he should be watched? This is the reason that Judge Cross gives:

The authority has under its supervision some 2,000 units and approximately 4,000 occupants in five projects. Of these tenants, 450 are what the authority described as mother-led families, meaning thereby that the mothers were in residence with children and separated from their husbands and living apart from them.

Bearing in mind that the authority is a public authority it was argued on their behalf that it must be sensitive to public opinion and public relations. It was therefore of the utmost importance to the authority that the good name and reputation of its tenants and employees may be maintained.

May I interject here, Mr. Chairman—is that not kind of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority that they are going to protect the good name of their tenants? They say that it is a ghetto that they are trying to establish. It is none of their darn business who these tenants are out with or see as long as they obey the laws of the province of Ontario and of Canada.

When it became known, that without the permission or knowledge of the authority female tenants were visited secretly by employees from time to time, the good name of its housing projects would suffer. Quite apart from the fact that the authority is a public authority, it would appear to me that any landlord has a proprietary interest in the good name of the tenants who occupy his premises and has a right to lay down rules and regulations both for his employees and tenants which will preserve this object. Such an object may well seem all the more desirable to a publicly owned project supported by taxpayers.

Well, here is one of the main principles I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker. The fact

that it is a public authority and the fact that it should be sensitive to public opinion and public relations is all the more reason why any public authority should avoid trying to dictate how its tenants shall live. These tenants have a lease. They are bound by that lease and they must behave themselves as any other tenant in any other apartment. I do not say that they should be allowed to carry on as they please, because, again, they are bound by a contract just as in any other private apartment.

But what this housing authority is trying to do in Metropolitan Toronto is to impose its will, a puritanical law of its own, upon these people and it is infringing on the rights of the tenant and it is most certainly infringing on the rights of the people who are in its employ.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Will the hon. member tell us who were the arbitrators?

Mr. Trotter: I am reading, Mr. Speaker, from the decision, the award of the board of arbitration in a case and if the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions missed it, an employee of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority was discharged because he visited a tenant and the union took it to arbitration and the decision was brought down in January of this year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who were the arbitrators?

Mr. Trotter: The arbitrators were His Honour Judge Cross—that is Eric W. Cross; Mr. J. W. Healy, QC—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why, he was a great former Liberal Minister of Welfare—with such a philosophy?

Mr. Trotter: I am not interested in his politics. I am interested in the principle behind this, because this is a recent decision and the dissent which was written by Mr. Wren, who represented the union, was released in early March of this year. This is a very recent matter and it is something that could involve a basic principle in public housing and labour relations in general and I think it is the duty of government and The Department of Labour in particular to see to it that the influence of government is brought to bear on these housing authorities that they be most careful in respecting the rights of the tenants and in respecting the rights of labour.

I am again quoting from Judge Cross. In his decision he said this:

The union on the other hand argued very strongly that the company's rule was an unpardonable invasion of the personal liberty of their employees when off duty, and that the authority had no right to interfere with these activities. The grievor however cannot claim lack of knowledge of the company's policy because the executive director, Brady, stated that he had interviewed the grievor after his visit to a sister-in-law's apartment and referred him to the regulations that he had acknowledged in 1962.

Mr. Brady said that he had made it clear that if he entered an apartment without authorization of the manager or himself it would lead to discharge.

Here again, these men come, are employed and sign these documents; it is a job for them, it means very little to them at that time until they realize that they have had restrictions put on their liberty which I say that no employer in his common sense today puts on his employees and a public authority should have no right in commonsense or in law in putting on its employees. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Labour is taking this in and will bear in mind that there are many things that go on in Ontario against the rights of labour and this is one of them that should be corrected.

I just want to point out a couple of examples of judgments made in the United States on labour. I think we, in our labour negotiations, tend to follow what has been accomplished in the United States. They developed industrially, as you know, more rapidly than we did, and we have in many ways tended to copy what they have done. Mr. Drummond Wren, the union nominee on this board, quoted from a book entitled *Employees Discipline* by a man named Stessin. Stessin summarizes the decisions that have been reached by some of the well-known arbitrators in the United States, and on page 126 Stessin says this:

Finally arbitrators seem to agree that employers have no control over what workers do during their off hours provided it does not affect the employer-employee relations.

On page 96 in the same book, he quotes a man named Bruler, who wrote a decision re International Harvester, saying this:

The company has no jurisdiction over the private lives of its employees, and the employees are not answerable to the company for their actions in this area.

Again, here, I say from experience and from learned men who have had experience in this field, that companies have no jurisdiction over what their employees do during the off hours.

Imagine, if the hon. Ministers and their various department heads went snooping around to see what civil servants did in their off hours, what a chaotic mess it would be and how unjust it would be. The morals are no business of the employers, let that be ruled in the home and through the church.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): One of the main picture companies has another view of that.

Mr. Trotter: They can have their views. I am expressing my views on this occasion.

So long as it does not affect the work of the company or the relations of the company, again, this is their own business. I think probably in the motion picture industry you are referring to what would necessarily affect contracts. So, Mr. Speaker, this is an entirely different situation.

Finally, I say that I hope the human rights commission has looked into this situation to see to it that not only the employees are protected—and fortunately the employees have a good union that can speak up—but also the tenants who are not quite so fortunate and are in a difficult position because if they speak up things could be made most difficult for them. Usually, in fact always, they are in the lower paid category and the tenants, like so many consumers today, are unorganized. So on their behalf I also press home this point that the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority is trying to enforce an asinine regulation. It is a regulation that infringes upon the liberty and the rights of individuals, and this it has no right to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other item on which I shall be brief—

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trotter: If I get that "hear, hear" from the Tory benches I might continue on, so do not urge me, I am tempted.

Mr. Speaker, on the Throne debate I had spoken on this matter of salesmen, and unjust prices charged for various items by magazine salesmen, by vacuum salesmen, by the freezer salesmen. As a result of what I had to say and what the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) said, there was quite a flurry.

I heard from a tremendous number of people who had been taken in, and also I

heard also from a number of the companies involved trying to explain what a good deal they give the public.

I want to repeat, or enlarge on this a bit, for this reason. I do hope and wish that the government would bring out legislation that would license these people, that would enforce a control upon them, because they obviously fear any type of control and they obviously are trying for a short term to cover up.

There were two or three pleasant outcomes of the flurry which took place in the House over this subject. One was that some of the advertisements did not appear in the newspapers for a while. The company that sold the freezers did not see fit to put ads in the paper for a while until very recently, and then the same old thing appeared again placed by the Wholesale Food Market. That is the company that advertised something free. You just pay \$16 a week and you get all this extra food—and you get a freezer. A freezer, incidentally that is worth about \$200, and, depending on the contract, you end up paying \$586 or \$756. They are back advertising again.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the hon. members of this House through you that I hope that on the estimates, on the Throne debate, or the Budget debate, whenever they can, if they have a case they get up and they name names. It is the only way, until the government does something, that we can shut them up and cut them off.

I have been disappointed in the Better Business Bureau. In this matter it has been very weak. I once checked with them myself to see what they would say, and had other people check and other people have volunteered information of the answers they get from the Better Business Bureau. I think it is time the Better Business Bureau brought up its standards.

For example, when I mentioned a couple of incidents of the magazine salesmen they said, oh, they had tried to clean that up. Mind you that was the result of what went on in the Legislature here about a year ago.

Oh, they had tried to clean that up! Well it is not as rampant as it was, but people are still getting sucked in buying things they should not be buying and they really do not want until they have found out what they have bought.

What I cannot understand is there were complaints made to the Better Business Bureau about the Wholesale Food Market. The Wholesale Food Market used to put an

ad in the paper saying, "we are not in the freezer business," and they would have a picture of a freezer—and that was an obvious lie, that they were not in the freezer business—and after complaints the bureau persuaded the Wholesale Food Market to withdraw that ad. But if you phone the Better Business Bureau today, as some people have, they say this outfit is all right. This outfit sells freezers that are worth \$200 for somewhere well over \$500 and well over \$700, and the Better Business Bureau seems to think that that is good business.

Well, that is no protection for the public. I am amazed that the Better Business Bureau is so weak on this. Again I say I wish they would bring up their standards of what they consider better business.

In fairness, there is in Ontario a group known as the Canadian Central Registry which registers salesmen or anybody who wishes to be registered and keeps up a certain code of ethics. I do not doubt for a minute that they in many respects do a good job. They have approached me because they claim I am hurting the magazine-selling business by some of the remarks I have made.

I must admit that they make a real effort, but at the same time they still are not protecting the public. They may be helping some, they are trying to govern their trade, but they in law cannot force people to join. Even so, even if they have a member whom they have registered and who they find has done wrong and they strike him off the register, the damage is still done to the individual who has been sucked in.

The only answer on this—there are really two answers: One, we give as wide publicity as we can to these people who prey upon the innocent; second—and there is some talk that this is going to happen—the government must take cognizance of the fact that the people of the province are being rooked and see to it that legislation is brought in in order to protect the people to some extent. You are not going to protect the public completely, I do not believe you can possibly do it, but I think you can go a long way towards protecting the people from this business of getting usually the lower-paid worker rooked on account of that.

To give you an example: If a family had \$1,500 in debts to finance companies, and this is not uncommon, it is going to cost \$30 per month for the interest charges, and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics tells us that one-fifth of the families in Canada with three children under 16 are making between \$2,000 and \$3,500 a year, and that includes family

allowances; people with four children or more—over 25 per cent of them are making just between \$2,000 and \$3,500 a year. Now, it has been my experience on the countless contracts that I have seen as a result of people phoning me, that it is almost always the lower-paid person, the person who thinks he is getting a bargain. They could never afford a freezer normally and here is a bargain if they get it free and they get all this food. So this goes on and on, and again I say to the hon. members of this House and through them to the public that the public should be aware of the fact that they just should not touch this stuff, because even if you phone the Better Business Bureau you will get a bad steer. It is a pity that the people today seem to be the victims of a serious situation.

Finally, one of the worst offenders in this—mind you, I have met groups like the Wholesale Food Market, and the Compact Vacuum Cleaner people—and this type of company, they start this stuff, but the people who are just as bad if not worse, are the finance companies, because I am quite convinced that they are quietly in alliance with these people. It is so obvious when you see the contracts, when you see the names of the finance companies, you practically know that with the Wholesale Food Market people the Frontier Finance Company is mixed up, and you can see that with Compact the Laurentide Finance Company is mixed up. It is almost inevitable that these particular companies are in alliance, and I hope that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) gives us an opportunity to discuss a resolution I have on this paper where I will go into more detail of what this financing costs, because almost always—not always, but almost always—these people who sign these conditional sales do not know what they are signing and they sign them in blank, the final figure is never discussed, and then they are filled in.

It is awfully hard to prove in the courts but I believe these people when they tell me this because they come from all over and their stories are so consistent, and of course, as it happened to me recently, when I make a speech in the Legislature, these companies like the Wholesale Food Market phone me and say, "Anybody who has signed a contract and does not like it—we will be glad to help the people out because we do not want to sell anything that the people do not want." Occasionally if you get it quick enough you can stop it, but you see there is one trick: "We would be glad to settle with these people, we feel sorry for them, but you see

we have sold our promissory note and conditional sales to the finance company, and the finance company is insisting that the contract be carried out. We cannot do a thing about it."

Well, of course, I really do not believe them when they tell me that, because I am quite convinced that the finance companies and these sharp operators are in alliance, and it is only when we not only hit these salesmen but hit the finance companies that we are going to put an end to this rooking, this consistent rooking of the public, that is going on. I notice even in one quote here I had from a Toronto newspaper that—it is Mr. Marvin who is being quoted, he is the man who runs the Compact Vacuum Cleaner Agency, he says if his office gets a legitimate request to cancel a contract before he has turned the deal over to the finance company it will do so. But then, of course, he goes on, if it is turned over to the finance company they cannot do anything about it. Well, I have been through a number of these and I am quite convinced that as soon as they get that contract signed it is immediately turned over to the finance company. That is one more reason why we need a cooling off period where these people who have signed these contracts have three or four days, I believe as the legislation is in Great Britain, to cancel their contract, and this is one way we can give some type of protection.

In the long run it has to be that the law needs to be changed and we need to publicize these people. It is in the interests of legitimate business to see to it that these people who make a mockery of the words "free enterprise" are put out of business because they are not fit to be carrying on in the fashion as they have been doing, and I certainly hope the government will lend its efforts in that respect.

Finally, one thing that is most unfortunate is that some of the major newspapers know this is going on. I have mentioned this before, that their advertising people should be more careful. Since this has received publicity I notice now that the only one that is printing seems to be the *Toronto Star*, but surely they in their policy, in the advertising policy, should see to it that ads such as this should no longer appear. This is the one where the people get a \$200 freezer for \$500 plus. This ad is now back in the *Daily Star* and it is most unfortunate. I wish these newspapers would take note of it because some of the papers have done a marvellous job.

One particular group in the Toronto *Telegram* is a fact-finding squad; over a period of time they have done a marvellous job in giving it publicity, and so have the *Star* and the *Globe*, but they allow these ads to be in when they should know, if they do not know, that they are misleading the public, and with that I close with a plea to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) that he give this some thought. I understand that the former Attorney General (Mr. Cass) was going to bring out legislation. What we need is a consumers' bill of rights. The government has been pretty slow on this, because we have made numerous speeches in regard to this subject, but the present situation is hurting legitimate business, and in fact it is hurting the low income earner very, very much, and it is our responsibility to protect him.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget debate, I first of all want to add my belated congratulations to you publicly for the very efficient manner in which you preside over this House. When I first came here in 1948—I see now there are several changes, and I am considered somewhat of a veteran. I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edwards) and the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) preceded me here and then I came along with you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon), the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) and one or two more, I think the hon. member for Hastings West (Mr. Sandercock).

However, in going back over the figures as far as government estimates and expenditures, I do find in the last 20 years a very pronounced change has taken place. In particular, education 20 years ago had a total budget of a little over \$16 million and this year will be in the neighbourhood of \$420 million, a 2,600 per cent rise in a period of 20 years. So one can readily see the responsibilities of government are becoming more burdensome, every level of government is looking for finance and naturally the people being taxed resent being loaded with taxes.

However, I have listened to many fine contributions in the way of speeches. Every hon. member, irrespective of what group he represents, tries to present the problems that confront him. I am no different from anyone else but representing a rural riding, I must speak out for agriculture and in the time allotted to me, Mr. Speaker, I will try to keep my remarks to that subject as much as possible.

The importance of agriculture in the econ-

omy has been constantly and consistently recognized by the Ontario government. And the importance of The Department of Agriculture in provincial affairs has been stressed over the years, not only by the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Robarts) today but also by his predecessors in office. Agriculture in this province has always received a dominant place because the importance of farming and food production to the welfare of our people cannot be overemphasized.

As the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) stressed in this House as recently as last month, in introducing the estimates of his department, agriculture has made possible the industrialization of this province because, as history has shown, no country in the world has moved to an industrial footing without first having achieved a sound agricultural economy. And as the hon. Minister went on to say, agriculture continues to sustain the well-being of Ontario, and a healthy agricultural and food industry will continue to lead this province into new accomplishments and into a new era of development.

We in this province, as a government, have been constantly aware of the needs of agriculture, the needs of farmers, the needs of those depending on farm products for the growth of the great food industry, and the needs of the whole economy in which agriculture plays such a large part. Because of the stress placed on a strong agricultural industry, the people of Ontario have enjoyed and are continuing to enjoy a plentiful supply of good food at reasonable prices.

To my urban friends, may I remind you, in spite of what you hear about subsidies being paid to agriculture, the facts are the government of Canada last year spent \$172 million in total aid of agriculture for all of Canada. The tobacco growers of Ontario alone contributed \$400 million to the federal Treasury in taxes. There are 200,000 less occupied farms in Canada today than there were 20 years ago, yet those fewer people have increased productivity by 54 per cent.

Agriculture is unlike the life it used to be. It is now a business and requires capital to operate. Today it involves not just tilling, sowing and reaping, but chemistry, physics, genetics, economics and mathematics. Too many urban Canadians think farming is for the strong in the back and the weak in the mind. It is not a job for misfits.

In the last ten years, according to statistics, food costs to the consumer have risen 19 per cent. Rent, in comparison, has risen 32 per cent and medical care by 63 per cent. But the

farmer's income share is shrinking. For each dollar you spend on beef, he gets 57 cents; on milk he gets 53 cents; on bread, 11.5 cents. The rest goes for transportation, packaging, processing, wholesaling and retailing.

The average net income per farm throughout Canada is only \$2,150, according to 1961 statistics. Oftentimes the remark has been passed that farmers pay little or no income tax, but the answers are very clearly seen if one will go into a study of the figures of revenue.

In Glengarry county—I am sorry to say this but it is factual—56 per cent of the farms had less than \$4,000 gross income and 70 per cent had a gross income of less than \$5,000. The first question which will be asked by many is: Why do they stay there?

Admittedly, we are confronted with a situation where so few, less than seven per cent, of our dairy milk producers have an urban centre to ship milk to. Those who are fortunate enough to find a market which has existed within their family for 60 years or more, into the city of Montreal, are in that category; the rest have to find an outlet in the manufactured end of milk products, which is the condensory, or cheese, and which pays in the neighbourhood of \$3 a hundred pounds to the producers of milk.

We are not as fortunate as to be surrounded with a large urban centre within the confines of our own province; and, as you know, Quebec today is producing more milk than it can consume, and how long those seven per cent or so will enjoy the benefits of the Montreal market no one knows. Strained relations and this feeling, which persists in Quebec, of patronizing their own and not wanting to do business with the outside world—I am sure the intelligent people do not feel that way but nevertheless it is in existence.

Since the net income is not more than two-fifths of the gross, over half and perhaps two-thirds of the farm families in my county are not earning a decent living and the facts bear this out. According to statistics, about 25 per cent of the farmers in Canada account for 75 per cent of the total agricultural production. But there has been in recent years in Ottawa, particularly since the last election in 1963, a drifting away from the traditional concern of Canada for a strong and healthy agricultural industry.

Agriculture remains the largest primary industry in Ontario, as it does throughout the rest of Canada. There has been a minimizing and declining attitude toward the importance of agriculture in our national affairs by the

present federal government, and throughout all of this country today there is a growing alarm that agriculture is being downgraded in the national political scene.

I need only say that the federal policy in respect of agriculture lacks much basic honesty, imagination and leadership in regard to the farm problems of the present day. I think it is sufficient to say that, since the Liberal Party has been elected to office in Ottawa, there has not been one piece of important farm legislation introduced for the consideration of Parliament. The *Family Herald*, Canada's leading national farm paper, quotes the following:

Were it not for the wheat deal, the Liberal Party's agricultural performance in government would have been a disaster.

An hon. member: But what a wheat deal!

Mr. Villeneuve: The government before had sold it for them, to start with.

The province of Ontario's concern over national farm development policies, such as credit and rural development—and one must speak out in protest against the sham which the federal Liberal Party has made of the great and vital agricultural industry of this country. The hon. gentleman from Grey South (Mr. Oliver) knows conditions are not good on farms. He knows it. The hon. Harry Hayes, Minister of Agriculture, is relegated to the lower echelon of importance in the Pearson Cabinet.

The spectacle of confusion in agriculture in our national policies, with very long-term serious consequences for Ontario, can no longer be ignored, because I would say, Mr. Speaker, without any hesitation, if there is not a change in trend, and this is the responsibility of all governments, 50 per cent of the farmers who are farming today in the outlying rural areas who have not an urban market for their milk or other produce, will not be there within ten years from now.

We, in Ontario, are developing concern for the weakening structure of national agricultural policies. In these days of federal-provincial conferences, Ontario cannot sit by when agriculture is relegated to the back seat of national government. One needs to look only at recent events to be concerned over decisions to take important agricultural programmes and transfer them to non-agricultural departments in which the concern of federal officials over the farm problems, either does not exist or is limited at best. The Canadian government spent on agriculture less

than three per cent of the national budget, while in the United States, the agricultural budget amounts to seven per cent. In Holland, Denmark, France, England, West Germany, Norway and Sweden, it is eight per cent of the national budget.

Yes, I will admit, to my hon. friend that this government has ignored agriculture to some extent, as far as finances go, because in accordance to our expenditures back in 1948, we in comparison, interested in agriculture, have not received the amount of the Budget I believe it is necessary to receive in order to help this industry. The technological revolution has brought with it the need for larger increased capitalized farms. By 1961, the average farm holding in farm capital, had risen 328 per cent since 1946. The farm family is probably asked to accept more risk for less pay than any other segment of our economy.

Now, the dairy industry is the most essential form of farm income in eastern Ontario. We are favourably located near a heavy concentrated population of the United States and our surplus of dairy cattle sold in the United States, represents a cash crop income. That has been maintained for a period of some 30 years and is perhaps the most responsible for the sustenance of the dairy farmer of that area.

Eighty per cent of the milk produced from Prince Edward county eastward to the Quebec border is sold to the manufacturer trade through condensories, creameries and cheese-manufacturing plants. Dairy products provide over 20 per cent of the farm cash income of Ontario. Automation and mechanization costs in farm operations necessitate more research in agriculture and I am pleased to hear the hon. Prime Minister of this province make the statement of what he intends to do, or this government is going to do in the expansion of the Agricultural College.

That institution is recognized as one of the finest on the North American continent and if we are to get answers to agricultural problems, research must be the essential responsibility of the government to give us the facilities to get the answers. And I am more than pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this announcement has been made today and that that has taken place.

We must face up to it and provide leadership and guidance to avoid having any particular section of this industry destroyed. A healthy farm economy is a tonic to every industry, to every branch of commerce. The dairy farmer is part of an important basic

industry in this country, we must maintain a proper balance in our economy and to do what is within our power to assure our dairy farmers of a fair compensation for their labour—and at the same time to maintain a continuously reasonably priced food supply to the consumer.

The Babcock test system now presently in force for milk testing has been one of grievous concern for many years and any system that permits the plant operator to base the amount paid for milk on a test taken at the plant, by or on behalf of the plant operator, will always be open to suspicion. The relationship of solid and fat in milk content should receive further study in accordance to the returns it could increase to the producers, on a quality basis.

If we are to take an overall account of the dairy industry we must take action to resolve it by diverting milk supplies to the channels of the domestic market, where it will have the greatest consumption and an opportunity to be sold as an export product. Today, there is almost complete recognition that the four dairy groups cannot operate separately, that one overall marketing plan and board is needed in each province if the dairy industry is going to once again get back on a stable footing.

Agriculture has a need for fewer and stronger organizations, in my estimation. The provincial government has jurisdiction over the marketing of milk. Large dairies should be restricted so as not to be allowed to exploit the milk producers by manipulating surplus milk supplies to their own advantage.

Placing milk in schools for the daily food diet consumption of children is one means where the Canadian population could be better served.

Actually, there are many families living in urban centres, particularly in our smaller income class population, where children do not receive the amount of milk they should to maintain a healthy body. Science has not, as yet, discovered a product which is richer than milk in calcium, so essential in the building of strong, healthy bodies. Educating the children to partake of nutritious food when they are young is a form of an educational programme which will certainly influence their eating habits all through their lives.

A land use survey has just been completed in eastern Ontario and we are now in a position to apply the ARDA programme, in its full meaning in this province, with federal government co-operation assistance to help the rural areas, where poverty and low farm

income has existed for far too long—a policy which will restore confidence in people willing to work to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I will move the adjournment of the debate and continue later.

Mr. Villeneuve moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Eco-

nomics and Development. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Is there a night sitting on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. Night sittings are on Tuesday and Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 27, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Monday, April 27, 1964

Second report, standing committee on education, health and welfare, Mr. Cowling	2467
Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued	2468
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2500

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1964

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park), in the absence of Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe), presented the second report of the standing committee on education, health and welfare, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Bill No. 86, An Act to repeal The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grants Act, 1960-61.

Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. G. C. Wardrobe (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about an editorial which appeared today in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, entitled: "Troubles of the North". It mentioned that mining towns of northern Ontario have a difficult and unstable existence. I quote:

To compensate them for this, the mining municipalities get part of the profits tax levied on mining by the Ontario government. This tax returns an average of \$90 million a year to Queen's Park, which returns an average of \$26 million to the

mining municipalities, the amount paid to each being determined by the number of miners living in it. The mining municipalities want this raised to about \$50 million, and their case is well founded.

As far as the Ontario government is concerned, the Ontario mining tax has amounted to a maximum of approximately \$18 million a year when the uranium mines were in full production. Last year, it was approximately \$10 million, of which the mining municipalities received about \$6 million a year.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, on a question of privilege, I want to correct a misstatement, to put it mildly, in last Saturday's *Toronto Daily Star*. I will read the offending paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and then make a comment on it:

During the debate on the so-called police state bill, the Liberals and the New Democrats expressed support for limited use of wire-tapping by police and the new Attorney General is resisting this pressure.

May I just say, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who was in the House will know that the Liberals—none of us on this side in this official Opposition—said we were in favour of wire-tapping, either limited or otherwise. How the *Toronto Daily Star* was able to concoct this story, I will never know. But I want it to be known quite definitely, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Party, that we made no such statement and took no such stand at any time.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): The hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) was supporting Robert Kennedy who supports it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Provincial Secretary has anything to say, let him stand up and say it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the

day, I would like to announce that at the committee on agriculture meeting, which is called for ten o'clock on Wednesday next in committee room number two, the Stinson report on the tobacco inquiry committee will be discussed.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I submitted a question last week but the Minister was away, and I was away when he was here; since he is here now may I ask the question?

It is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), to whom the Ontario Northland Railway Commission reports. The question is: Has the commission taken steps to give added service to northeastern Ontario by including trains No. 41 and No. 44 in its operations after April 26, 1964?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. I might say I am sorry I was not in the House last Thursday but, as was said, I was here Friday and he was away at that time.

I am not too sure whether I am clear on his question. He asked: has the commission taken steps to give added service to northeastern Ontario by including trains 41 and 44 in its operation? I think the hon. member knows that 41 and 44 are Canadian National trains. They originate and terminate at North Bay, and I understand they will be running seven days a week. If that is the question, that is as far as I can answer it.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, may I explain? Trains 46 and 47 were also CNR trains; they operated from Toronto right through to Timmins. The last run of 47 was, I believe, on Friday night, and 46 on Saturday night. There is going to be only one passenger service operating from Toronto to Timmins as of yesterday—train 49 going north and train 50 coming south. Those are the only two passenger trains which will be operating; 46 and 47 are off the boards. I believe there is another number of train, but it is that fast express and freight, so actually there will now be only one passenger service operating from North Bay to Timmins, and Timmins to North Bay.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, now that I understand the hon. member's question, we are putting in a bus service to meet 41 and 44 coming from the north so that they can get into Toronto the same day and meeting them at North Bay going north, in order to

speed up the service. I think we have explained that several times in committee and in the House. I do not think it needs any more clarification than that. This is a new bus service so people can leave the north and get this train and be in Toronto the same day; the same applies going back to the north.

Mr. Troy: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. Minister think that service will be sufficient to handle the traffic? I notice there are toilets on the bus, too.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated several times before that if we find this service is not adequate, our hands are not tied; we can put on more passenger trains to meet this train provided we find a necessity for those trains.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Twenty-fourth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development the cost of the preparation of the report concerning the Windsor economic conditions?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): The cost is approximately \$12,000, primarily, for the consultants who did the study.

Mr. Newman: Were the various individuals on the committee paid at all? I am referring to the members representing the union and those representing management.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There was nothing paid to the members of the committee, just to the consultants.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question in regard to that study done in the Windsor area? He will recall that a considerable amount of badgering went on for a fair amount of time before the government was persuaded to make this study. Can he give me any specific actions which have flowed from the study now that it has been

completed? I mean, what can the hon. Minister advance as a substantial result from that effort?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think, to be fair to the study, it was completed, as you know, early this year. We have not had time to make any definite recommendations as to what should be done. The prime recommendation was that there should be an amalgamation of municipalities. I might say we have heard from a number of municipalities which are not in favour of that; that matter is now being discussed with the city of Windsor and the surrounding municipalities.

In the meantime, working conditions in Windsor have never been better. Whether the study has put the finger on some things which were not happening but which people imagined were happening, I do not know; but I would think that the study will, very definitely in the next six months or so, indicate to the people in Windsor and perhaps to the government that some steps should be taken to assist Windsor in becoming highly commercialized—such as it was previously. I might say, also, that there are a number of new industries going into Windsor, and have been going in in the last year.

I would think that the clarification of that economic report is such that if there was any doubt on the part of industry about getting good treatment from labour and from the city officials, that has been removed. I think that the Windsor Economic Council has cleared the air on some doubts people had about opening up a plant in Windsor. I would also like to say that, in view of the good fortune the federal government have been able to bring about through the export of automobile parts, in my estimation Windsor stands in a better position to take advantage of that export of automobile parts than any other city in Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: Was the result chiefly a psychological result, from which has flown action on the part of the individuals within the communities themselves?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think you are right.

Mr. Newman: One of the recommendations was that special consideration be given to the location of government and institutional facilities in the general area. We are very fortunate today that the automotive swing has gone the other way and employment conditions are better than they have been for a long time. They are not as good as we would like to see because we still carry approximately 5,500 people in the un-

employed category. A lot of this unemployment, or some of it, could probably be eliminated by the establishment of governmental and institutional facilities. What is the hon. Minister's opinion concerning such facilities and their effect upon the economy of an area?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I am not an authority on that. I think it is out of my jurisdiction to recommend where any of these facilities should go. A set of those same recommendations has been made to Ottawa, with reference to Blind River and Cornwall for federal institutions. I would think that all governments will be aware of what they can do to assist the municipality, if they were going to build such institutions, and to put them where they could serve a community perhaps better than they could here in the centre of the province. I would think that what you have to suggest was in the minds of most people who are preparing or setting up government departments of any stature whatsoever. They will go to those areas.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the federal government has instituted tax incentives, depreciation allowances, home purchase subsidies, and auto parts incentive programmes to relieve this type of situation. What is the provincial government prepared to do in case the pendulum swings the other way and the economic conditions become unfavourable?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is a \$64 question. All I would like to suggest to you is that the province has gone as far as I think it should go with the federal government in meeting some of these recommendations. We have met the federal government on a number of its concessions. Some, of course, do not lend themselves to the province taking participation in these areas, but I would think with our liaison with Ottawa, we will watch those allowances or concessions very closely. I do not think at the present time we need to start planning for greater concessions when the economy is growing the way it is now—if we are not complacent about our present position and I certainly do not think we are complacent in this province.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister believe that the federal programme as instituted has some merit—the idea of giving incentives to an area that does not have the same rate of growth as other areas?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it has some merit. On the other hand, I think it has some pitfalls. A company can be, let us say, enticed

into an area and then once those concessions are removed after a period of three or five years, it could find itself operating in a very uneconomical area. That is the position we should watch very carefully, to make sure we do not coax the industry into an area and then find after these concessions are removed that it is not economical to operate there, that skilled labour is not available, as well as many of the other things that industry needs to be competitive.

Mr. Newman: But the hon. Minister does approve certain types of incentives to enhance the growth of a community, does he?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say so, yes.

Mr. Newman: I would like to bring to the hon. Minister's attention an editorial in the *Windsor Daily Star* of April 25. I would strongly recommend that he familiarize himself with it, because it is most critical of the attitude the hon. Minister has taken in his original comments on Thursday. Rather than read the article, I will simply suggest to the hon. Minister that he familiarize himself with it. It is self-explanatory and if he reads it maybe his attitude toward incentives may change.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Thank you. I have not seen the article. I will be glad to get it.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I may be remiss in this question, because I did leave a little early Thursday night. I am not sure whether it was specifically asked of the hon. Minister. *Hansard* is not yet available.

You have under vote 402 the automation foundation on employment. In the text of your opening remarks there was no specific explanation of the interrelationship between this and the federal survey, which is presently under study, or any explanation of the interrelationship between this and the study of John Deutsch which he announced last week. I wonder how they fit together?

Hon. Mr. Randall: When you were out of the House the other night the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) made quite a lengthy statement on it. The federal-provincial study is now on, with reference to setting up the automation foundation. I think you will find a full explanation in your *Hansard*.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402 agreed to.

Vote 403 agreed to.

Vote 404 agreed to.

On vote 405:

Hon. Mr. Randall: Vote 405 we are going to leave to the end and take before vote 411.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You are going to take housing at the end, then?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are going to take housing at the end. We asked for that the other night.

On vote 406:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, with regard to vote 406, I wonder if the hon. Minister might make some further explanations as to what the future course of the Ontario Development Agency is. I am curious to read now that it is admitted that in the first year there were some \$300,000 in losses. The government's argument is that it recognized from the outset that these were marginal industries and that this was a gamble that was worthwhile. The hon. Minister also laid heavy stress on the fact that one of the main contributions of this agency was on the level of what might be called more effective management—management know-how.

If I may go back and just cite the case—it is the only case with details available, if we appear to be threshing old straw—of Fairfield in Owen Sound. Clearly this was one in which the government interceded in the belief that the main requirement was greater management efficiency. In fact, when I pursued this issue in some depth a year or so ago, and pointed out that the company in question had gone bankrupt in Preston, had moved down to Jamaica; had gone through two or three stages of management there, ultimately had been put in the hands of some management consultant firm, and then was brought back to Owen Sound, as I understood the government's explanation, it had cleaned out the corporate shell and had put in new management. Indeed, when I pressed the then Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) rather strongly on this point, he at one place, as *Hansard* for last year will indicate, said that we were to have nothing to do with it until the elder Fairfield was out of the picture altogether and the company established a management group that included some representatives from the city of Owen Sound.

Now, unfortunately, we do not have the irrepressible spokesman for Owen Sound with us this afternoon. That may be good, or it may be bad, I do not know which. But the thing that puzzles me is that when the government moved to meet the obvious need

for more efficient management in this company, and apparently convinced itself that it had taken the necessary action to make this a reliable economic concern, results within less than a year proved it was wrong.

Taking this as the one case history that is before us, what went wrong? Was this company wrong in its whole effort of attempting to manufacture, as its tradition has been, from partly waste materials and partly new materials? Was this the main difficulty in efforts to make it an economic, viable unit, or did it once again end up with inefficient management? If so, how do you explain this when it had the industrial commissioner and two or three of the top industrial people of Owen Sound on the management committee?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I think the question being asked by the hon. member—is it about the Fairfield Company or the ODA in general?

Mr. MacDonald: The ODA in general, but Fairfield is the only one for which we have been given any sort of detailed picture. I am taking it as an example of the general explanation the hon. Minister gave us of ODA.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well then, to go back and review the reason for taking on ODA, it was the first loan made by ODA when the agency was first set up. We did not have the advisory board that we had throughout the year after ODA was set up. As you know now, we have a new advisory board consisting of seven men instead of 15—very well qualified people.

Going back to Fairfield's story, I agree with the hon. member the gentleman had two failures prior to coming to ODA. Recommendations were made by the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent), who was mayor of Owen Sound, and the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher). In all honesty they felt they were doing the city of Owen Sound a service, and I think in looking over the correspondence that they were. They were entirely sincere in asking the government to move in and help this small industry. The town had 12 per cent of its labour force unemployed. The townspeople themselves agreed to put up \$15,000 of their own money and I do not think you can write people off if they are willing to put their own money into it.

The recommendation of the agency was that the company should get itself a better manager than Mr. Fairfield. That was not taken care of until perhaps around May after it had gone through its first allotment of

money. Then the agency insisted that things were not improving, in fact were getting much worse, and that the company should replace Mr. Fairfield. That, I think, without looking up the dates, is when Mr. Ivor Wagner, the industrial commissioner and a very qualified man apparently, took over the management of the company. The company also asked us to send up a technical adviser, which we did. It looked at that time that it could weather the storm. And then Mr. Fairfield, in the capacity of a salesman apparently, went out and took an order from the federal government for socks that he was selling for less than cost. Under those circumstances, the company just could not survive.

We do not think that can happen again, although we would certainly not want to make any bets on it, because actually what we are doing is betting on the integrity of people. If they live up to the agreement that they say they will live up to, we now have the machinery to make sure that they do, whereas with the first loan that we made to Fairfield, we did not have that machinery. The other two cases were almost in a similar category. We did not have the machinery to follow up the ODA programme such as we should have when the agency was first set up.

I would think that from Fairfield we have learned a very valuable lesson. I could read a report of almost three pages of what came out of the Fairfield case, but I would like hon. members to keep in mind that while \$135,000 was lost in Fairfield, almost \$100,000 was paid out in wages to the people of Owen Sound. Many of these people, according to the hon. member for Grey North, were on relief. So all was not lost. I have some figures here pointing out what was gained in taxes, not only by the municipality but also by the province. We are not in the business of trying to take care of the tax collector in a roundabout way but I think some of the criticism of Owen Sound is not justified under the circumstances. I would say that in the future we will certainly make sure before loans are advanced that the management meets the conditions of the agency's agreement, which was never met up in Owen Sound—it was too late.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if we are dealing with Fairfield alone for a moment, Mr. Chairman, before the hon. Minister gets to the general position of ODA, I must say I appreciate his explanation but there are just two points in it that provoke comment. One, he states that Mr. Fairfield was left in the picture until May. I have a little difficulty in

making this add up with the comment of his predecessor in the House, because it was in March, or at the latest, early April when we pressed this point. The Minister, sir, said he would have nothing to do until Mr. Fairfield was out of the picture altogether. Now maybe the hon. Minister's explanation is that he was out of the management but he was out on the road selling. Is this it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think, backing up Mr. Macaulay's statement, Mr. Fairfield was taken out of the position of director but then the directors made him the general manager of the operation. I think that is where the difficulty occurred.

Mr. MacDonald: It sounds like a senatorial appointment.

However, let me make one other comment on this. Let me go back to the hon. Minister's phrase. He said: "We bank on the integrity of people and if we find we have misjudged then we have learned our lesson." The fact of the matter is that when a little investigating was done at the Ottawa level to discover exactly what the economic relationships of this company were with the federal government, or to put it more accurately, what its contracts were with the federal government, it was found that the company had requested it should be permitted to be freed from the contract that it had been granted. The reason it wanted to be freed was, so they said, because it had so much other profitable business that it could turn to.

Now clearly, in light of what has happened since, this was unwittingly or otherwise, a very serious misrepresentation of the situation. Indeed, I think, Mr. Chairman, misrepresentation went one step further back. The federal contracts called for 100 per cent new material going into the socks that the company was going to make. Fairfield has always operated on the basis of putting in a lot of old material, reworked material, and apparently what happened—though there was some interesting verbal footwork to try to keep this covered up—was that it accepted the contract, ignored the fact that new material was required—it was going to be making socks in its traditional fashion, partly made of old material—and the federal government stepped in. It was not freed of the contract, it had the contract cancelled. So the whole reputation and dealings of this company are such as to make us a little fearful as to how careful was the government's examination.

The hon. Minister explains the government did not have an advisory committee at that stage and implicit in his remarks is that the

Fairfield case slipped through because it did not have an advisory committee. If that be the case, I just hope that its advisory committee is a little bit sharper in the future because it had plenty of warning about Fairfield before the company arrived this time in its cap-in-hand fashion. It had been going cap-in-hand to governments all over the western world for quite some years now.

Vote 406 agreed to.

Vote 407 agreed to.

On vote 408:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): On vote 408, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister. In the estimates I notice an amount of \$760,000 for northern Ontario development and foundation research, special services and projects. Could the hon. Minister give us some information as to what projects are being discussed or being considered?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, there are the studies on gold mine tailings, on peat moss, and the air service for northern Ontario. The economic council is working in co-operation with it. I think most of these are listed in the annual report that we gave to hon. members Friday.

Mr. Troy: There is apparently some research going on in regard to the use of asbestos in paving, I believe. Is it this department or The Department of Highways that is doing it? Has the hon. Minister any information on that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand that it is The Department of Highways.

Vote 408 agreed to.

On vote 409:

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question in regard to vote 409. You have set up, I think, ten regional development associations in this province. Over the last number of years we have always asked the Minister regarding how many industries settled in our towns and villages across this province. I think in your opening remarks, you said there were 178 industries established in the province of Ontario in 1963. Could you give me the number that have settled in the towns and villages? There has been a great need for industries in these towns. They have been working to get an industry and nothing seems to happen. These towns and villages certainly need some industries in order to keep them in existence. I wondered

if the hon. Minister could outline to me what his plans are, or has he plans to assist these towns and villages to get an industry to locate in those towns that certainly need some assistance?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can get you the names of the towns. I do not have them here. I will dig them up and give them to you before we are through. Insofar as the regional development plans are concerned, I announced in my presentation that we were going to have an international meeting in Toronto this year on regional development. We think we are as well advanced in regional development as anybody in the Dominion of Canada. In fact, many of the other jurisdictions have been here to find out what we are doing. As far as we are concerned, we do not think we are doing enough. We think a lot more could be done, but the effort has to be co-ordinated.

Regional development is not only a problem here; it is a problem, I think, over most of the world. From my own experience, I can point out to you that four or five years ago, in any city in any country in Europe, they would almost give you the Crown jewels if you would go there and build a factory in areas where they had unemployment, where people would not move to the cities which were short of labour. We have somewhat the same position here, in many areas.

I think that one of the great problems of regional development is to find out how we can get industry into the smaller centres. The incentive programme we talked about earlier this afternoon is perhaps one way, but incentives cannot last forever; otherwise you are placing one manufacturing industry in an uncompetitive position against another. You may be able to subsidize them to get them started, but certainly you cannot continue to subsidize them for all time to come, and that is one of the problems. We believe in getting industry out of, let us say, the Golden Horseshoe area to move into smaller towns where they do need one or two good industries.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question with regard to England. I think they have a plan over there, which I am not too familiar with—maybe you have made a study of what is taking place in England. I understand that industries which could exist in towns and villages are encouraged to go there. Maybe you plan something along this line; can you enlighten us?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think they have had some success, but I know they have also had some failures. We intend to bring somebody

from the U.K. to sit in on this international meeting, because I think they are probably more familiar with it than most people, inasmuch as most of England, as you know, was badly damaged during the war and they decentralized a lot of industry and put it into some of these satellite towns. I know, in a few instances, they have had some pretty bad failures. Even with the backing of government money, they have eventually thrown in the sponge and the business has gone under.

Answering your other question, new industries went into 74 Ontario municipalities last year. I do not have the breakdown of the towns, but I could get it and give it to you.

Mr. Spence: I would appreciate that.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, how can the hon. Minister reconcile his last statements with his original remarks when he introduced his estimates? In his original remarks he said that this government, as far as possible, should seek to create development where it is most efficient. Investments must be concentrated in areas and industries with the greatest growth potential. What the hon. Minister has mentioned to my hon. colleague is just exactly the opposite to what he originally said in his introductory remarks.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I do not think so. Just take your own money. If you are going to put your money into a plant, would you take it and put it up in the bush where you are a long way from your customers, or will you put it where you are close to the source of supply, where you can cut down your cost of transportation and where you have available labour? These are the things which have to be considered. All I am suggesting is that you do not take industry and earmark it and say, "You have to go 500 miles north of Toronto if you want to start to make shoes, or bicycles or washing machines." We think industry has to have the right to settle where it can get the best return on its dollar. All I am suggesting is that we would hope to encourage industry to go out of the complex we have here in the Golden Horseshoe; certainly I do not think this government should insist that industry and investors should take their money and put it in an area where they may consider it to be uneconomical to operate.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, how is the hon. Minister going to encourage industry to go into these smaller communities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the communities themselves have a lot to do with it. They

create a very healthy climate such as we think we have created in the province of Ontario. I think industry will go there anyway. Your own city of Windsor is a good example of that. You are creating a healthy climate down there now, because of changes in federal legislation on exports. The motor car industry has improved itself and it is attracting supplier industries; I think the same thing would happen in small towns.

I think there are lots of things they can do in small towns to invite industry to come in. In fact, we had a gentleman here from London the other day with a programme to attract industry. One of the things we suggested was: "Why do you not point out you are not just talking about industry, you are talking about gracious living for your employees and your executives?" If you were coming out of the city of New York, it would be very nice to be able to settle in a town like Tillsonburg or Blenheim or Delhi, towns down there where you can get some country living, gracious living, and at the same time you are still on the main line railway track and have lots of transportation by road. These are things, I think, many of the municipalities do not spell out when they are trying to encourage industry to come and settle.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, everything is still a matter of dollars and cents, and the hon. Minister still has not explained how the provincial government would encourage growth in the smaller communities. The federal government has already taken certain types of incentive programmes to encourage growth in certain areas, but this government has no programme at all. You are just fortunate that economic conditions have been fairly good, and that the federal authorities have taken steps; but this government has taken no steps at all to encourage these local areas.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think that is quite right. We have the regional development programme. We work with the industrial commissioners in the various small towns. We have on our plate, now, three or four towns which are begging for industry, which are talking to industry. Our people in the agency are working with them. We give them every encouragement.

Insofar as what the federal government have done, they have picked out specific areas where they have had a high number of unemployed—and again I think there is a lot of disagreement; nobody entirely agrees with these concessions which have been made. They cannot be made on a long-term basis,

and on a short-term basis they could be fatal for a company in a very competitive market. I do not think the federal government intend to continue those programmes indefinitely.

I still go back and say that, under regional development, I am quite sure we are going to be able to assist industry to go into smaller areas. But on the point you made, and I want to emphasize this, I do not think this government or any government should tell the investor where he has to put his dollars; otherwise this will not be a free enterprise economy.

I do not think we will encourage too many people to come here and set up industries in the province of Ontario unless we let them make the decision as to where they are going to settle. We can encourage them to go out of the industrial areas, but we certainly should not force them.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Minister in connection with encouraging industry. From what I can gather, this is a verbal encouragement and not much more than that. I would suggest, sir, that several things come to mind. As I listened to you speak previously of the need for co-ordination in connection with regional development services and as I listened to your last remarks, sir, I am wondering if you did not raise this question in a number of people's minds: Is there close co-ordination with the federal programmes? You think perhaps the federal government might drop some of its programmes. Surely there is a responsibility in connection with your department to keep very closely in touch with them and be aware of whether they are going to drop their programmes or not?

With respect then to the point made by my hon. colleague from Windsor-Walkerville, Mr. Chairman, I would feel that the provincial government should take more responsibility in manpower study. I am thinking of a retraining programme.

As I say this my mind goes back to a study in the United States, by their Senate committee, of Hazelton — an area which was depressed, which is in the coal mining district, and which was desperately needing supplementary industry. The state took the responsibility of providing retraining programmes, of encouraging advertising on a broad basis—that if industries would come in there would be a retraining programme; labour would be retrained in order that it would be skilled labour for a certain industry.

I feel, particularly with the provincial government's responsibility in training, that this would be the kind of pinpointing which would be very inductive to industry to move. I suggest again that an overall study of industrial opportunities, with a tie-in to tax deductions would be an aggressive approach.

I understand the hon. Minister is doing studies on transportation. Surely he has been deciding where there is an area which seems to be blighted with respect to industry; is where the economic situation may wither in some way. Perhaps if we could build better transportation into such areas and advertise it, encourage vocational schools to set up there, this would be an encouragement to industry. Not that I agree wholeheartedly that you have to tell an industry: "You must go there"; but at least it should be more than verbal encouragement.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would be good enough to comment on those points.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. I was in Pittsburgh a few weeks ago and, as the hon. members probably know, there has been more money spent in Pittsburgh, to make it attractive for industry to come and settle in the Pittsburgh area and solve their unemployment problem, than in any other city in the United States; yet they still have a very high ratio of unemployed in Pittsburgh. I think, when I was there in February, it was running between eight and ten per cent.

Pittsburgh has a programme, as we have in the province of Ontario, of trying to get industry to come into its area. They have a training programme similar, I think, to what the federal government is running here in co-operation with the provinces.

We are co-operating with the federal government on retraining programmes. We will be doing more of that, I think, in the future. But I would like to point out that these designated areas were not designated because of municipal taxes or lack of municipal taxes, or anything along that line. They were designated because of the unemployment in those areas. The programme of the federal government was primarily aimed at assisting unemployment in these designated areas; and for no other reason, at the time they put it into effect. There may be other reasons from here on in.

For instance, we know there will be 250 miners laid off in Bancroft on July 1 when they start stockpiling uranium. That presents a very major problem to this province and also to the federal government. What are you going to do with 250 men who are

miners, who are not trained, and who will not need training until July 1 to work in a factory? These are the problems with which we are confronted; and they are the problems I think I spelled out in my presentation of the estimates on Thursday.

We are primarily concerned with areas which are going to lose their industries—whether it be in mines, whether it be a factory, or whether it be in the fields—and doing something for these people before it gets to a point where they become unemployed in great numbers. So when the hon. member says we are not doing anything, I think we are doing a great deal in this province, perhaps more so than anybody else, because the facts speak for themselves.

We are down to 2.5 per cent unemployed seasonally, adjusted at the end of last month. We are not a bit complacent about it, because it can go up that fast just as quickly; but I think this province is doing as much, if not more, than any other province in Canada to make sure that our people are gainfully employed. Our big problem is that we have spot areas where you just cannot pick up a factory and put it down overnight and employ people. But certainly we are going to have to look at means whereby we can bring those people into areas, properly trained, to fit into a new segment of society if necessary, and give them gainful occupation.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Minister. I think that Bancroft is a good example. He referred first of all to a retraining programme in co-operation with the federal government. I cannot help feeling that his suggestion that the federal government is taking a major responsibility in this—I might be unfair to him in that subject, but it seems to me that—take the regional development services; this should be a major role of the hon. Minister's, to be looking at this kind of retraining.

I mean we have seen situations where they might encourage a lot of people to take welding or something else, if we know that this is going to be a needed occupation in the future and so on. My hon. friend says we know that it is not. Well, it is the province, after all, which has gone in with the federal government; I would think it has taken a long hard look at what occupations it is retraining people for, and what the future opportunities are.

I ask that because you have the danger of an industry closing in Bancroft. The hon. Minister says, "Well, this is a question we have got to face." I appreciate this; you

can see there is going to be a problem there; but I ask the hon. Minister, just so that we can pinpoint the constructive steps he will take; what steps is he going to take in Bancroft—the concrete approach that he would take in connection with regional development purposes? Could he outline for us what steps he is going to take with respect to the 250 men who will be unemployed in Bancroft?

I ask this, sir, because he says that the interest of the federal government in designating areas was because of unemployment. Surely the answer to unemployment is that he not only gives retraining but also job opportunity in connection with secondary industry, so that his concern is similarly the concern of the federal government and there should be a close relationship. I think it would be most helpful for us to see that it is no longer a theory but is actually translated into practical terms. The hon. Minister has been good enough to cite the example of Bancroft. Could we ask him now to outline for us the concrete steps he is going to take in Bancroft?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, let me say first of all that we do not have any magic wand. These situations come, and they are going to continue to come. If you look back at Elliot Lake, they had 31,000 people working there a few years ago and now it is down to 9,000. They are the hard core of the people who have homes and youngsters there and who do not want to move away. They are the people we are left with. They are the people we are worrying about now—to find out how we can get an industry or something in there to keep these people working when they are not mining uranium.

But I ask myself: Where have the other 21,000 people drifted to in the last few years? They drift into other areas and find the kind of work they want, the kind of work they find in mining. I imagine you will find a good many of them in the Timmins area right now, and I think you will see some leaving Bancroft.

We are making a survey of the needs of people for employment. We have a survey going on now in our department. I would think that, out of that, we will find out what we can do with a barber who does not want to be a barber, or a miner who can no longer mine. I think you also realize that somebody suggested they should put the federal pension building up there in Elliot Lake, and that would take care of everybody who was unemployed. I am sure it would help the merchants up there but it certainly

would not take the miner and put him behind a desk pushing a pencil. He would still drift away and want to do the work he is trained to do.

These are some of the things, I think, which will very definitely have to come out of these regional training programmes we are talking about. And I want to emphasize that we are working with the federal authorities, and the vocational schools and training schools we have in this province; and I think when the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) goes on with his estimates he can point out the many things being done to retrain people for gainful occupation.

But I think, even 100 years from now, these spot problems like Elliot Lake and Blind River are still going to come about, and quite often an industry may be wiped out. We have negotiations going on at GATT right now. If we believe what we say we believe, there is going to be a lowering of tariffs and undoubtedly some industries are going to get hurt. If they are going to get hurt we have to make sure that we have positions for those people to move to from the area where they are hurt.

I think that this government is doing as much as any government. In fact, we think we are doing more; and we are going to continue to do more to make sure that we keep that low level of employment.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I appreciate the enthusiasm of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrobe) in connection with your remarks. But I am still asking questions, because I know you are a man of practical experience, a man who likes to see things in ones, twos, threes, and fours.

You have been good enough to mention Bancroft. From your last remarks, the first thing which came to my mind was your saying, "Well, men from Blind River and Elliot Lake moved out." I ask: Is it your suggestion that, with the situation in Bancroft and the impending unemployment there, the men move away from there? If it is not that situation, I ask: are you doing a survey on unemployment? I ask: Apart from the survey, what concrete steps, what one-two-three-four programme have you for the people of Bancroft?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be delighted to answer that. In the first place, we made an economic survey of Bancroft over a year ago through our department, and we forwarded that to Ottawa; so they are familiar with it. In the second place, we received a delegation down here who recommended what could be

done in the lumber business up there and also with a large chemical plant. And we have approached the presidents of these companies and asked them if they are still interested in moving an operation into Bancroft; that is still, to the best of my knowledge, being looked at although it does not look very encouraging for a number of economic reasons. I am talking now about the chip board industry, that is primarily what they were looking at. Thirdly, we have talked to the Minister of Industry at Ottawa on two occasions, we have had correspondence with Prime Minister Pearson about the uranium business, and as you know, in the Ontario Research Foundation we have had, in the last two years, research going on in further uses for uranium.

These are some of the concrete steps we have taken with regard to Bancroft. These are some of the many that were taken with many areas. I do not know what else we could do at the present time. We know there is going to be a spot problem there and these are the steps we have taken now which have been open to us. If anything else comes along, we are going to look at it. I would think we would be in Bancroft again before July 1, certainly long before they turn the key in the door, and I am not too sure that that may happen.

We are hoping there can be some solution worked out for the uranium mining industry in this country. Negotiations are going on now with Ottawa, and as you know, it controls the supply of uranium. It has nothing to do with the province, particularly in the disposition of this metal. I am quite sure that having taken those three steps, we have done all we can to implement some kind of programme for Bancroft. The next move, if we cannot get an industry in there, will certainly have to be sending somebody up to see how we can move these people into industry where their services can be used.

Mr. Thompson: I realize, and I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, that in many ways there is not an easy pat answer with respect to world markets for uranium and so on. But as I understand it, the hon. Minister has been in touch with Ottawa in connection with Bancroft. He has made tentative negotiations with a lumber company and a chemical concern, which apparently have not jelled. He has written to the hon. Minister of Industry. He has not considered public works of some kind but he has thought that perhaps if things do not start developing that he may have to go up and have another look.

Before the hon. Minister's time we heard of a situation in Elliot Lake where men became unemployed. I remember the panorama of vision that took place on the part of not one Cabinet Minister but a whole collection of them. And then what happened? Gradually we saw the disintegration of that community. I think this hon. Minister is probably being more cautious, judging from everything he has said, and from saying that he had this regional development service. If I was to go to Bancroft tomorrow and talk to those 250 miners, I would not have one constructive remark to make to them. I would have to tell them that I am sorry, from what I could gather there were some negotiations in connection with lumber and chemical industries, which do not seem to have worked—we will give them marks for trying on that—and there have been letters to the Ministers of Trade and Industry in Ottawa. But reassurance to those men, I do not see.

I took that example because the hon. Minister was good enough to take the example of Bancroft. I would hope, when we think of Elliot Lake and other grandiose plans which did not seem to materialize, that the Ontario Regional Development Services will come through with concrete action. I say this because last year we listened to a most energetic Minister who gave us a whole series of surveys that were going to take place. We have been very interested to see concrete steps that are now being proposed and we still await that.

Mr. W. E. Sandercock (Hastings West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the hon. Minister on the great effort he has made in connection with the Bancroft situation. We have been here at different times with delegations and he has met us very courteously and has done everything in his power to try to do something for that village which we know is in a bad situation. There have also been delegations to Ottawa. I am sure everyone that I know who is interested in that village is doing everything he can to get some kind of an industry there to help the people out. I would certainly like to compliment the hon. Minister on what he has done, and I know he has not left a stone unturned.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the hon. Minister, it seems to me that we in northern Ontario cannot hope very much for secondary industry other than in connection with the natural products that we have in our area—that is, industries having to do with lumber, or industries that make tools and equipment for the mines, and our agricultural

industry. Certainly, it seems to me too that the one industry that we should be going all out to encourage is the tourist industry.

But the thing that we need before we can possibly compete with southern Ontario is the market in our own area. With only the large extent of northern Ontario right from the Quebec border to Manitoba in our own section—maybe 500,000 people—there is not much opportunity at all for us to get any industry that can manufacture goods. We would have to sell them in southern Ontario or other places, so why should a manufacturing company go up north when it has to send the products all the way back south? We must then get all the help we can from this department for our tourist industry and in helping out the agriculture industry. We have now found out that northern Ontario is a wonderful place for growing potatoes. We are finding New Brunswick farmers coming up there and developing that industry.

As far as saying that we must move industry from southern Ontario to northern Ontario, I think it is ridiculous. As the hon. Minister says, industry is only going to settle where it has an opportunity of competing with other manufacturers and it must be in an area where it has a market.

I hope the tourist committee that the department has and the other committees considering our problems will help us out. The hon. Minister knows just as well as I do what our great problem is. But the big thing is population—we just do not have the people.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just adding to the remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), we had this automation foundation conference last year and following that Dr. Deutsch of the economic council has suggested to us that we pool our efforts and, I hope, pool our money and do a good job of setting up an automation foundation, which I think will go a long way to answering some of the problems that we foresee coming, such as in the uranium industry. If we could have foreseen this a year or so ago, perhaps if the automation foundation had been formed then, a lot more could have been done. So I say we are moving along the line of doing something as quickly as we can.

I may point this out also that into The Department of Trade and Industry come a number of people who say, "I want to establish a plant in this area." We always suggest to them that they go out of town. If we can, we try to get them into areas where they can lend something to the community and be of service to the community. For

instance, we have a needle trade coming down here. They want 300 people in the needle trade and we cannot find any professional people to put to work in the needle trade. This is one of the major problems. I would think northern Ontario is an area we could suggest. There is a lot of European background in northern Ontario and perhaps that is where they could get the people for the needle trade. This is a case where I think we can persuade people to go north, if they are in a light industry such as manufacturing fabrics and in the tailoring industry.

These are some of the things that we are trying to do to get industry to move into areas where at the moment to you and me it looks uneconomic. Perhaps it will not be uneconomic to somebody with a light industry. I think we know what Bata did a few years ago, after World War II, in the shoe business when it came down here. These are things that we do try to persuade people to consider when they are establishing—to get them out of this area and get them into areas where they can operate on an economically sound basis. So I think we are moving in that direction and we are trying to do all we can to make sure that we diversify industry into as many parts of Ontario as we can, and it is in our interests to do so.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister is talking around the subject very nicely. I am sure that when delegations come to visit the hon. Minister, he gives them the most comfortable chairs in his office, he makes them thoroughly welcome, he exudes his charm—he is a charming man—and I am sure that they get the impression that he is trying to do everything he can. But I think what my hon. colleague from Dovercourt was getting at, and my hon. friend from Nipissing, is that we would like to know what you are doing in a concrete sort of a way.

For instance, is the hon. Minister in favour of fixed assessments? There have been two or three private bills before the House dealing with fixed assessments. Is this the policy of the government that there should be fixed assessments, and, if so, on what basis is this being determined? A couple of years ago, Mr. Chairman, the government decided that there would be no more fixed assessments. They were wiped out. The government took those sections out of The Municipal Act. Now the back door has been opened a little bit. Every now and then the occasional private bill sneaks through and the hon. Minister sits and says not a word.

Has the government policy changed on

fixed assessments or has it not, and if it is available to one, why should it not be available to all? What are the ground rules? I think this is important. Has the hon. Minister any approach in regard to Hydro concessions? This has been talked about on many occasions. I would like to hear whether or not the hon. Minister is interested in offering Hydro concessions.

What about the use of the ONR? I pointed out to him in my remarks at the beginning of these estimates that his predecessor had promised a two- or three-point effort into the operations of the ONR. Is the hon. Minister in favour of using the ONR as an economic instrument to encourage industries to locate in certain places? We agree, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot force industry, and we would not want this government to force industry, to go into fixed locations but there are things which can be done in addition to talking. Depreciation incentives—has the hon. Minister any programme of depreciation incentives?

It is all very well to say that a certain municipality should talk about the luxurious living executives are going to have, but there has to be a little more done to encourage industry to go into the municipalities which need these industries very desperately. So many municipalities are like the dog chasing his tail: They need more assessment to bring their services up to date so that they will attract more assessment.

Where do they start? If they have not got more assessment, the Ontario Municipal Board will not let them put in more water works or more sewers to attract industry. And if they do not have the facilities to attract the industry, the industry will not come in and they will not have the assessment. So round and round we go in a great circle.

Has the hon. Minister, with his colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), anything to say about that? As I say, it is fine that these conversations are going on, and we are sure that when these delegations come in, as the hon. member for Hastings West said: "I am sure that the people are received in an amiable fashion and they are made welcome." But, what is the hon. Minister able to say, in a concrete fashion, that he is doing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know. I think you had better turn your hearing aid up because we have already pointed out that we had a gross provincial product increase of 6.9 per cent here last year. Our unemployment is down to 2.5 per cent. We are bring-

ing in industry at a greater rate than ever before; we are trying to get them to go into areas where they are not now located—

Mr. Singer: How?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sure I have lots of recommendations for Mr. Pearson but I do not think he would listen to me.

Mr. Singer: What are you doing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think Mr. Pearson is going to run his government, and he is going to co-operate with us and we are going to co-operate with him. You say: What are you doing? I think we are doing many things but it would take hours to talk about all the things we have done.

Mr. Singer: That is what these estimates are for.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All our missions overseas, our trade missions, are selling goods from small towns all over the province of Ontario. Two hundred-odd men have gone from small towns into new markets they were never in before; they have opened up a whole new vista of possibilities for their products—from small towns as well as from the large cities. We have investment missions going to the United States—we have had four this year and I think we will have 12 before the end of the year is out—inviting American industry to come in here and open up plants because it is a good place to open up a factory.

Insofar as recommendations on taxes and greater depreciation are concerned, that again, as you can appreciate, is tied up with the federal authority. If the federal authorities are going to move in that direction the province will have to move with them; but you only move in that direction when it is absolutely essential—and in some places it is not essential, it is detrimental. I do not think you can go on giving concessions to one industry against another, or one man in an industry against another one in an industry.

I think we are doing everything we can in this province to find and build a steady employment record, and create a healthy economy for industry to thrive in. And I think the record speaks for itself. We could sit here all day and say, "What is the government doing?" and I would have to make a list as long as a wet week. I will bring it in, and give it to the hon. member; but I do not think we have to. I think the record speaks for itself: That we are doing anything any other provincial government is doing, plus.

What the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) will do, I do not know; that is their department and I have enough trouble running my own, Mr. Chairman. I am doing everything I think I can do to improve the climate for industry to come and settle in this province here and make a dollar. And let me spell something out for you: The only time industry is interested in going anywhere is if it is profitable; if it is not profitable it is not going to go. If you look at the figures at the end of last year, and the figures to date, I think you will find that industry finds Ontario a pretty good place in which to operate.

There is a good family income here. There is a good employment record. There is a good climate as far as the government is concerned. We are close to markets, close to sources of supply. I do not know what else we could add to that but I think that industry is proving, itself, that this is a good place to operate. When we get to the point where we need all these concessions you talk about, I am quite sure that we will come up with our share of them. Right now we do not think it essential that we should come up with a number of concessions for industry which does not require it.

There has been a lot of discussion as to what we should do about the federal tax bill, and what they have done in the United States. There are two schools of thought: Some think we should follow, some think we should not. I do not think we should at the moment. There are others who agree that we should not follow at the moment. But, as far as the province is concerned, I think the province is doing an excellent job of encouraging industry to come in here. I do not know what else we can do that we are not doing to make it a better climate for industry to live in. If you have any suggestions, the door is open; I would welcome any suggestions you might have. If you think you have suggestions which would improve the climate in this province, bring them in to me. I would be delighted to get them.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would make a suggestion right now, of a general nature. It seems to me, from everything which has been said so far in this discussion, that there is simply no co-ordination at all of the various policies in this general field. My suggestion would be that this department should be responsible for developing coherent plans and implementing them itself, if necessary, or at least co-ordinating the activities of other agencies.

The hon. Minister has frequently referred to the fact that there has been a significant increase during the past year in the provincial gross product, and that unemployment on a seasonally adjustment basis is at a relatively low level. I think it should also be borne in mind that his own department, in one of its recent economic surveys in the monthly magazine—I have just forgotten the name of it but the economic bulletin, or whatever it is—pointed out that a province such as Ontario inevitably benefits disproportionately when there is an upswing in the business cycle because of the large amount of manufacturing in this province.

The other side of that coin, of course, is that if the cycle goes down we suffer disproportionately for exactly the same reason. The hon. Minister himself, in his introductory remarks on these estimates and also today, has indicated problems we can anticipate in the future. As far as I can see, although the hon. Minister has identified some of the problems, there does not seem to be any co-ordinated effort by the government to do anything about them or to lay the ground work to do something when action is required.

He has, for example, talked about the possibility of a general lowering of tariffs, which is, I think, a position he favours subject to certain conditions. In the overall picture it would be to the benefit of Canada if we could have a general lowering of tariffs throughout the world but, as the hon. Minister has pointed out, this will create quite significant dislocations within our own economy; particularly in the economy of Ontario, with its heavy reliance on secondary manufacturing.

There will have to be adjustments, as the hon. Minister himself said. We are going to have to contemplate moving labour and capital out of declining industries into rising industries.

I believe that the hon. Minister has quite a competent research staff within his department in one or two different branches. I have no doubt they are giving some study to this matter. But when one gets down to specific details as to the kind of programmes which are being developed, I must say one gets the impression of widespread confusion. Each little facet of an overall programme is somebody else's responsibility.

Training and retraining, Mr. Chairman, is essentially the responsibility of The Department of Education. I do not know what consultation and/or co-ordination there is between this department and The Department of Education, but I certainly have the impres-

sion that—we will get into it in more detail when we get into the education estimates—the training and retraining programmes being undertaken right now are certainly not going to meet the requirements of the situation if any large-scale transfers of labour become necessary.

As far as moving workers is concerned, there are practically no programmes at all. I suppose that comes under the National Employment Service.

Now NES effectiveness in that field, I may say, leaves very much to be desired. But if it happens, and it appears from what the hon. Minister says that it may very well happen, that in Bancroft it will simply be impossible to attract any new industry to employ the people who are going to be displaced in a very few months, have we any plan to move them out into other areas, giving them retraining if necessary? Are we going to assist them in moving? Are we going to help with their moving expenses?

Unfortunately, if they have to move, they are undoubtedly going to suffer some significant losses, those of them who have invested in houses and so on are not going to be able to sell the houses to anybody. Is there any sort of plan developed even for that one limited adjustment that may have to take place?

It is fine to say, "We know there is a problem, we are looking at it, we are going to be back there before July," but July is not very far away. Surely a programme could have been worked out by now, in consultation with NES—if it can be induced to give real attention to the problem—and with The Department of Education with respect to retraining. That is just one facet, but if we start looking to the future and consider the adjustments that are going to become necessary if there should be a general lowering of tariffs and as automation progresses, such programmes are going to have to be on a large scale. There are other countries in the world that have large-scale programmes to take care of these adjustments. Here, we apparently do some study and that is about all.

The hon. Minister said a moment ago that what the other Ministers are doing is their business, he has enough to do looking after his own department. That is probably true, but then what the other Ministers do, very much affects the problems that he is thinking about. A couple of years ago when we had a more impulsive Minister in the portfolio now held by this hon. Minister, we were told in a Budget speech that the provincial government was going to proceed with cer-

tain incentives to industry in the taxation field, following upon certain incentives that were granted federally. That is the last we ever heard of them. They never got beyond the Budget speech. I am not saying they were well considered. It would appear from what happened that they were very badly considered. A little bit of consideration indicated that they were not practical or would not produce the result that was contemplated.

It is that sort of impulsive, unco-ordinated behaviour that I think is creating the complaint on this side of the House. We would like to see some evidence of co-ordinated behaviour. As far as I can see, from what I have heard and what I have read, this department's sole function, in the whole realm of location of industry, is to a certain degree in the research field, which is useful, and in providing public relations and information services—if I may call them that—communicating with industry as to possible areas where it may be able to locate and encouraging it to locate in areas where we would like to see it go. I am not saying that function is not important. I am just saying that is one of the functions. The only other function the department performs, as far as I can see, is to guarantee loans to certain people who cannot get them through the regular channels, or cannot get all the money they need through the regular channels. That seems to be about the sum total of this department's activity in the whole general area of location of industry.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that that may be good enough right now when things are pretty good. But the hon. Minister himself has indicated that he is aware of the fact that we cannot take for granted that the present favourable economic situation is going to continue indefinitely. I think that we on this side of the House, at least, would like to have more evidence that this department is doing the job I think it should be doing—that is, anticipating the problems that will arise—and developing plans that may affect many government departments and co-ordinating plans that can be put into effect as required, and is working with the federal government in the development of those plans.

At the moment, there seems to me to be a complete hodge-podge of little plans. This department has one or two or three, The Department of Education has one or two, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer may be giving some thought to using taxation as an incentive, I do not know. I have not seen any evidence of it if he has, but he may be. We have these little efforts, spread throughout the government, not very well co-ordinated

with each other, or with the various activities of the federal government.

The hon. Minister asked for suggestions, Mr. Chairman, and one suggestion is that in the coming year the department should give major attention to developing a co-ordinated programme to deal with problems that I think we can reasonably anticipate will develop in the next one, two, three or four years. I would say also that somebody has to take some responsibility somewhere for the specific problems we have right now, such as Bancroft. If we cannot get a new industry in there, then something has to be done to help the people move out. I do not think we can have a repeat of Elliot Lake. It is true that people drifted away. They got somewhere or other, but it meant very great hardship to many individuals. I think one of the functions of government should be to minimize these hardships and facilitate transfers and adjustments that become necessary because of changing economic conditions.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow through again on suggestions. I would agree with the hon. member for Woodbine. I not only feel, Mr. Chairman, that there is not co-ordination between the national effort on this and the provincial effort, but I have a feeling that perhaps the hon. Minister does not think the national approach of research is really on a sound basis. I notice you refer to the fact that it is suggesting areas that need assistance and the basis for this has been that of unemployment. I thought you were inferring that you had other bases for deciding the need of assistance. I also felt you were inferring unemployment is a fluid picture and you were thinking of it in a longer-term approach. If I could, I would appreciate clarification on that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are areas where you have unemployment and there are areas where you are going to have unemployment, such as Bancroft. I think both are problems. I think the federal government recognizes that, the same as we do. I think you must remember that when the government came into power it appointed a Minister of Industry, Mr. Drury, who, if you know something about his problems, is busy assembling a staff. Two of his people are in our place today. They are down every day in the week. We are working very closely with Mr. Drury and his staff and with Dr. Deutsch and his staff.

I have had three meetings with Mitchell Sharp's department on trade and commerce. I think there can be no suggestion whatso-

ever that we are not co-operating with the federal authorities. As I pointed out in the estimate speech, there are 54 foreign offices run by the federal government around the world. They suggested that instead of opening any further Ontario offices, we should take a desk or an office in one of theirs and co-operate with them. We have agreed to do that. We are still talking about where we want to put manpower in their foreign offices.

In the matter of unemployment, the matter of assisting industry, the matter of taxation with these federal-provincial conferences, and the matter of retraining of people for new jobs through the automation foundation that we are working on, there is a great area of co-operation. I think it would be unfair to say that we were not co-operating with Ottawa. I think if you called the people up there, they would tell you they are looking to the province of Ontario because we are further advanced than many other provinces in some of the things that Ottawa would like to do on a national basis.

On the other hand, some of the problems in the other provinces are entirely different to ours and I think most of us recognize this. Their economic circumstances are different. But we believe what we have done here is indicative of what can be done in other provinces, provided they can get industry in there.

Just before I sit down I think an hon. member asked me a question about where these new plants went last year, or did they all settle here in the city of Toronto or this area. The answer is, "No!" The eastern Ontario region got 11 of these branch plants and other areas got five of them; in northwestern Ontario they got six branch plants; Georgian Bay got six; the Lake Ontario region got four and three manufacturing arrangements; northwestern Ontario got five new plants and one manufacturing arrangement; midwestern Ontario got 14 branch plants and 12 manufacturing arrangements, which put more people to work since they got something new to manufacture.

In the Niagara region alone they got 18 new plants and eight manufacturing arrangements; Lake Erie got 13, and three manufacturing arrangements; St. Clair region got eight, and two manufacturing arrangements; and in the Metropolitan area they got 88, and 40 manufacturing arrangements—which I think is par for the course. Almost 50 per cent of these new manufacturing plants and manufacturing arrangements were spread out across the province of Ontario; this is the

thing in which the department has acted. I think it indicates that we are endeavouring to spread industry across the province.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow. You mention this co-operation with the federal government, and I would appreciate clarification from the hon. Minister. Could I ask: With this close co-operation do you agree with the federal government's designation of areas which need assistance?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I say, within reason. I think even some of the towns do not agree with the federal government. I think Brantford took exception to the fact that they were designated as an unemployment area.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to know: Do you agree with the federal government or with the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me say I am not opposed. I think in many areas they can use that kind of assistance, but I would be very careful that this long-term assistance does not create hardship in an industry. Take the implement industry, for example: I do not think the employees at Massey-Ferguson would be helped if Cockshutt Plow, were, let us say, subsidized for the next 10 years, and then it was found that people were being laid off at Massey-Ferguson and taken on at Cockshutt Plow and had to move from one city to another.

I think that in getting industry started, you certainly must give them all the help you can; but I would be very leery of coaxing an industry into what I would consider to be an uneconomical area two or three years from now, when they pull the rug from under them and those incentives are no longer available.

This is what has happened in many areas in Europe and it has created some hardships. I think we can learn a lesson from Europe, so that we do not get too far out on the rug and then find, when you pull that rug from under them, that they cannot compete. This is the thing we want to watch so that we do not pull the crutches out and see these industries in trouble a few years from now.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate the point, sir. I gather from the hon. Minister that he is in agreement with the federal government's approach with respect to the designated areas for assistance, and he is in agreement with the areas which the federal government has so designated.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not say that. I said that I am in agreement in some areas. I did not say I agreed with all the areas in it, because some areas were left out. We have heard already from one or two small towns which said, "We should have been included in that, and we are not included."

Then, as you read in the press, some designated areas did not want to be considered designated areas. All I say is that I think the federal government has done what they thought was in the best interests of those areas. I have no objections to it but I just think we should be very careful about spreading it.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to say that surely, with this whole approach and your talk of co-operation, it is not a case of just having no objection to what they are doing. I would think there would be an active approach to it.

You suggest that there are some areas in which you are in disagreement with the federal government. Could you clarify the areas about which you are in disagreement with the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not in disagreement with any area. I just say, in the general principle, there are some areas I have already gone on record as saying did not want to be designated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is the hon. Minister still referring to the Brantford area? This is the third time he has referred to areas which do not wish to be designated.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was the one which was in the headline first.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps, if you would permit me, on a point of order I should inform the hon. Minister that the mayor of Brantford, when the designations first occurred, was in the process of running for membership in this House. And his first reaction was that he did not agree with the designation, but it soon became apparent that the whole area was gratified to have this designation. It was explained that the designation was the result of careful scrutiny of the employment figures over a number of years, and that there was a plan for the designation and Brantford did adequately qualify. The whole area is really taking great advantage of the designation.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to move into another area of this subject.

I would commend the department for the splendid report, the economic survey and the subsequent report on the Niagara region. I was not in the House, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister of Economics and Development made his opening remarks prior to the presentation of his estimates, and I do not know to what extent he went in dealing with this very elaborate and concise report. I would ask him to make some comment on what action the government might intend to take in regard to some of the very disconcerting problems which arise from the report.

I am particularly interested in the one section, "Urban expansion and land use planning." Many hon. members will remember for many years in this House in the past, I have raised the question of the great concern for the declining fruit producing acreage in the Niagara peninsula. And, of course, as many times the problem was sloughed off by the previous Minister of Economics and Development and, at times, sir, the previous Prime Minister. But I am sure that this report does point out we should have some concern in regard to this problem.

It points out, and I just want to make a few brief remarks on what the report finds in regard to the ever-increasing decline of fruit producing acreage. It says:

The average rate of tender fruit land converted to other uses between 1934 and 1954, a 20-year period, was 80 acres a year; and between 1955 and 1958, a three-year period, it was 320 acres a year. Up to the end of last year, 37 per cent of the original 41,000 acres of tender fruit land had gone.

One table in the report shows that between 1951 and 1961 there was a net loss of 2,180 acres for peaches and sweet cherries, the great bulk of it being peaches. During the same period of time, with the single exception of grapes which managed to hold their own, there were significant declines in the acreage planted to other fruits. Plums and prunes lost 2,425 acres, and apples 2,350 acres, while pears and sour cherries showed smaller decline.

Mr. Chairman, I believe if there was a section of the province which needed immediate attention it is this section of the Niagara peninsula.

I feel that when we talk about the need for industry in particular sections this is one area which does not need more industry but needs some real planning to preserve the tender fruit producing lands and to develop a buffer zone of farm lands, if we could call it that, between the one part of the Golden

Horseshoe and the American border. I would ask the hon. Minister to comment. As I said, I was absent when he made his comments prior to the presentation of his estimates and he might have made some reference to this report and the problems contained therein. If not, I would like the hon. Minister to inform the House, particularly myself, of what action, if any, the department intends to take in regard to this most concise and important report.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am not entirely familiar with all that is contained in this report. There are many reports put out. All I would suggest is that we are interested in the problem along with the agricultural group and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart). We have had a number of discussions with The Department of Agriculture through the Ontario Economic Council, where we have an agricultural committee composed of men who are engaged in the agriculture industry. One of the members of the agricultural committee of the economic council is very familiar with this problem and it has been discussed at economic council. I understand that they are discussing it with The Department of Agriculture but what plans have evolved from that I am not prepared to say. Since the hon. member has raised it I will be glad to have a look at it and give him further information on it.

Mr. Sandercock: Mr. Chairman, we have a factory in our riding that I am very proud of, the Bata shoe factory, which employs around 1,200 to 1,300 people. The remark was made here a few moments ago by the hon. Minister in referring to this factory in Batawa. This factory is built out in the country and we are very proud of it. It is a great factory. It has all sorts of facilities there to look after its help—picture shows and cafeterias and all such like—and we are very proud of it. The hon. member for Woodbine made the remark "sweatshop." I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, that I have been through that factory from top to bottom, in every department, I know practically half of the people who work there, and I have never heard the word "sweatshop" ever mentioned. I resent that.

Mr. Bryden: What is the base wage paid there?

Mr. Sandercock: There has never been a person come to see me or to complain to me about the wages that are paid in the Bata shoe factory.

Mr. Bryden: Well, what are they?

Mr. Sandercock: They live in the most beautiful homes in the country—a lot of them.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could find out what the base wage is and then that will end the argument as to whether it is a sweatshop. I had a little discussion last year as to whether Fairfield was a sweatshop and discovered that employees were starting at 65 cents an hour and getting up to 75 cents. Mr. Wagner and a lot of other people jumped to the defence of this company. But it was obviously operating on a sweatshop basis—one of the first companies that The Department of Labour, when it implements a minimum wage, would have to take a look at. Sometimes people suffer in silence for a long time.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is one brief comment I want to make on another observation made by the hon. Minister a few moments ago. I think it was rather interesting that when he was giving a breakdown of where these new industries had located in the province of Ontario in the last year that he finally got to 88 for the Metropolitan area. Now, 88 was approximately 50 per cent of the total.

A year or so ago rather a startling figure, in terms of getting the overall picture in the province of Ontario, became available when it was indicated that half of the manufacturing in the province of Ontario was found to be located within 35 miles of Toronto city hall. If 88 of the new industries, representing about half of them, are now being concentrated in Metro alone, the conclusion that the hon. Minister missed—and I draw to his attention—is that the concentration is getting worse rather than better. He uses the term “it is par for the course.” Well, half of them in an area going out 35 miles would have been par for the course, if by par for the course he meant maintaining the same balance. But if half of them are now being concentrated in Metro alone, the concentration is getting greater and greater and greater, so his efforts really are not achieving any greater distribution.

However, what provoked me to rise, Mr. Chairman, is that there are two phases of regional development services and the regional development associations that I wanted to raise with the hon. Minister.

My first one is by way of a question that I would come back to and have the hon. Minister comment on, and that is to what extent are the regional development associations today giving any attention to our basic industry of agriculture? I raise this because a few years ago when the first meeting of the

Regional Development Association of Northwestern Ontario was held, I was informed that some people who attended had a great deal of difficulty in getting acceptance of the fact that there are areas in northwestern Ontario to which agriculture is extremely important. As a matter of fact, if you get into the area, Mr. Chairman, that you yourself would be very familiar with, from Fort Frances through Emo to the town of Rainy River, this is one of our concentrated areas of agriculture with a magnificent co-operative movement. There are other pockets around Kenora and Dryden and elsewhere, but you have this major pocket. There was some difficulty in getting the regional development association even to consider that this basic industry was part of its responsibility in the development.

However, this was not unique. When the first meeting of the Regional Development Association of Eastern Ontario was held, because it was an outgrowth of the united chambers of commerce in eastern Ontario, it held a three-day meeting and it made the mistake of inviting Grattan O'Leary to be its banquet speaker at the end of the conference. It was a mistake for this reason, that Grattan is a fairly forthright individual, even among his fellow Conservatives, and he drew their attention to two things. One, that during the course of the three days there had been very carefully documented briefs presented to at least half a dozen of the hon. Ministers who came down in quite an impressive display of VIPs from Queen's Park. Each one of the briefs had been presented to the appropriate hon. Minister and he had got up and in effect said “No.” So Grattan O'Leary's comment was, “Well, what is the point? Why have people go to all this work and do the research and present you with the needs of the area when the reaction of the Minister is almost a reflex reaction of ‘no’?”

Now I come back to the main point I was making a moment ago. He drew attention to the fact that they had met for three days and there had not even been a whisper of consideration of the industry that is still the basic industry of eastern Ontario, namely, agriculture.

In that connection I want to raise with this hon. Minister, in the hope that I can get a little bit further than I was able to do with his predecessor, one aspect of the agricultural industry that would help eastern Ontario. As the hon. Minister is at least generally aware, if not in detail, the milk industry, an important aspect of the whole agricultural industry, has been faced for some years with the problem of a surplus. This has tended

to wreck the market in the four different groups within the milk industry — cream, cheese, and concentrated and fluid milk—certainly at least wrecked their pricing procedures. However, there is one obvious answer to the problem of how you cope with a surplus, and that is to develop the potential of that branch of the industry for which there is a market. The one for which there is an obviously greater market is cheese, and the cheese marketing board is doing a very good job in terms of developing a continuity of supply which would help to exploit a fuller potential in the British market.

But I want to come back to another aspect of the industry right here in Canada. I raised in this House problems with which I had been provided some basic background, in connection with the Black Diamond cheese factory in the area of Belleville. Black Diamond is the sole remaining Canadian-owned cheddar cheese manufacturing company or processing company. Its great problem, however, Mr. Chairman, is that it is severely limited in terms of developing its markets and providing an outlet for this surplus milk that could be directed toward cheese, rather than these other flooded markets, because of the fact that it cannot get into the United States. It is estimated by experts that if it could get into the United States, it could sell literally untold millions of pounds of Canadian cheddar cheese, which today has achieved a position among the gourmets of the world that is pretty well unrivalled. Yet the fact of the matter is that Black Diamond operates on a quota of something like half a million pounds. Talk about a flea bite or a rat bite or whatever be the appropriate bite for cheese, I do not know—perhaps a mouse bite. Half a million pounds of cheese is all it can get into the United States and why, Mr. Chairman? Well, it is very simple. We have permitted the entry into Canada of Kraft, part of a big worldwide company. Kraft has become established in Canada. Mr. Chairman, I was told by people who are in a position to know, that Kraft has successfully lobbied the Liberal, the Tory, and I presume the Liberal government again in Ottawa, into complete inactivity in terms of making representations to the United States to open the legitimate market for Canadian cheddar cheese in the United States. In some mysterious way—and I have an unholy suspicion it has to do with election funds—Kraft has been able to lobby into inactivity the Liberal and the Conservative governments at Ottawa, so that you can never get any representations made at Washington with regard to a fair deal—

just a fair deal. While we let Kraft come into Canada and establish and exploit the Canadian market to the full, they keep the door closed in terms of Canadian cheddar cheese going into the United States.

I will come back and try to wrap up this whole point with the hon. Minister. First, to what extent are the regional development associations considering, or acknowledging, that the development of the basic industry of agriculture is part of their concern in the various parts of the province? And, specifically, now that we have a new Minister in this department, is he acquainted with the whole Black Diamond cheddar cheese problem in terms of export to the United States? Has he looked into it and, if so, what has he found? If he has not looked into it, would he consider doing so in the hope that he can outdo his predecessor, who looked into it and found it was tough and then said, "This is a federal matter" and backed away from it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, in the first place I am not familiar with the background of the Kraft industry the hon. member talks about, but certainly I would be delighted to have a look at it to see if I can lift any doors to get more cheese exported from Canada. I can assure the hon. member that when I first went overseas I checked most of the stores in Europe and we did find Canadian cheese in Europe.

The hon. member mentioned the poundage; I cannot say whether he is right or wrong. I had an inquiry from somebody here as to why we were not selling Canadian fruits and cheeses in Florida. We made an inquiry the other day and they tell me they are down there and are available, so we are having that checked further to see how much is available in Florida, because the question was brought up.

A lot of Canadians go there in the winter time. They would like to buy Canadian cheese, and it is not available, so we are having a check made in Florida to see where it is available and how much is available. Perhaps the question the hon. member raises here today is a good one and we can do something about it.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe it is being smuggled into Florida.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be delighted to take a look at it. Perhaps I can go to Florida to have a look at it.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the regional development—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, just let me answer one question at a time and I will bring the hon. member up to date.

We talked about the 88 plants in the Metropolitan area, and perhaps I should have enlarged on that. The 88 plants in this area—and I still agree with the hon. member, we want to get as many out of this area as we can and spread them across the province—but that Metropolitan area includes Ontario county, Halton county, York county and Peel county so they are not all based in this area here. Just how many did come in to the Toronto area, I do not know at the moment; but I could find out.

When I joined the economic council, one of our first meetings was up in Fort William-Port Arthur. A question was raised up there about chaff off grain which was being shipped to Manitoulin Island. The freight rates went up and they could sell it no longer. I came back and we started an investigation of it; these are just some of the things the northern Ontario development group are doing through the economic council and the Ontario Research Foundation.

We have nine special projects to be studied by the Ontario Research Foundation. These include possible end uses of mine tailings, fertilization, economic feasibility of the needle trade industry, the economics of increasing beef cattle production in north-eastern and northwestern Ontario, elevator grain screenings for cattle feed, co-operative action in growing and marketing garden produce, the reduction of iron ore by jet smelting processes, peat moss production, and uses of coarse fish processing. Close liaison has been maintained with the research foundation on reports, and these programmes are being studied. Also, I think we have a programme going on in the Ontario Research Foundation on the use of clay in the Lake St. Clair region.

Most of these regional development people are very closely allied with the ARDA group, and with our own agricultural people. I would think there is as much effort being put on agricultural growth and assistance to agriculture through the regional development people as in any other group. Certainly we want to expand that; and again I say it is one of the things we would like to check with people from other countries when they come here this year, to see what they have done. Perhaps out of it we can evolve a whole new programme.

But something is being done, as you can see. I think the story is that in Manitoulin Island we have one of the largest beef raising

areas in Canada right up there in northern Ontario, and it can be improved. They are having trouble getting cattle feed, particularly in the winter months; and this has brought up a study in which I think we are going to come up with some answers.

Mr. MacDonald: I would like to thank the hon. Minister for his comments.

The second question I wanted to raise with him, of a general nature, has specific reference to northern Ontario. Let me go back to the observations of the hon. member for Nipissing. He said that it is difficult to establish new manufacturing industries in northern Ontario because of their distance from the market. Obviously, this is the basic problem. If half of the manufacturing is situated within 35 miles from the Toronto city hall, there is a pretty cold, hard economic fact which militates against the establishment of industries in northern Ontario—unless they happen to be related to the basic resources of northern Ontario which are there and you cannot put the industry anywhere else if they are an extractive industry based on it.

This brings me to the point I want to raise with this hon. Minister. I suggest if he is serious about developing the industries of northern Ontario, he has to take a look at the forest industry. As far as mining is concerned, the tragedy of mining is that the industry begins to disappear from the time you start to mine, because you begin to destroy the resource and it does not reproduce itself. Unless the community has the extreme good fortune of Timmins, as appears to have been the case in recent weeks, the day is going to come when it will likely become a ghost town because of the fact that its basic resources disappeared.

This is not true of forestry. Forestry is a resource which can be reproduced, can be regenerated. We can have it for future generations. However, again I go back, for example, to the organizational meeting of the Northwestern Ontario Regional Development Association. I am told from very reliable sources that some pretty tough talk went on at these meetings, from people who are interested in developing secondary industries in northern Ontario. But they could not get the resources.

The resources have all been parcelled out in great empires through leases. They could not get working arrangements on any long-term basis with those who held the lease, and perhaps were not using certain of the species, to make that species available for whatever purpose the secondary industry wanted them, let alone being able to get a

new tract of lumber on a new lease completely to themselves.

They, in effect, said to the government spokesmen who were there, "We are not going to invest a few million dollars in an industry if you cannot give us a long-term assurance of supply". There is a man up in northwestern Ontario—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I think the hon. member's talk is very unsound and I think—

Mr. Bryden: Who cares what the hon. Minister thinks? Why does he not wait for his turn?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Why does the hon. member not talk sense?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this man comes from northern Ontario and it is possible you know what makes northern Ontario people tick. If you do, I invite you to try to muzzle him because he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Less than one year ago—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister sit down so that I can proceed?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, the hon. member talks all the time.

Mr. MacDonald: At least I trust that when I have something to say, I just do not open my mouth and let the words flow out meaninglessly.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Continue.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, you yourself know one of the top industries in the city of Port Arthur, whose owner last year publicly proclaimed the fact that he had never been able to get from this government—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Who was it? Have they got it now?

Mr. MacDonald: The name just escapes me at the moment. I do not know whether they have it now. All I know, Mr. Chairman, is that there are dozens of industries across northern Ontario, but this government has never been willing to sit down to reconsider the division of these resources and make them available for the secondary industries which want to get in there. You can talk from now until doomsday—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Circumlocution of falsities.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, do you want me to interrupt him regularly every time he gets up?

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask that the member who is now speaking be given the floor and listened to with attention.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope you are effective.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I will be talking in a minute.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there have been repeated pleas for the provision of these resources so that they can develop secondary industry. For example, during the election campaign, I had a very interesting visit to the little town of Matachewan, up in the Timiskaming area. The hon. member is not here again today. He must be running his hardware store and making his third or fourth million up there.

However, up in Matachewan—

Mr. Singer: He needs you to help him run it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, somebody up there referred to him as being a vigorous critic on the ONR and he never raised his voice once on behalf of the ONR during all the estimates.

However, Mr. Chairman, let us get back to the issue. Here is the town of Matachewan, which is situated right in the midst of forest resources. These forest resources, I believe, were originally with the E. B. Eddy interests and been transferred down through the years.

There has never been, I was told by the mayor of the town, or one of the top businessmen in the town, a single stick of timber cut by the licence holder for years in that area—not a single stick. He is trafficking in the cutting. He sublets certain cuttings that can go on to people who can come in. Here is a town that used to have a few thousand population. It was a flourishing town. It has become, in the delightful phraseology of those who are up there now, "disorganized." It has had to revert to an unorganized territory because they simply could not meet their taxes and they had to go back to being an unorganized territory.

You have the women's auxiliary of the Anglican Church and the Catholic Church holding bazaars and what-not to raise enough money to pay for the street lights in the town. This is the kind of thing that has

happened in the little town of Matachewan, set right down in the forest resources of northern Ontario. Yet the resources are not being used to rebuild the economy of that area. They have been sat upon by a licence holder, I repeat, who has not cut himself a stick of timber almost within the last generation. All he has been doing is trafficking in the cutting, by subletting cutting rights.

I say this to the hon. Minister, that if he wants to build the economy of northern Ontario, the basis upon which it can be built is the forest resources, because this is a renewable resource. This is the sound long-term economic base. He is not going to be able to do this, be able to provide the employment for the young people of the north so that they do not have to come south and perhaps get in the end of our unemployed lines when economic conditions get bad again, unless he is willing to sit down with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), perhaps through the Cabinet, and be willing to reassess the great natural resources of northern Ontario and make them available, in limits that are no less than are needed.

I am not suggesting for one moment that any company should have its limits cut below what is plant capacity. All I am saying is that their excess limits shall revert to the Crown and be made available to those who want to be able to use them by building secondary industries; or alternatively, that some steps be taken by the government to sort out the species from the limits that are being used by a company now in operation, to make those alternative species available for those who are interested in using that resource for the building of secondary industry.

Has the hon. Minister considered this whole important aspect, the most important aspect for northern Ontario, either himself or in conjunction with his hon. colleagues in the Cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I say the hon. member's point is well taken. I think it is something that certainly should be surveyed and investigated, to see if we cannot improve the economy of northern Ontario. If this is a bottleneck, I would certainly be glad to look into it and discuss it not only with the economic council, but the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests or anybody else who is involved. There has been some discussion with our people about the situation. I think that same situation may exist up around the area we were talking about—Bancroft—with reference to a chipboard plant. I investigated that and I found that it was being used but

the chipboard was being made down in Trenton. So it was a matter of carting it from that area down to Trenton, and not putting a plant up in Bancroft. However, if these areas exist, certainly I am interested in looking at them and making any recommendation to the government that will assist the secondary industries.

Mr. Troy: You should speak to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, a little while ago there was some discussion with the hon. Minister regarding location of industry, particularly with a view to attracting industry to some areas of the province that are considered to have less than sufficient development.

I would like to raise the matter with the hon. Minister from another point of view for a moment, and that is the question of an industry moving from one location to another. I am quite prepared to accept the hon. Minister's proposition that you cannot say to an industry where it is going to invest its money. Investors will invest where they think they will get the best return. We are running into a fair-sized problem of movement of industry and there is a little more involved than merely what an entrepreneur does with his own money. In some cases, there is inadequate consideration of municipalities that may be involved and of workers who may be involved. It is my suspicion, at least, that in some cases, private industries have found it profitable to make a move, because they have shifted some of the cost onto other people.

We know of an outstanding example that was quite a *cause célèbre* in this area last summer, and that was Amalgamated Electric. It did not move very far. It did not even get outside of the congested section of the province. It moved from inside the city out to Markham. I am not saying the move was bad in itself. I think it is inevitable that manufacturing will move from the centre of the city out into other areas, and I think it may be beneficial in many respects. Some of the benefits that Amalgamated Electric got from its move came from dumping the employees out in the street and getting out from under important obligations to them.

I may say that another move that has been made in the last year or so relates to a company with which the hon. Minister was associated at one time. I think it should be noted that that company—I do not know if the hon. Minister had anything to do with it or not—treated its employees in a manner that one could admire. It certainly did not try to

get out from under any obligations to them. It worked very hard to find alternative employment opportunities for those who did not want to move, and this happened to be the majority of them. It gave an opportunity to any who wanted to, to move to the new locations. From anything I have seen of the move of General Steel Wares, no one could take any reasonable objection. But in the Amalgamated Electric move, there certainly was a basis for serious objection.

The government has refused to accept any responsibility in this field. I took the matter up with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree). I got absolutely nowhere with him. When the move took place, I tried to raise it in the public press suggesting that this was a government responsibility. It was particularly a responsibility, I thought, of the then Minister of Economics and Development, whose constituency was affected. The people affected lived mainly in his constituency. I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development that a policy should be developed and laid down with regard to industries moving, not to tell them where they may move or where they may not move, but to ensure that when they do move they discharge all their obligations and do not shift part of the cost of the move onto other people.

In the particular case of Amalgamated Electric I do not think the city of Toronto suffered severely, it is a pretty big municipality that can stand that sort of thing. But sometimes when these moves take place the municipality which is abandoned is in very serious straits after having invested substantial amounts of money in municipal services for the benefit of the industry concerned. The new municipality to which the industry may move may find itself faced with substantial investments. All these things are costs of the move that the industry does not undertake.

I am particularly concerned about what happens to employees. Amalgamated Electric was certainly a sad story in the history of Ontario. People who had served it for many years simply were dumped out on the street, most of them were even cheated out of what they thought were their pension rights but apparently were not sufficiently guaranteed, and most of them got very little in the way of severance pay. I do not know if the company was trying to escape the union that existed there. If it was it was disappointed because the union followed it out to Markham. But the point is that the union could not do a thing for the people whom

the company left behind in Toronto. I would like to know if the government has any policy—I know it has no policy now—but is it contemplating developing any sort of policy to protect all interests concerned when this sort of move takes place?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I do not think there is any stated policy. I think you are going to find good employers and bad employers. The hon. member has stated perhaps two circumstances where the employees were treated the way he would like to see them treated, and others where perhaps they should have been given more consideration.

I was trying to find, in this economic report I gave previously, where I suggested that as these tariff changes come about perhaps there will have to be some rationalization of industry. As it happens, I think out of that will come some of the things the hon. member talks about: That if industry is going to move out of an area for any reason there should be probably some "pre-work" done to plan what happens to the employees, such as we did at the company where I was previously employed. I think most employers would do that.

At the moment the government does not have any legislation to prevent that happening, and I do not think at the present time we contemplate it. I would think that, if that happens, in many instances we can work with the company to try to persuade them to be good citizens and take their employees along with them. I am not too sure, about the company the hon. member mentioned a few minutes ago, that most of the people are not back up there working because as I understand it, they are certainly operating full blast.

Mr. Bryden: They have recruited people in Markham.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Whether they have any of their old employees or not I would not know.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the point I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that the development of policy should not wait until this becomes a really large-scale problem. There is a considerable amount of movement going on now, and I think it is going to increase. Technological change in itself, apart altogether from developments that may take place in the tariff field, is inducing more and more in the way of movement of industry. I think some companies move their plants because they have obsolete plants in high tax areas; they

simply move out into lower tax areas and, while they are at it, get up-to-date plants.

This is good. They should be doing that; but I think that the problem is now serious enough that, without waiting for any overall tariff adjustments which will undoubtedly intensify it, I would suggest to the hon. Minister he might start considering a policy to deal with the matter which could be applicable now. It will mean we will have something if it becomes really a major problem.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go along with the hon. member for Woodbine because the community of Windsor certainly was the prime example of the effects of a major industry leaving a community. It meant \$14 million a year lost in annual revenue. I think that this department should give serious consideration, immediately, to a study because there is still the fear that other industries may be leaving the community if they find it financially not profitable to stay. They certainly do have some obligation to the employee before they do leave the community, as well as to the community itself.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question in regard to industries. We have councils of towns and villages, and the chambers of commerce give of their time and their money in order to contact an industry which would be interested in settling or establishing in that town or village. Would it be the right procedure to contact the office of the hon. Minister? Would he give them a lead on industries which are interested in establishing here in the province, to contact them? Is that the right procedure, or what suggestions has he along that line?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we would be delighted to have them come in to see us. We would also be interested in letting them know of any prospects we have who may want to settle in the province.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, also under this heading I would like to ask the hon. Minister another question. As he knows, there has been a great discussion about the surplus of flue-cured tobacco. I know from time to time new markets have been found for some flue-cured tobacco. I wonder if the hon. Minister has anything new to tell us in regard to future markets to get rid of this surplus flue-cured tobacco which is on hand.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think that question could be better answered by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I think he has done

a pretty good job of solving the problem to date, of helping to solve it. As you know, The Department of Economics and Development under the former Minister visited Japan about a year ago. I think out of that, with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, we did make some sales to Japan. I had hoped to do some, let us say, investigating on this trip to Russia which I cancelled out on, but perhaps before the end of the year—any time I go anywhere I take these problems with me to see if I can open any doors. I think that pretty well is what we can look forward to doing at the present time. I would think the hon. Minister of Agriculture has that pretty well in hand.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister another question? In regard to these offices which he has in Europe, are there displays of agricultural products there at all times, such as tobacco and fruit and vegetables?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. There has not been, because there has not been a show place for it. The offices are small, as the hon. member will appreciate; although I understand in Dusseldorf we now have some appliances on display. I am pretty sure when we get the chance to visit over there we can find out if we can change the goods around from time to time as you change a store window. That is the programme we envision.

Ontario House will be opened on June 4 and we intend to have a whole bottom floor set up as a showroom there for displaying manufactured goods and agricultural products.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I had noticed the hon. Minister referring to the trip to Japan. I also noticed the hon. member for York South was referring to the need to try to get cheese sold in the United States. I noted, too, the hon. Minister's deep interest in trying to get an export market.

I had been interested in West Germany and the approach, I understand, they have taken. That is, they wanted to move into Egypt, and I have read of this example, in connection with some secondary industry, that they went to Egypt and got what they considered one of the best designers in this particular area, from Egypt itself. They brought him back to their research area and then had him decide how to adapt design and policy and style to fit the Egyptian market. I am wondering, sir, in a sense, whether the hon. Minister has considered doing that, whether he has actually gone out in the way

that, for example, the West Germany government has to pick top people and bring them back to work in Canada so that our industry then gets the best advice with respect to style and design and so on in getting right into another market?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I think it is an excellent idea. You certainly have to make your product fit a market, otherwise people will not take it.

I think we mentioned in our estimates report that we have now 25 co-op buying groups working throughout the United States and Europe. These are people we have brought over here from those markets to tell us how to package a product and what we had to do to sell it in their markets; because they are the people who have to go out and sell it.

As an agent for, say, 12 small companies in, say, the haberdashery business—certainly if the clothing is not designed to sell in that market this man is putting his own investment on the line. He wants to make sure when he leaves here that we have changed the product to fit his market. I think that is essential wherever we go.

On food products, I think it may be such that you do not change a food product because you want to give it the romance and glamour of being an import. If you change it too much it looks like a home-grown product and gets lost; and I think, if you go into a supermarket, you can realize how quickly anything imported can get lost on the shelves. I think keeping the Canadian label, and making sure it stands out as an import product, will probably increase the sale of imported foods.

But on other items I agree with you. I think we should either bring the people over here or go over there and find out what designs are acceptable. I have done that in my business and found it works.

Mr. Thompson: Could I just follow up on that? Would you then—I am thinking of your research centre, the \$9 million research centre—it would seem to me if I could suggest this, and I think you probably have yourself, and I just want to reiterate my support on it—that a real role of the provincial government in assisting industry is in research and in connection with retraining. I am not sure with respect to tax reductions for research, whether there should not really be a close liaison with skilled staff. You mentioned that; do you think this is a good idea? Does this mean, sir, that you may be looking, for example, to move into, I could

take it, France? You might be thinking of starting to move Ontario industry into this area, and would be looking for research specialists you might attract to come here?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not sure I follow you. I think what you mean is, are we trying to get Ontario plants to go and open up a plant in France?

Mr. Thompson: No, no. I am sorry. I am thinking that I feel this, sir, with all respect to the hippopotamus and the sale of "buy Canada" and "buy Ontario," that I think in a sense if we had the style and the quality in goods that we could compete in France, or in Egypt, or in West Germany, or anywhere. If we can compete there then I am sure we will not have much trouble with respect to the Ontario homeowner considering that with Ontario quality and style in goods it is worthwhile buying them here. I just have a certain apprehension that there is a feeling of high tariffs behind the philosophy of this fat overgrown hippopotamus.

I suggest that one way to help to show that we are keen and aggressive and competitive would be if we tried to get into the foreign markets. One way that the Ontario government could help is with research. In particular, one way it could do this is by getting top-notch research design staff from certain areas for the Ontario government. Looking at a co-operative group of industries trying to break into a new field, they would say: "We will go over and we will pick out some top-notch design personnel and we will bring them over to work in our research. We will pay them and they will work with us in conjunction with these industries, so that then you will be able to move into this export area." I suggest, sir, from background reading I did some time ago, that this is what they are doing in West Germany.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments about the development associations. Most development associations find it rather difficult to plan a programme on a long-term basis because they are never sure of the financial support being forthcoming from the municipality. I was just wondering if the hon. Minister has ever considered setting up a fund to cushion this situation, and give these people enough funds to get over this problem, say, for a year or two years, until the funds would be forthcoming.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, answering the hon. member's question, we are looking at that now with reference to increasing

the grants for some of these projects that the Ontario regional development groups are working on. Their big problem is, we granted them \$15,000 apiece but they cannot match it. That is where they bog down. We are looking at this on the basis of where we can improve that grant from our end without them matching it. We would like to see them match it dollar-for-dollar, but if they cannot, that should not be any drawback to getting that particular organization working in that region. There are various regions perhaps where they cannot match the grant we give; we are looking at it.

Mr. Gaunt: Thank you.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could try again to pinpoint an approach that you take. Several minutes ago you mentioned the needle trade and suggested that this might be something that could be developed in northern Ontario. You said you suggested it because of the European background of people there and I assume behind that is the feeling that they would have an acquaintance with the needle trade industry. Just so that we could have some knowledge of your approach on this, where do you go from there? Could I ask you if you have a study or if you have available facts on the skilled kind of labour in the north and the background of European people, or is this just an assumption you have?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was just an assumption. At the moment, as I said, we are making an economic research study on the type of people going to be required. This was one trade that came up the other day when a manufacturer said he wanted to come into this area and needed 300 people and the 300 people were not available. I think you will realize the needle trade has been a depressed industry for a long while, but is now working almost around the clock. This again is another problem which came up almost overnight. The reason I mentioned the European background is that I think history has shown they are very industrious with their hands. Certainly the experts in the needle trade are professionals and it seems to be the consensus that in any area where we could find those kinds of backgrounds we could probably find skills that either could be trained quickly, or we could find skills that are available but have not been used for some time.

Mr. Thompson: I would follow up because this seems to me a concrete example, sir, to show what you are doing.

Reading the estimates of last year before you became the Minister, I had understood that there was a manpower study being done of Ontario. I assume that this is the manpower study that is being continued. Just to clarify your approach with Ottawa, how do you tie in with Professor Deutsch's approach on the study of manpower? Is he not making an assessment of individual trades?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know how far Dr. Deutsch has gone. As you know, he is just assembling his staff. He has been down to see us a couple of times but we are associating with him through our own Ontario Economic Council. It is hoped that Dr. Deutsch can act almost as a clearing house for all economic councils across the country. We have been perhaps a little more advanced than they have up there because they had, as you know, formerly a productivity council which has now been disbanded. Since Dr. Deutsch took over he has been calling on the various provinces, talking to the chairmen of the various economic councils across the country. Many have different names. We call ours the Ontario Economic Council, and he came to us first. He has made a few visits. We have opened the books and shown him what we are doing, and given him all the information he wants. We will correlate our programmes with him when he gets under way. At the moment, as I say, if you check with Dr. Deutsch, you will find he is busy assembling staff, which is his major problem.

Mr. Thompson: I would assume that the National Employment Service should have some kind of knowledge of the available skills of people in Ontario. What I want to know is, do you not at this time know where there are 300 people skilled in needle work?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Without checking the facts, I would say, no. I do not think they know where there are 300 people available; if they are available, they are all working. What we are looking for is 300 people who are not working. I think that is the nub of the problem—where can we find 300 people in this area or some other area that we can fit into the needle trade?

Mr. Thompson: The national employment service in other countries, such as for example, Sweden, it seems to me carries out a closer study. It, after all, is a central funnelling body for workers going into industry and leaving industry and getting other jobs. Would you want to see our

national employment service gathering together the facts?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have contacts with them, yes. I think there will be a co-operative effort on our part and through the economic council to work with the national employment service. That is where most of the statistics will come from. I think when you compare it with Sweden you are talking about a population of seven million people in a very small country. I think they certainly have had the statistics available to control the movement of people, perhaps more so than any other country we can think of. Just the other day, they were talking about nationalization of industry. They are merging a lot of their small industries. As you know there is going to be quite a dislocation of people, I think, in Sweden over the next few years. So perhaps they are going through some of the things we have been going through on this continent in the last few years too, where a great deal of mergers have taken place and people are available for other work in the same industry and have to be trained for something else. I think with the programme we have set up, and working with the national employment service, we will evolve a plan that will cover the situation, when we get the information we are looking for and do not have today, but which I would think would be available.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I do not attach any accusations to you; you have taken over this as a new job. But it seems to me, in an industrial province such as Ontario, when we as yet have not had these facts on the capabilities and the skills of our employment force, it shows that someone has been asleep at the switch and, frankly, I would say it is both the provincial and federal governments. However, as we know, the training of people is, I assume, a provincial responsibility, although some of our hon. friends here do not recognize it.

I, sir, would ask this question: we have established that we do not know if there is a surplus of people—let me put it this way—you cannot find the people for this needle trade; now at a later date you are going to have a much closer analysis of the skills of our work force, so you know at this point we are blind about it, searching for a needle in the haystack, if I could refer to it this way. However, sir, I am wondering, with this, would you have a situation where you might need certain skilled people in order to draw others to this industry? I am thinking of a skilled foreman. Has there been an examination of this and if you do need a certain

type of skilled foreman or designer, will you go over to hunt for that kind of person and bring them to Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that is already being done through the immigration services, both federally and provincially. I think one thing we have to look at in immigration is that it is as if the roof is leaking and it is too late to fix it because it is raining; when it is not raining, you do not have to fix it.

I think immigration is somewhat on that plane. When we have great numbers of unemployed, nobody is too interested in bringing anybody into the country and immigration drops off, as we know it has done over the last several years.

Now in certain areas, like the province of Ontario, where we could use skilled workers, the problem is to find them, because things are pretty good in the places from which we want to bring them. A lot of people are reluctant to leave Europe now. A few years ago, yes, they were anxious to leave. But today, they are all working steadily, the standard of living is increasing and moving up and a lot of those people are reluctant to take off and leave their homes and come over here. Our problem is that of trying to put our finger on the key people you talk about.

Many corporations have gone overseas and through our immigration services in Ontario House and the federal house, they have been able to recruit a number of skilled people and bring them over. The aircraft industry here and the machinery industry are two industries that have, I believe, worked with us in the last few months to bring over skilled workers.

I happen to know of a very fine machine shop here that goes to Sweden and Norway and Denmark when they want to find machinists. They have been having difficulty getting people to come over and take jobs in this country. Even though the wages are higher, their standard of living over there has improved, so it is more difficult to get them to move.

Mr. Thompson: What about nurses?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will leave that to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Mr. Troy: I hope, sir, that when your department induces people or arranges for them to come over, they do not have the experience that a Scotsman in my riding had. He was brought over here, he was a skilled worker in a curling stone plant in Scotland.

On one of your trade missions one of the manufacturers was asked if he would find out if somebody who was skilled in the making of curling stones would come over here. Just about a month ago he was told "your job is finished." He brought his family over, bought a home and that was his experience. I do not know, but there is some expression that is used in curling that somebody was way off the broom in that one.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister, in view of some of his answers this afternoon, what liaison he has with the provincial Department of Labour in the retraining programmes, and also The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are certainly interested in anything they are doing in The Department of Education, and also in The Department of Labour, similar to other departments. These hon. Ministers have programmes. We are aware of what they are doing. We co-operate wherever our services are needed. Certainly if we can make any recommendations to assist their programmes, we do.

I think one of the things we are instrumental in doing through the economic council and through the trade ministry is to make the departments aware of the needs of Ontario industries, whether it be manpower or skilled manpower. We are working, I think, with each of the departments you have mentioned. We have a very close liaison with them.

Mr. S. Lewis: Perhaps one suggestion that might be made arising out of the debate is that the adult retraining centre give a course in the needle trade! I am rather concerned about some of the replies that you have given because what we have now, for instance, in the Metropolitan Toronto area, is a retraining centre retraining well over 1,000 people, close to 50 per cent of them women, for skills which apparently, on the basis of the embryonic studies now made, will be obsolete when they finish their retraining course. And yet the hon. Minister says that there are industries in the province which wish to establish in certain areas, but they lack skills. You cannot find the 300 people in one instance. You may not be able to find the 20 or 50 people in another instance.

I find it rather anomalous that in the one area where retraining specifically is being applied, it is being applied to essentially obsolete skills; and in those areas where the

skills are needed there is no hint of retraining whatsoever. I therefore ask again—might there not be some advantage to a co-ordinated committee between Education, Labour and your department, in a formalized fashion, to see precisely where the retraining should take place?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I think you have a good point. Let me also point out, on the economic council, that it is made up of government, industry and labour and these problems are talked about at the economic council. This problem of the needle trade was not known to us until the man decided he wanted to move a plant here about a month ago. So it is a trade that, overnight, we found that we could probably use 300 people if we had them.

I can assure you we have taken steps to advise the people in The Department of Labour that these skills are needed. Certainly if they are training 300 barbers, it would be nice to turn round and train them to use the needle and get in the needle trade very quickly. Perhaps we do not need barbers, but we certainly need people in the needle trade. I think we are elastic enough that we can change our programme in those areas if we find that these people are needed. As I say, in the needle trade, we just found out about it a month or six weeks ago and we are moving on it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, is there not a basic pool of skill in the needle trades right here in Toronto? I know people who left the needle trades because—I was going to say the wages were so poor—but I should say the remuneration was so poor. They took what wage rates they could get but in view of the short periods for which they could get work, it was not worth it. I know a fellow now who is a skilled man in the needle trades, a top skilled man, who is delivering milk because he finds that he can get a better living that way. I do not know if some of these people could be induced back into the industry. I do not know the particular phase of the industry in which this new employer operates, but it certainly is an industry that requires very high levels of skill. I think that we have a pool of that kind of skill around here, although we seem to have dissipated a lot of it. I do not know if skilled people can now be located.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask, leaving the needle trade, I understand the plastics industry is a very dynamic and developing industry in the 20th century.

What kind of retraining programme is developing for people wanting to move into the plastics industry?

Hon. Mr. Randall: My knowledge of the plastics industry is that it is fairly well automatic. You buy a machine and you pour the beads in one end and the finished product almost comes out the other. In fact I do not think it requires the skilled training needed in the needle industry. Most of the plastics parts, even the massive parts today, are coming out of machines that run up as much as 24 hours. They can almost build a table with beads.

I do not think the skills in the plastics industry—we need perhaps a supply of tool-makers to make the necessary moulds and dies used in the plastics field, but once the beads are poured in one end it is almost like pouring it out of a teacup. The finished product comes off and there is very little finishing required, so that it is almost an automated industry. I think if you want any examples of what I mean it lies in the fact that we do not have any Japanese imports of plastics because we can turn them out cheaper here than they can turn them out in Japan, and we do not have the freight haul. That is one of the things we found out in our business, that we could compete against any low labour area, let us say, if we automate it to the *n*th degree. In the plastics industry they turn out miles and miles of garden hose, as you know, every day by just keeping the wheel turning and pouring in the beads. It is almost a hopper feed, so if there is any skill required in that industry it is primarily in the making of moulds.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I have been interested because when we were on the manpower committee last year we had a representation from the plastics industry in which they were suggesting that—I am talking of tool and die designers—but they were suggesting it would be greatly appreciated if the government would consider setting up a design centre for them to encourage research and activity there. The thing, I think, which interested us on the committee was the enormous, rapid growth which had taken place within the plastics industry.

The point I am really after is that I wonder, when we think of the needle trade industry and we think of Ontario—a vast technological field and I appreciate there are opportunities for people now—if it may be useful to encourage them to go into it. It would seem to me our interest should be looking ahead to some of the needs we see

in hard skills. To me, one of the things we have been slack on in this province is that for a long time we relied on the flow from Europe of technical people. We did not realize we had a soft spot in our own fabric, that we were not getting the proper training for young people to fit into an industrial age.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is obviously perceptive and informed in the field. I wonder, has he any idea when the first major manpower study connected with the new plans for automation is likely to come down—the study which would, in effect, cover the areas which were suggested in the select committee report of last year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I could not give the hon. member a date at the moment. The federal-provincial studies on that are just getting under way, but I can assure the hon. member that we were going to go ahead on our own, as the hon. Prime Minister said the other day, and it was only through the intervention of the federal authorities who said to slow down until we go it together. So now we are really waiting to see what they want to do along these lines before we make any further commitments. But we are ready, willing and able and they know it.

I would think that within the next three or four months they should have their programme jelled, and we should be getting together with any of the other provinces interested in this foundation of an automation programme.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is there any thought in the hon. Minister's mind of retraining facilities beyond those presently utilized in the province? Is he anticipating, as a Ministry in conjunction with the others, the setting up of any network of retraining facilities which in effect would be ready to go when the manpower study came out?

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): That is The Department of Labour.

Mr. Bryden: That is the trouble; it is everybody's business. It is The Department of Education, actually.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I assume the hon. member is referring to an industry which we think may be available to use manpower in the future?

Mr. S. Lewis: Right, yes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I cannot say yes or no—except that we are putting together this research complex out here at Sheridan

Park. I would imagine, if we do a lot more of our own industrial development out there, of new products for the future, that certainly as those products get under way and are being developed, we will have to think of the types of skills which should be available in order to put them into a plant and turn them out in the production line.

I think, just to give you one example: We talked about the plastics industry a minute ago. There is a lot of misconception about plastics. I think we started out with what we called Bakelite—you could drop a plate on the sink and it would splatter into a million pieces four or five years ago and today you can take a plastic and do almost the same with it as you can do with steel or aluminum.

The chemical companies themselves have developed plastics to a very much greater degree of usability and tensile strength than they ever did before. This, of course, has meant a constant changing of the equipment to produce those parts in factories, and it has been a costly programme. These are some of the things which I believe have created obsolescence insofar as skills are concerned, and perhaps have eliminated people from plants who have had to find other occupations.

I would think, in answer to the hon. member's question, that when we get the research centre going with this research we are talking about, that is one of the things we will have to keep our eye on. If we are developing a product which requires new processing and new skills, we will certainly have to make sure the bodies are there, available for it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have tried this twice before, let me try it once again before we leave the vote. Does the hon. Minister have an attitude on fixed assessments? An approach?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The only attitude I have is that I realize they do not have fixed assessments in some provinces and perhaps that is an economic advantage. In this province I learned, when I came into the government, that they abandoned fixed assessments two years ago. I listened to the conversation on Hershey Chocolates, I think the first two or three days in the House, and I realized there were some for and some against. As far as I am concerned, I think any economic advantage to the province of Ontario I would like to see. But on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has to make some of those decisions. Unless I can persuade him to change his mind, I

will have to go along with what he has recommended.

Mr. Singer: I did not know the hon. Provincial Treasurer—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would say that the hon. Minister is a most skillful tight-rope walker. I did not know that was one of the skills he had acquired along the way.

However, I want to ask one or two more questions about the fixed assessment problem. If we can believe the information given to us by the people who were sponsoring bills to provide for fixed assessment in special cases in this province, notwithstanding general law to the contrary, one can only conclude that there are certain instances where subsidization of industry will encourage a particular enterprise to locate in a particular place. Now that was the only justification given.

Hershey Chocolates, we were told, had to have their fixed assessment in Smith's Falls because they were promised it and they would not have gone there if they had not received this incentive. Similarly with the enterprise which located at Cochrane. If it was not true, then there was absolutely no reason for the fixed assessment at all. If it is true, then I would suggest that it provides at least a *prima-facie* case for looking into the question of direct subsidization of industry, particularly in regard to encouraging it to locate in some of the underdeveloped sections of the province.

The trouble with a fixed assessment is that though it provides a subsidy for industry, the entire subsidy is paid by ratepayers in one small municipality. I am not necessarily against subsidization in certain instances, but I think if there is going to be subsidization it should be spread much more widely than that. I do not think that the ratepayers in a municipality which is already having economic difficulties should have the whole cost thrust upon them.

The hon. Minister expressed a very cautious opinion an hour or so ago—I think quite rightly—that you have to be careful about which industries you subsidize, because you can get into a discriminatory position. On the other hand, if there is a role for subsidization, as there must be if there was any justification in these bills at all, then I think it should be looked at from the point of view of an overall provincial policy rather than a concession given by an individual municipality. Is the hon. Minister prepared to give any consideration to that, to have any of his staff look into the possibility of it as a policy?

After all, tax concessions, which have been used with not too great effect I believe, are a form of subsidization; accelerated depreciation for certain types of industries or in certain types of localities, is also a form of subsidization. What about this whole question of subsidizing industry, particularly with regard to inducing it to locate in less developed areas of the province? Has the hon. Minister's department given any consideration to it, or are they preparing to look into it as a possible line of approach in helping to solve the problem of unfavourable location of industry?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, let me say this: I do not think we have any intentions not to look at any government which will assist a town in getting industry. This is not new; it is being used in many areas of the United States. For instance, in Arkansas I know that they have very great concessions for industry to go down there, even 100 miles away. It is working a hardship on the areas where they move out leaving a lot of people behind—we just talked about it a minute ago. It is creating employment in a new town that is prepared not to worry about the settlement but to make sure it gets the payroll on Main Street every Friday night. So there are many things that enter into this programme of concessions.

Let me suggest that I talked to a manufacturer not too long ago in a small town and the only thing he was screaming about as unfair was that his freight rates were higher. It cost more to ship from his town to Montreal or Toronto than it did to ship from Toronto or Montreal. I said, "You went up there in the first place because you said you got lower taxes, you got lower-cost land, you got a lower-cost building, and you had many advantages, perhaps you got lower labour costs. Now you are asking the government if we will subsidize you on your freight rates. If we do that you might as well come right back to Toronto here and start all over again where we do not have to give you a subsidy."

No matter where you go with these subsidies there is no end to them, you can keep on going. I think the sooner we recognize that it has got to be an economical operation where everybody holds his place and pays his full cost the better it will be. On the other hand I recognize that in some areas we should give consideration to any possibility of getting industry into a small town, but as we keep pointing out, one concession leads to another. In the near future we should look at lower assessments or fixed assessments. I

am prepared to take it to my hon. colleagues, and either have it accepted or turned down.

Mr. Bryden: I think most of us are against fixed assessments because of the undesirable competition they produce among municipalities, but some municipalities are still struggling to maintain the system notwithstanding the change in the general law. I think it should be dealt with from the larger point of view.

Vote 409 agreed to.

Vote 410 agreed to.

On vote 411:

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate I asked a question about a couple of industries that the former Minister of this department had reported on September 21 last year were coming up to the North Bay area. I have not seen them yet. Is there still some information on file about these industries or when we may expect them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand there are still negotiations going on with those industries. I cannot name them but there are discussions going on and there is still a possibility that we will get them into North Bay.

Mr. Troy: Thanks very much. Hope springs eternal.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with regard to item 6 under vote 411, could the hon. Minister give us a bit of a breakdown of that figure of \$240,000 which is for a number of related objectives—sales missions—export clinics, and so on. Could he give us a breakdown for each item listed there?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. On trade missions the figure is \$66,000; the group buyer plans I talked about where we bring the buyers over here and set them up, \$15,000; export clinics, \$7,000; under Canadian engineering services, we set up \$20,000 for selling engineering services abroad, a new part of our programme this year; the MO shows we set up, \$25,000; Made in Canada labels, \$5,500; small business management and training, \$1,000; research for new industry, \$10,000—we are looking at a number of new industries, new complexes that we think can be set up in this province. We are doing a study on those—seminars for industrial commissioners, \$1,000; municipal education programme, \$1,000; United States trade crusade, \$65,000. We are spending a lot more of our efforts in

the United States as I pointed out a few days ago; achievement awards, \$1,000; consultant fees and expenses, \$15,000; for unprovided expenses, \$7,500. That totals \$240,000.

Mr. Bryden: How is it envisaged that the \$65,000 will be spent on the item of U.S. promotion? I am not quite sure what the term is that the hon. Minister used, but I take it it is for promotion of Canadian goods in the United States. How does the hon. Minister plan to go about that with \$65,000?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In the plans to implement necessary programmes we have trade crusade luncheons, we have six business opportunity missions going over, we have direct mail campaigns for these missions, we have arrangements set up at chambers of commerce and boards of trade in various cities to bring in possible applicants who would like to establish a plant in this province—

Mr. Bryden: If I may just interrupt the hon. Minister, is this a project mainly designed to encourage Americans to come up here and establish plants or is it to encourage Americans to buy our products, or is it both?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We combine three things: we combine trying to get Americans to come up here and set up plants and to get them to buy Canadian goods, and to take out a licence to manufacture Canadian goods or to get a licence to manufacture their goods in this country—a combined programme.

Mr. Bryden: It seems to me that for \$65,000 that is rather a tall operation. I have some doubt whether or not the hon. Minister can really do very much with that amount of money in relation to what he is planning. What has been his past experience in this area of operation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Our experience has been rather encouraging for the small amount of money that we are spending in a market of 200 million people. For instance, we held a meeting in Pittsburgh on June 24 and out of that we got 15 manufacturing arrangements, four branch plants and 21 marketing programmes started. In Cleveland we had 11 manufacturing arrangements, nine branch plants out of that, and 17 marketing arrangements. In Cincinnati, we had 22 manufacturing arrangements, ten branch plants and 12 marketing arrangements. And in San Francisco we had five manufacturing arrangements, six branch plants and ten marketing possibilities of Canadian products over there.

When we work with a chamber of commerce or a board of trade they only bring the people that they think have a genuine interest in what we have to offer, so we are not talking to hordes of people. We are speaking to groups of maybe 40 or 50; in most cases I do not think it runs over 50 people. Most of them are very selective and they only come if they are interested in the message that we have to sell.

May I say that we do a pretty good pre-sell job before they get there. They are not coming there to be wined and dined, they are coming there to do business. We have the order pad in hand and we are ready to set up any kind of programme. Sometimes it lasts for three days. We have a very thorough programme for three days in these areas and make sure we cover the market before we leave and cover all the possibilities. I agree with the hon. member that we could use lots more than \$65,000 but that is all I could get in the budget.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister then, is this what he means by export clinics, or is this something different again? Is this part and parcel of the total picture? Are the export clinics held here or outside?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, the export clinics are held here to get more people involved in exporting out of Ontario. In other words, we get some of these men who have been overseas to come back and tour with us, and stand up and tell their story before groups of businessmen. I think they can tell it better than we can, because the listeners say, "Well, you're politicians." But you get an amateur businessman up there who has made his first trip to Europe and come back with an order, and I think what he has to say makes a greater impression than we do on others who have not gone overseas or tried to get into the export business.

For instance, export clinics have been held in London, Fort William, North Bay, Ottawa, Barrie, Kitchener, Vineland, Chatham, Peterborough, Toronto, and we have had over 1,438 people to these clinics; so 1,438 have received this first-hand message as to how you can export and widen your markets.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister indicate the sales missions he has in mind for this fiscal year?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, just before the hon. Prime Minister moves the adjournment, I think for the record all hon. members would like to join me, as one of the Toronto members, in congratulating the Toronto Maple Leafs on winning the Stanley Cup on Saturday. This is certainly something which crosses all party lines because I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that most of the hon. members were supporting the Maple Leafs in these playoff games. It is a credit to our capital city and, without a doubt, they are the finest hockey team in the world today. Good luck!

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Just before the House rises, I would like to remind the House that one of the main reasons for this win on Saturday night was one of our honourable citizens from Etobicoke—Red Kelly. I think the House should take notice of that.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that one of the reasons for the win is that so many of the hockey players come from northern Ontario.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): In this mood of jocularity, Mr. Speaker, I think I can move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we will complete these estimates and proceed with the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 28, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Seventh report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans	2503
Legislative Assembly Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	2503
Tourist Establishments Act, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, first reading	2503
Hotel Fire Safety Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	2503
Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Robarts, first reading	2503
Statement re transportation surveys in Metropolitan Toronto and region, Mr. MacNaughton	2505
Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, concluded	2506
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis	2534
Recess, 6 o'clock	2542

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today in the east gallery, students from Frank Oak Vocational School, Toronto, and in the west gallery, students from Earl Haig Secondary School, Toronto, and St. Peter's Separate School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's seventh report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that upon the request of a member there shall be paid out of the monies that have accrued to him at the time the request is made, any part of his indemnity not exceeding \$300 per month and any part of his allowance for expenses not exceeding \$150 per month.

THE TOURIST ESTABLISHMENTS ACT

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Tourist Establishments Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, in brief explanation, the amendments provide that the tourist establishments to which the Act applies are confined to those providing sleeping accommodation or to camp sites providing services.

Presently the regulations require preliminary approval of plans to construct a new establishment. The amendments in this bill will authorize regulations to require approval of material alterations to accommodations.

A provision being repealed gave authority to municipalities to pass bylaws in matters to which the regulations apply and required municipal inspection of tourist establishments.

The last change is that the penalty for breach of the regulations is increased from no minimum and a maximum of \$100, to a minimum of \$10 and a maximum of \$500. An additional penalty is provided of \$10 for each day a tourist establishment is operated without a licence up to a maximum of 90 days.

THE HOTEL FIRE SAFETY ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hotel Fire Safety Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is generally to simplify the matter of inspection of hotels and tourist establishment structures, and things of that nature, with respect to safety from fire.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1962-63

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-63.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will recall that The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-63, was introduced and received unanimous approval of this Legislature on April 26, 1963. The

Act regulates and sets minimum standards for employee pension plans. It should not be confused with a provincial public pension plan, as it has been almost continuously ever since it was introduced. Its purpose is to improve and strengthen the private pension plans of this province by widening the coverage, by ensuring solvency and above all by stemming the loss of pension rights due to job change.

The Pension Benefits Act as it now stands does three main things. First of all, it requires employers who have 15 or more employees to establish standard pension plans providing certain minimum pension benefits. Thus employees in any but very small companies would receive minimum portable pensions related to their service after January 1, 1965, under the bill as it presently stands.

In the second place, if an employer provides benefits above the minimum, these must be portable when the employee has reached age 45 and when he has completed ten years of continuous service. By portability we mean that the employee has a right to pension benefits from his employer's contributions, as well as his own, and further that these benefits cannot be surrendered or commuted for a cash refund except to a very limited extent as set out in the Act. You will recall that was set at 25 per cent. I might add that the portability is Canada-wide, and indeed it is world-wide because the employee's pension is preserved for him no matter where he may go.

Finally, the Act establishes a general supervision over pension plans through the Pension Commission of Ontario. This supervision includes such matters as funding, solvency and investments.

Mr. Speaker, I made it clear when the Canada Pension Plan was first announced last July, that we would support an agreed national pension plan and furthermore that we were fully prepared to amend The Pension Benefits Act to conform to such a national plan. The discussions between federal and provincial governments during the intervening months make it appear that we will have a universal pension plan with uniform benefits and contributions right across the country. Our workers here will be covered by a public plan and there is not the same need now to compel employers to set up standard plans as we did under this Act.

The Pension Benefits Amendment Act which is now before you has as its purpose the repeal of all the provisions concerning the standard pension plan. Henceforth there will be no compulsion on an employer to

establish and maintain a minimum pension plan.

The other parts of The Pension Benefits Act are retained. This means that from January 1, 1965, existing pension plans must comply with the portability rules as they were defined for supplementary pension plans. Existing pension plans must also meet the standards of solvency and certain other requirements as set out in the Act.

The rules concerning portability as set out in the Act and as carried on in this amendment, will in future apply to all pension plans regardless of size. In the original Act, the rules on vesting of pensions—that is vesting the employer's contribution in the employee—and the locking in of the employees' contributions only apply to employers of 15 or more employees. This limitation was put in for administrative reasons, as we discussed it here last year, but with the repeal of the standard plan it is possible to extend the advantages of portability to employees of small firms. This has an added advantage in that the making of reciprocal arrangements with other provinces on portability at this level, apart from the national plan, will be considerably simpler.

To indicate what this extension means in practical terms, out of about 7,500 Ontario pension plans, 4,500 are for employers with 15 or more employees and 3,000 are for 15 employees or less. Practically all of the very small pension plans are underwritten by insurance companies or by the federal government annuities branch, so that the making of the necessary amendments that we are proposing in this Act will not be difficult. The employees of these 3,000 small plants will benefit from this change.

To remove any misunderstanding, I would like to emphasize that The Pension Benefits Act is not retroactive. It requires no pension plan to make any change whatsoever in the conditions governing the pensions or refund benefits arising from contributions made before January 1, 1965. Therefore, no one need fear that the benefits to which he is already entitled will be changed in any way by this legislation.

Over 7,500 employee pension plans, whose membership includes one-half of the male paid workers and one-third of the female paid workers are operating presently in Ontario. Constitutionally the regulation of these plans falls to the province and I do not need to recite here the various ways in which portability of pensions and the solvency of these pensions funds adds to the freedom and security of the worker. We went through this

and debated it very fully last year and we are all agreed upon it.

But this amended Pension Benefits Act adjusts to the events of this year; it will help to achieve these goals; it broadens the area in which this Act will still be effective, and it does not in any way interfere with the development of a nation-wide public plan.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to announce to the House that, as chairman of the executive committee of the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Transportation Study, I have, with the vice-chairman, the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) today entered into agreements with three transportation consulting agencies for the purpose of:

1. Undertaking a survey to determine the public acceptance, costs and economic feasibility of establishing an experimental rail commuter service to operate between Burlington and Ajax, and

2. Conducting an overall scientific survey of transportation characteristics and requirements of the entire region extending from Hamilton to Bowmanville and stretching as far north as Barrie.

It will be recalled that the transportation study organization was created just over a year ago by the government to investigate and report on an overall transportation policy for the metropolitan region which I have described.

In the first stage of its operations it carried out a study of the potential use of the 15 railway lines radiating in all directions from the downtown area of Toronto. A report of this study was distributed to all hon. members and widely publicized. This study reported that use could be made of 280 miles of railway lines in the area for the purposes of public transportation providing suitable terminal facilities can be made available. And, more particularly, that about 80 miles of these lines and rights-of-way could be adapted for fairly frequent rail commuter use or rapid transit as well as general railway use, with varying degrees of modification.

It should be pointed out that this new study, involving the possibility of an experimental rail commuter service, should when completed and evaluated provide the study organization with information necessary to determine not only the physical feasibility but also, most importantly, the economic feasibility of introducing such a service to this highly populated region.

In no way can it be construed as a com-

mitment to introducing such a service in the near future. It is merely a further step in attempting to determine what use, if any, can be made of these facilities, as they may become available, in bringing about an efficient overall solution to the transportation problems of the region.

We are proceeding with this extra study in co-operation with the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railway companies, to provide precise information on the cost of carrying out necessary modifications and providing other necessary operating facilities in the light of public requirements and acceptance of this form of transportation.

The survey of transportation characteristics will include a study of regional land use, population, employment and other factors which can be used in a computer analysis for evaluating all forms of travel in an integrated transportation system operating throughout the region. It is expected that this data will establish formulae to determine where transportation demands will arise in the future and how they can be served most efficiently. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the results also will provide general data which can be used as basic material in possible transportation studies of other regions.

The portion of the survey covering the area within the Metro boundaries will be carried out in co-operation with the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

The surveys to determine rail commuter acceptance and traffic characteristics will involve many thousands of residents within the region. Together, they will form the largest and most comprehensive transportation study ever undertaken in Canada.

I would like to ask all hon. members who represent ridings within the study area to do everything they can to encourage the fullest co-operation of their constituents in carrying out this massive project. It is realized that residents in some parts of the region have developed an antipathy toward surveys, mainly as a defence against the intrusion of salesmen using unscrupulous selling tactics. As many thousands of telephone and home interviews will be required over a prolonged period, it is essential that we receive the unreserved co-operation of all those who may be contacted so that the project can be completed expeditiously. All information gathered in the household surveys will be kept confidential and used only for statistical purposes.

This is an important phase of the overall study which would result in great benefits to the entire 2,000,000 population of the region

and, possibly, other regions of the province as well as contributing greatly to maintaining the high standard of transportation which the economy and the people of the province demand.

The results of these rail commuter studies and recommendations arising from them are expected to be known late in the fall, and the results from the other survey will be ready for analysis by the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-fourth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(continued)

On vote 411:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, regarding The Department of Economics and Development, I would like to bring before this House a matter of extreme urgency to all of us insofar as the levels of our lakes is concerned and how they will affect the economy of Ontario.

You probably all saw in the morning *Globe and Mail*, the story of the low level of the water on Georgian Bay and Lake Huron insofar as it affects shipping, shipbuilding and every aspect of our economy in that area. I would like to bring this before the House and ask the consideration of not only the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), but the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in taking immediate action. As the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) will bear out, these lake levels at the present time have cost the Hydro—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, how does this particular subject come before us under this vote?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I submit it is trade and industry.

Mr. Chairman: Continue.

Mr. Sargent: As the hon. member for Muskoka will bear out, this lake level problem has cost us an increase of \$12 million in our Hydro rates to date. That is a matter of fact from one of the hon. member's fellow commissioners. It also will cost us, shortly,

thousands of jobs in our area in the shipping business because we cannot get our ships into our harbours to unload grain. It could be carried as far as the ridiculous point that the people who are losing many millions of dollars in their businesses could take joint suit against the government. It could cost millions of dollars for the cottages embracing Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. I would ask the House to consider asking the hon. Prime Minister to summon, by asking the joint commissions, the governors of the states of Michigan, New York and Illinois, to tie in with the federal government, a sort of a liaison, to bring about an immediate crash programme to solve this problem.

Now it will be argued that this is not a provincial responsibility. I do not know how true that is. But I do know the problem is ours, Mr. Chairman. This is going to cost thousands of jobs; it is going to cost millions of dollars in our economy, and I think it is a matter of urgency that you call a high level conference to devise a crash programme to find an immediate solution to put the water back in Lake Huron and Georgian Bay that is being drained out into other sources.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, it is so important to us on Georgian Bay and Lake Huron that we deviate from this vote to ask the hon. Prime Minister if he would consider taking such steps.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, this whole matter, of course, is under very close investigation. Look at the situation as far as the Great Lakes are concerned. While we in Ontario, border on the northern shores of the Great Lakes, also involved are seven or eight of the United States. The water, sir, drains out of Lake Michigan, enters the Mississippi river system and eventually empties out into the Gulf of Mexico. Of course, the other drain through on the Great Lakes system is to the St. Lawrence river and out through Quebec. There are many jurisdictions involved. This matter is presently receiving a great deal of study and I can assure you that this government has no intention of sitting by idly and watching these events take place without making all the moves that we can in order to do what can be done.

But I point out to the hon. members that this is a problem of immense magnitude. It is not simply a problem of, as the hon. member says, putting this water back into the Great Lakes. It is not that simple. There are enormous forces of nature at work. I can recall in 1952, for instance, when there was a select committee of this Legislature

set up at that time to deal with the reverse of this problem. They spent a year studying what could be done in order to reduce the level of the Great Lakes because at that time docks were floating away and the exact opposite of the present situation was the case.

Various governments and government projects were blamed for that. Some people are looking now at the St. Lawrence Seaway and the deepening of it as one of the reasons why the water is draining out of the Great Lakes. At that time, there had been a new dam built down the St. Lawrence and this dam was supposed to have dammed all this water up through the Great Lakes, which was carrying away docks and all sorts of things.

I only use this to illustrate to you the very large problem that we are dealing with. I notice in the London *Free Press* of a day or so ago that there are very intense investigations apparently being made by the American Army engineers, to whom I believe falls this responsibility in the American government set-up. They are looking at the possibility of some form of water control at the northern end of the St. Clair river, where the water drains out of Lake Huron. The amazing thing is that these water levels are down throughout the whole lake system. In other words, there is no one particular spot where it is not down.

Some people advance the theory—and of course, this is certainly borne out by our experiences with water apart from the Great Lakes, when we think of the water situation in southwestern Ontario, the Chatham area and down into Windsor and north into Huron county—that we have had something like one-third of normal rainfall for the last three years.

This is pretty general over the whole drainage area of the Great Lakes. This is one explanation advanced for the low water levels. This is one of our own measurements of rainfall which indicates to us that the water just simply has not been falling. Wells are dry, and the water table is down. But that is not necessarily the whole problem.

I can assure hon. members of the House that we are very aware of the magnitude of the problem. That is why the emergency water programme that was discussed in this House last week has been brought in. It does not deal with the water levels in the Great Lakes. It deals with the water levels of farmers' wells and the general level of water in the water tables throughout the province. But these two problems are not unrelated, even though the cure for them may not be the same.

It may be that the only way to solve the problem of the levels of the Great Lakes is to introduce additional water from some other source into the whole Great Lakes system. That water can fall out of the sky and replenish the streams and the rivers, which in turn will replenish the lakes. We know from our own records that the rainfall has been very low. Perhaps in Owen Sound there was a lot of snow. But south of there, there was an amazingly small amount of snow this winter. As a matter of fact, the snow was gone from that whole central region of western Ontario shortly after Christmas and never did come back. There was no spring run-off this year because there was no snow. This has two effects. One, it affects the farmers' wells. Two, it has a very direct bearing on the ultimate water level of the Great Lakes.

I can only assure the House that we are aware of this problem in all its ramifications, in both of these areas. In one we are taking immediate action and the other, in my opinion, is a long-range problem because it involves so many jurisdictions and it involves such an enormous area.

We have had some discussion here about the possibility of diverting water from other watersheds into the Great Lakes system. If you look at the magnitude of those schemes from an engineering point of view, you are looking at ten or 12 or possibly 15 years research and work before they could happen. It is a long-range problem. But I can assure you that we are doing, and will continue to do, what we can to ensure that it is studied and that we find a solution.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. Prime Minister—

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member for Grey North has referred to Hydro in connection with low water levels. I want to assure him and the House that because of Hydro's stabilization of rates reserves, which are held to overcome difficulties such as we are in at the present time due to low water levels, that we have been able in Hydro to draw on those reserves to meet this situation and to pay additional costs of coal so as to maintain electric supply and to keep the rates at their present level.

The hon. member has said that there has been an increase of rates on this account. This is not the case. There are still funds in this reserve. He has stated to the House that one of the commissioners has told him that there has been an increase in rates, or will

be an increase in rates, and I would like him to name that commissioner.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in answering the hon. member for Muskoka, he is correct in this regard. He is aware of what the 13th power bill is. It was at a deficit this year and the reason there was no 13th power bill was because of the increased cost to Hydro from the lower lake levels. I think you will agree on that. The inference was that the over-all Ontario costs for the low lake levels were causing a \$12 million increase to your budget.

Mr. Boyer: This is coming out of the fund.

Mr. Sargent: It does not matter how you arrive at it—

Mr. Boyer: The hon. member has misunderstood the situation.

Mr. Sargent: It is \$12 million. The point is, I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister for his concern, but I would like to ask him—and this is to finalize this—to what extent the province is involved in these studies. The people of our whole area are looking to you to lead in this matter and bring it to a head, and not look to Ottawa to solve it. It is affecting us here, and I would very much like to ask you to tell us to what extent the province is involved in solving this problem.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If you are referring to the problem in your own area, we brought in an emergency water programme last week, during the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, and it was set out right there what we are doing.

Mr. B. Newman: (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, on vote 411, the previous Minister (Mr. Macaulay) conducted a series of export clinics throughout Ontario. These involved a considerable expenditure of funds. Directly across the river in the city of Detroit, just this past week, was an American Society of Tool Manufacturers Engineers show. At this exhibit of manufacturing tools, only two Canadian companies were involved. Only two showed up and took part in this show. There were likewise two who acted as representatives for European manufacturers. There must be something kind of peculiar when you have the largest tool exposition in the world, so close to the largest province in Canada, yet the best we could do was to attract two Canadian manufacturers to participate in the clinic or in the show, to come along and look for business that is so sorely

needed, especially business in the U.S. This certainly could have had a marked effect on the balance of trade.

I would like to know what this hon. Minister is doing to encourage our own Ontario manufacturers to partake in such an exposition. This would have been a cheaper thing to promote—simply writing letters informing various manufacturers of this opportunity, rather than actually conducting the clinic yourself. Mr. Jack Kent of the Windsor *Daily Star*, writing in a column, chastises Canadian industry and probably rightly so. He mentions the absence of Canadian firms and suggests that either our firms are not interested in U.S. business, or are afraid of the U.S. market, or are too busy to bother about it. Whatever the reason, the Canadian manufacturers should keep a sharp eye open toward this tool show in succeeding years. Some Canadian firms are finding a lot of good business in the U.S., and there is a growing trend toward a more open-door trade policy between the two countries.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister, is his department doing anything to encourage the Ontario manufacturer to partake in such expositions?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to answer the hon. member on this. First of all, I think he touched on two things. The clinics we hold are export clinics to advise manufacturers how they can get into the export market. Attendance at the exhibitions in the international field up to now have been pretty well assigned or controlled by the federal trade Minister. I think you will recall there was one held in Philadelphia last fall. In that show, over 50 Ontario manufacturers participated.

I do not know how many tool manufacturers participated in the show in Detroit, but I would just say this to you: We have set up in our budget this year \$100,000 for foreign exhibitions and this is to give us an opportunity to join with the federal government in participating in some of these offshore exhibitions. We have a very keen interest in them. I agree with you that we should be in as many exhibitions as we can, and what we try to do here is encourage the manufacturers to display their goods. I think if you talk to the federal people about what they have done, you will find they have had the manufacturers ship their goods to Ottawa, they have crated them for export in many instances, and they have taken them over and sent federal people over to run the exhibit where the manufacturer could not afford to

have his own man on the stand. I have had some experiences myself. I would say that in this coming year we will participate in international affairs, we hope in co-operation with the federal government, because with \$100,000 you cannot go too far.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister done anything to encourage Canadian participation or Ontario participation in this show by tool manufacturers? This was in the city of Detroit just this past week, and it certainly is a shame when we find only two Canadian manufacturers interested in such a project that could mean so much business here in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know how many manufacturers are showing. I would say there will be a lot of Canadian manufacturers visiting those exhibits. Certainly we will give every bit of encouragement to manufacturers to participate in these American shows. Frankly, I feel this is where we are going to get our biggest return in the export market, because we are already pre-sold on the kind of goods we are manufacturing in Canada. We do not have to make the product fit the American market. It is pretty well designed after American designs, to compete with Americans in this market. I think very definitely we will be able to convince a lot more of our manufacturers to participate in these international shows, particularly in the United States.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue this one step further. Has this department done anything to encourage participation in this show that has just taken place?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot answer that. We try to get manufacturers to participate in every international show. I would have to dig this one up and try to get the information for you, but I would say we have not made any specific drive to get people into this particular tool show. I will be glad to make some inquiries, and see what effort was made along these lines and whether we contacted any manufacturer, and let you know.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, surely the hon. Minister would know such an important thing. The largest tool exhibit in the world would have merited a little better answer than what the hon. Minister gave us at this time. He should know whether any encouragement was given on the part of his department to industry throughout the province of Ontario to attend this.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is probably not aware of the hundreds of exhibitions that take place in the United States year in and year out, month in and month out, and we are certainly not aware of all the exhibitions. I appreciate that this is a large one and anybody manufacturing tools or machinery equipment should be in it, but 3,500 shows are held throughout the United States in the course of a year and I do not think any manufacturer could participate in all those shows.

We have a pretty good machine tool show here ourselves, as you know, once a year in the Toronto exhibition grounds. It takes the entire Coliseum building. I think that our Canadian manufacturers are doing a pretty fair job in getting into foreign markets with their equipment. We will certainly never be able to cover all the shows. I think if we had two manufacturers at the one in Detroit, perhaps next year we will have 200.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may point out once more, this is not just an ordinary exposition, this is the largest tool exposition in the world. This is not just some small exposition that may have been conducted in some centre farther down in the U.S. Over 40,000 engineers and technical people were at the affair. Certainly this government should have done something to encourage local—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not care. The hon. member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough) can do all the heckling he wishes. I am interested in promoting Ontario and Canada in the United States. And if I can promote it by making a few remarks in this House and having a few of the disinterested Tory members heckle me, that is quite all right. They do not suffer from the unemployment that my community does. I want to see my community just as well off as other communities in the province of Ontario. What is good for the larger metropolitan areas is also good for the city of Windsor.

If by hollering a little in this House, we can encourage a little more action on the part of The Department of Economics and Development, I am here for that purpose.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Your level of interest is so low that boredom easily sets in.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 411 agreed to.

Vote 405 and vote 412 are combined.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister introduced his estimates, there was much talk about housing. In my reply, I tried to extract from him what programme we really have for housing and what programme he has announced.

True enough, some of the newspapers patted him on the back and said, "Here is a bold new plan for housing." But, Mr. Chairman, in the five years I have been here, every year has begun with a brand-new bold programme for housing. The latest one we had came from the hon. Minister's predecessor. It was a 12-point programme hailed as the greatest thing that North America had ever seen or the world had ever seen. The hon. Minister's predecessor, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay), promised that in a year the problem of housing was going to be solved in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Chairman, just two days ago I had a call from a gentleman who lives in the city of Toronto.

He advised me that he was earning \$50 a week; he had five children and he urgently needed accommodation at a rate he could afford. He was paying a rental that was far above and beyond his means.

He had made application for an apartment in the Lawrence Heights development some considerable time ago and he asked if I could help him to obtain some accommodation in that development. As I do in matters of this sort, I communicated with the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, which is an agency of this government. They advised me that this gentleman's name had been on the list for two years, that they were fully aware of his need for housing and that they sympathized a great deal with his request.

However, Mr. Chairman, after two years of being on that list, this gentleman had received the rating of No. 180. In other words, there needed to be 179 people dealt with before this man could get reasonable accommodation for himself and his family at a rate that he could afford.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, where is the housing policy that we hear so much about in this House year after year, that the government unleashes all its publicity agents so to pat itself on the back and say, "What great fellows are we, look what we are promising?"

This is the government that can bring out the same housing plan, or the same building announcement, a half a dozen times with a different lead paragraph and say, "Look what great fellows are we, we have another programme or another plan." But there is not a single thing really, Mr. Chairman, that the

hon. Minister's predecessor did to advance the cause of housing in Metropolitan Toronto.

As I read the hon. Minister's speech, it is all so surrounded with ifs, ands and buts and maybes, that it still leaves me with a great deal of doubt as to what end the hon. Minister is aiming toward. He says, for instance, and I am reading now from *Hansard*, page 2391:

Under the programme contemplated, the province could assume full jurisdiction for planning, directing and administering the housing programme—

Now does the hon. Minister mean that the province is prepared to assume, or is it just thinking about assuming? I grant you, Mr. Chairman, that there is a problem with the federal jurisdiction, the negotiations that have been going on there, and whether the federal government is going to act in certain ways. But this hon. Minister is not prepared to say that even if the federal government enacts the legislation, that we suggest it should, or we hope it should, or that we will do certain things. There is not one positive statement in his housing programme that indicates that he is going to do anything at all. It says the government "could assume full jurisdiction." A paragraph later, he says:

For example, having decided on the need, location and size of project required, the province could invite builders to submit proposals on a competitive basis for houses—

Does the hon. Minister mean the province intends to invite builders? When are they going to start on this intention if that is what they mean? Or are they just thinking about it again? Another paragraph, the one immediately following:

Another method could be the purchase of houses in existing subdivisions wherever economically feasible.

Well, it could be. It could be any one of a thousand other things as well. Does the government intend to buy any houses in existing subdivisions? What does "economically feasible" mean? Has the hon. Minister any tests for the economic feasibility of a plan of this sort?

It is not too long ago, Mr. Chairman, that I brought an application before a certain planning board in this metropolitan area and suggested that a method could be evolved if certain of the planning standards were changed somewhat whereby lower cost housing could be produced. And I solicited, amongst other planning experts, the planning staff of this province to get some assistance in

this idea. But the chief planner who came out of The Department of Municipal Affairs—and he came under very violent objection, he had to be subpoenaed—came into the witness box and said, “I have no thoughts on the matter at all.”

Is this hon. Minister, for instance, using the facilities of The Department of Municipal Affairs, the planning aspects of it, to do something about co-ordinating a housing effort? Or does he know what The Department of Municipal Affairs is doing insofar as housing is concerned? What are the views of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs? (Mr. Spooner's) planners insofar as housing is concerned?

How big should a subdivision be? How big should the lots be? How is he going to proceed about integrating subsidized houses into some subdivision? Is it important that a lot have 50-foot frontage? Could it not be 40 feet to enable the production of a cheaper house? What are the views and how long is it since he and his officials have met with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and his officials?

Is there any unified plan for housing coming forward; not from this hon. Minister, not from his predecessor, but from government? A plan that really means something? A paragraph later on he says:

Here is an indication of what we would like to do—

Well, it is all very fine for the hon. Minister saying “we could do, we might do, we would like to do, and if it is economically feasible, we will.” But surely when a man in the position of the gentleman who came to me the other day is unable to get decent accommodation for himself and his family, a man who earns \$50 a week, who has five children, who has been on the waiting list of Lawrence Heights for over two years, and is told he has reached the wonderful status of No. 180 on this list; surely when there are facts like this they should be apparent to this hon. Minister, as they are to almost all of the Metropolitan Toronto members of this House. Surely the hon. Minister should say something more than ifs, ands and buts.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I think we are entitled to know, at long last, is there a housing programme being brought forward by this government that means something more than these pious statements of goodwill that we have heard over lo, these many years? The hon. member for Riverdale a year ago said if the steps are taken in his world-renowned 12-point programme, there will be no problem in Metropolitan Toronto today. The

problem is much worse in Metro today than it was a year ago. It is going to get much worse a year from now than it is today. I say this: pap, that is all we have, 12 pages of pap in the hon. Minister's speech insofar as the housing programme is not good enough. This government should give some leadership in providing a housing programme. It is just afraid to wrestle with it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, answering the hon. member, I think first of all let me assure him there are more authorities in the housing field than Carter has got liver pills. Everybody is an authority on what you should do about housing. On taking over the portfolio from the former Minister, I first of all had to decide what we were worrying about, how major the problem was and then decide how we were going to do something about it.

These proposals I brought out in the submission a few days ago, with the recommendations that were forwarded to Ottawa since we took over the department, are based on the findings of our own director of housing and his staff. They were accepted by the late Mr. Garland as answering the problems of housing, not only in this metropolitan area, but in this province as a whole. I think perhaps you will find that the same recommendations will be accepted by many other jurisdictions.

We do not apologize for the past. I think there has been much done in the past, as I talked about the 12-point programme which the hon. member criticized the other day. A good many things have happened to the housing programme. Some of our own people have discussed this matter of people waiting for homes, waiting to get accommodation. One month they say there are 5,000 people staring you in the face; the next month they say we are building too many homes and should not build any more. With those problems we certainly were not going to rush out with a housing programme without a great deal of consideration.

Mr. Singer: Do not rush. A new programme every year on paper is much better than rushing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have a report here on the need for housing. The people who placed their names with Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority totalled 18,281, of whom 14,220 were rejected for other reasons, not because there was lack of accommodation. So you can see there is much to discuss with reference to housing, even in the number of people who make application for housing.

Perhaps you would be interested in a waiting list report that we have prepared and gone over very carefully. There is undoubtedly a pressing need for more public housing rental units in Metropolitan Toronto. However as we hear many conflicting stories concerning the degree of need, I have obtained some factual information from the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, which as you know administers the rental housing for us. The present active waiting list of the authority numbers 1,800. The current rate of application is about 200 per month, of which 50 per cent originate in the city of Toronto proper and 50 per cent in the constituent municipalities of Metro.

Interestingly, the turnover in existing units in Metro is about 14 per cent, or 350 units per annum. In addition, only about one-third of the eligible applicants accept accommodation when it is offered to them. There are a number of reasons why accommodation is refused, such as: lack of transportation or other neighbourhood facilities, 21.9 per cent; rules and regulations unacceptable, 7.9; social stigma, 36.8—"I do not want to live with Joe";—dislike offer, 11.5 per cent; family reasons, 7.9.

Incidentally, in regard to the family's ability to pay rent in the Metro Toronto projects, unserviced rents account for approximately 22.5 per cent, whereas service rents, which include heat, water and janitorial and other services, account for approximately 27 per cent.

I think the reasons for turning down accommodation which I have listed are interesting and serve to indicate that no matter how badly a family may require housing, it still will exercise its prerogative to decide where and how it will live.

I think one thing that is overlooked in this housing field is the social and psychological problem that we have in moving people who do not want to move. I think it is analogous to the story of the Boy Scout who said he did his good deed for the day. They said, "What did you do?" He said, "I helped a little old lady across the road, but it was not a very good deed." They said, "Why was it not?" And he said, "Well, she did not want to go."

I think in housing the same problem happens. Quite often we worry about moving people in a hurry without giving it due consideration. Certainly in this city we have a number of housing problems we think we can solve with this legislation which I am quite sure will be brought down at this session up in Ottawa. It is already on the

order paper in Ottawa. In fact, I am given to understand that perhaps this week it will get first reading. We believe in taking every step that we can take to prepare ourselves by setting up the Ontario Housing Corporation to do all the things that I said we would do last Thursday. I spelled them out, such as buying old homes, renovating them, getting builders to supply homes on perhaps a lower cost basis than we have been able to get in the past, and providing the kind of housing people want without jamming them into large housing projects.

I will go back to the one I dealt with after taking over on November 8, and that was Etobicoke. I think that one has been on the record for almost two years. How many manhours and how much money it cost to get it to the point where a month ago we got that housing programme settled once and for all, I do not know. I would say that the difficulty with housing is primarily because the federal government, as you know, put up 75 per cent of the money, the province put up 17.5 and the municipalities put up 7.5. Our position, as I have stated before, is somewhat like the ham in the sandwich. We have restrictions from the federal authorities—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Could you make that corned beef?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions would like us to make that corned beef. For him, we will!

The federal authorities have restrictions on what we could do with the 75 per cent, and in many areas the municipalities could not do very much with their 7.5—they could not find the money. We recognize the problems of the municipalities. We also recognize that they do not want a housing unit shoved out there unless they are prepared to negotiate on it and on this basis we have prepared these recommendations. The hon. member is right, until The National Housing Act is changed in Ottawa, we cannot implement the programme I gave last Thursday. But I am quite sure we will carry on with the old programme at a greater rate than we did in the past, because now we recognize what some of these problems are and I think we have a better relationship with the municipalities.

I have talked to a number of people who have large numbers of housing projects in their municipalities. I think we have a good understanding of why we should have housing. In fact, they are more than co-

operating with us to see that these projects, even on the old basis, will move ahead a lot faster this year than they did last. I am hoping, and, I am certain and would almost bet money on it, that The National Housing Act will be changed in Ottawa within the next few weeks and we will be in business on the basis I outlined. I would like to reiterate that this is the basis we worked out and recommended to the federal authorities, sir, which they have recognized will work in this province and perhaps in other provinces. If it comes through as we anticipate, we will have a very good and a very sound housing programme.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think it is very interesting that the hon. Minister tells us about the difficulties in this field. If this was a very simple field even this government could have solved it. But it is not a simple field and that is the reason there has been so much agitation about it. It is not a simple field at all. All the things the hon. Minister says are in fact correct.

Nobody is suggesting that you build these massive group housing efforts any longer. Thinking has advanced far and beyond that. It has even seeped into the department. Even the department has begun to realize there are different ways of doing things. I am certain that if there needs to be any action out of Ottawa it will be forthcoming, and I share the hon. Minister's optimism in this because I am sure Ottawa recognizes its responsibilities well.

But even now we have not heard from the hon. Minister that these "could's" or "we might's" or "if it is economically feasible's" are part of positive programmes that this government pledges it will undertake if it gets the legislation. Not all of these things that he talked about require federal legislation or change in the federal legislation. Many of them can be done with the existing legislation.

His predecessor said he was going to do them when there was not even any talk about changing The National Housing Act. This hon. Minister is not even as bold as that. Really, what I insist this province is entitled to is a positive programme of housing—not a history of the difficulties, we all know the difficulties; not a new recital every year when these estimates come up, of the great things we are going to do, or the in-between recitals of the great new projects that suddenly have been announced.

The hon. Minister gave himself sort of an oblique pat on the back over the efforts in Etobicoke, but the Etobicoke matter had

gone on for the better part of two and a half years and it is not settled yet. There is all this intermingling of authorities. There is the provincial authority and the metropolitan authority and the federal authority. How is the hon. Minister going to set up a programme that will cut through this red tape? Who is calling the tune? Are we going to listen for months and months and years before we get any of these things on the ground? Has the hon. Minister no suggestion in regard to these things? What happened to the housing advisory council? He is replacing it with a limited corporation which is going to take over.

I asked the hon. Minister if it was true that the committee that his predecessor set up had not met since the day he took office and he did not answer me. I presume the information I had is right. The committee has not met. He picked on two members of the committee, Mr. Soble and Mr. Dymond, two very capable gentlemen who would have, I am sure, some excellent thoughts insofar as housing is concerned. But with great sound and waving of flags, pet Tories were picked from all over the metropolitan area and put on this great housing committee.

A very charming lady out in my riding who is the head of the local Conservative organization was put on this committee. She got her picture in the bulletin and she thought this was great. But she has not even been called to a meeting. She is very capable and could have given the hon. Minister good advice if he would listen to her, but he does not let her come to a meeting to give any advice.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did she tell the hon. member that?

Mr. Singer: I suggested to the hon. Minister there has not been a meeting since he took office. He has not denied it and I presume that my information is right. I say it is a shame to waste all this good talent that he has—all these people whom he put on the committee and whose pictures he put in the bulletin, yet now he does not give them anything to do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was trying to establish whether she was a good Tory.

Mr. Singer: Well, she was president of the Tory local organization, I presume—

An hon. member: Is there such a thing as a good Tory?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: There is the problem, Mr. Chairman. We need a programme, we do not have one yet, and I would like to get some assurance from the hon. Minister that some serious programme is being put forward. We have not had one in this province for a number of years and it is high time we did.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to answer the question from the hon. member about the meeting. When he refers to the advisory committee, let me say first of all that we do not ask people which party they belong to before we ask them to go on the housing authority.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am sure you do not.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might tell you we have 39 housing authorities across this province and if you want to take a poll I think you will find that the political aspirations of each party are fairly well divided.

Mr. Singer: I was talking about the advisory committee.

Hon. Mr. Randall: And the advisory committee likewise. I will give you a report on the advisory committee because, fortunately, this is a working committee and sometimes we are better off with a working committee than one that meets too often.

The last meeting of the full advisory committee was held on March 30, 1963. At that time the committee reviewed studies which had been carried out over a period of several months by two subcommittees. It approved in principle the proposal that an Ontario housing corporation be formed, and instructed the finance subcommittee to carry out further detailed studies in order that the formation of an Ontario housing corporation could be formally recommended to the government. These studies were to include the administrative, financial, and legislative framework of the corporation.

The finance subcommittee carried out its study during 1963 in co-operation with officials of the housing branch, now a department of the Treasury. Mr. Ken Soble and Mr. A. E. Dymond met with me a month or two ago and, after reviewing the findings of the committee, recommended that I take steps to form the proposed corporation. These we have already done.

When the Ontario Housing Corporation comes into being, its board of directors will replace the Ontario housing advisory committee. This was the view and the recom-

mendations of the committee. And the reason why the advisory committee has not met for a considerable time is not due to the fact that it had become inactive, but because its finance subcommittee was carrying out studies of considerable depth and importance. Meetings of the main committee are on the call of the chairman and, naturally, Mr. Soble wished to obtain the government's views on the proposed housing corporation.

I have no doubt the matter would have been dealt with more expeditiously but for the fact that there was a change of Ministers and Mr. Soble wished to allow me a reasonable time to settle in before bringing his proposal forward. He brought it in shortly after I took office and I introduced the bill here for first reading the day before yesterday.

I think you are getting some action in the housing field—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to step into the area of housing in Metropolitan Toronto. I am curious—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member might as well; everybody else has.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I gathered that, Mr. Minister, but I do not have any of the entrepreneurial aphorisms to throw at the hon. Minister as to taking old women across the street, and "nothing succeeds like success." But I would like to offer some reflections on the housing situation in Metropolitan Toronto.

Let me begin, Mr. Chairman, by congratulating the hon. Minister for the basic content of his estimates and the manner in which he has handled them. The only one of the parts which caused me great concern, was this aspect which dealt with housing because it definitely had the conjunctive approach; everything was couched in "ifs" and "woulds". It tended to be totally predicated on the amendments to federal legislation, and that did cause some anxiety.

However, I would like to say to the hon. Minister that I for one am prepared to reserve judgment temporarily, after making some remarks. But let me tell him this—and I tell it to him without any personal animosity whatsoever—that we on this side of the House next year are going to hurl his words back at him relentlessly in the Throne speech debate, in the Budget debate and, if necessary, in what amounts to a filibuster on this subsection of his estimates unless something happens to the deplorable state of housing in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

I say, Mr. Minister, that the Opposition is in effect forced into this position, because apart from the hospital bed shortage in Metro Toronto, there is no area of greater social neglect on the part of this government than housing. If Franklin Delano Roosevelt was alive today and talking about a third of the nation ill-housed, ill-clad and ill-fed, the ill-housed facet would still apply to Ontario.

Mr. Minister, I gained my first political awakening in the field of public housing. I must admit that this is where reality struck home with a certain shock. The hon. Minister says that he feels we are moving on housing in Metropolitan Toronto, and he was a little sanguine in his remarks. He said he was not sure just how major the problems are, then quoted disturbing statistics from the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, and then said to the hon. member for Downsview that he did not want to rush.

Well, I wonder what happens behind the statistical evidence. Just out of curiosity, I have gone through some of the actual individual cases—and I say to hon. members here that it is not anything that is privy to me. These cases are on file with the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority. They are available to all who wish to see them and, so as not to incriminate the families involved, I will isolate them with letters and give the hon. members of this House some background as to the nature of the cases on the list.

Family A: Man and wife, aged 29; five children, three to thirteen. Renting shack with four rooms; trying to install their own plumbing. Shack is oil space heated, dangerous and expensive; no basement; no kitchen. Stove is merely a plugged-in affair with faulty and dangerous wiring. The man's income is \$300 a month.

Family B: Woman separated, aged 33; three children, 11, 12, 14; sharing small bungalow on farm property; total of 11 inhabitants. No chance of repair because the so-called house is marked for demolition; septic tank, inoperative. Income is \$203 a month.

Family C: Man and wife, 34 and 29; four children, ages two to ten; occupying three small, unfinished basement rooms in a private house. No bath or shower; no proper light or air; no heat, basement continually damp and floods between seasons. Fire hazard. Children suffer from chronic bronchitis. Income is \$300 a month.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this last family resides in my own riding. I know that the children will have their health perma-

nently impaired unless they move out of a situation which attacks the bronchial condition they have, and yet the public housing condition persists.

Then you have large numbers of additional cases on the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority files which, as you know, are elderly people who simply cannot get onto the waiting list of the Metro Toronto Housing Company Limited.

Perhaps hon. members would be interested to know that certain isolated cases go back to January of 1958 and that most are at least two years on the list. To give the 1,800 cases some interpretation, let me tell the hon. members of this House that at the beginning of April, 1964, in the one housing authority, there were 157 families looking for one-bedroom homes, 476 looking for two bedrooms, 628 for three bedrooms—I ask you to think of the implications for children—345 for four bedrooms, and 106 for five bedrooms. That total is 1,712 families, Mr. Chairman; since I got this figure it has apparently risen to 1,800, and they are coming in at the rate of 2,000 families per year—or 40 per week.

I would like to expand on it slightly. That survey is a little illusory because that is only low rental family housing. In the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Corporation Limited, which deals with housing for old age citizens, there are presently some 2,500 people on the waiting list. Two years is a conservative estimate of the waiting period. They are coming in at the rate of eight to ten a day, which means we will have over 2,000 cases plus, within one year.

The turnover is small. At the moment no space for old age citizens will be available until Thistletown is opened, one-and-a-half to two years from now at least. By that time we should have 5,000 to 6,000 people on the list. Let it be said, Mr. Chairman, that 80 per cent of these people are single and that three-quarters of that 80 per cent are single women.

The hon. Minister delights in his little aphorisms, and I remember him saying in his original speech, "You cannot argue with success." I would say to the hon. Minister: "Nor can you argue with failure." No matter what the hon. Minister says about the housing branch in the province of Ontario in the last three years, the situation in Metropolitan Toronto is a failure. It cannot possibly be described otherwise, and I do not think even certain Metropolitan Toronto Conservative members would suggest they do so.

The point is, and I refer the hon. Minister to his own remarks, that these are not simply

welfare cases by any stretch of the imagination. Welfare cases only take up ten to 15 per cent of the inhabitants of public housing units.

I appreciated the hon. Minister pointing that out because too often there are too many prejudices related to it. Eighty-five to 90 per cent of the people involved are low income earners—by no means welfare cases—playing an important and functional role in society and with no opportunity for adequate housing. And if I may say to the hon. Minister, when he came to that portion of his remarks which was supposed to alleviate the public housing situation, there were certain profound weaknesses. Again I do not say it with any animosity.

Weakness number one, the most striking, was that the hon. Minister gave no suggestion to this House at all as to how the provincial government in Ontario intended to cut through the confusion of existing housing authorities in the Metropolitan Toronto area. We have one huge and persistent jurisdictional muddle bordering on fiasco. When thinking about it and reading about it the only analogy that came to mind was Parkinson's law—the hon. Minister will remember it—that work expands so as to assume the time available for its completion. That is the nature of housing in Metropolitan Toronto.

Seven officials are now doing what one did before, says Parkinson, and if you substitute the provincial government for official A, this little paragraph from that noteworthy treatise sums it up rather nicely:

A is actually working harder than ever. An incoming document may well come before each of them in turn. Official E decides that it is all within the province of F, who places a draft reply before C, who amends it drastically before consulting D, who asks G to deal with it. But G goes on leave at this point, handing the file over to H, who drafts the minute that is signed by D and returns to C who revises the draft accordingly and lays the new version before A.

And A, in the person of the provincial government, stands paralyzed before it all. When eminent people in the field of public housing get up to speak on the state of housing in the Metropolitan Toronto area they need graphs, they need legends, charts, maps, interpreters, to try to cut through the labyrinth. Indeed, when W. Harold Clark spoke at the meeting of the social planning council of Metro on January 28, 1964, in order that the people in the audience could comprehend,

he devised such a map. The hon. Minister has doubtless seen it. His deputy Minister has doubtless memorized it. The nature of the material here is simply staggering.

Let me run through a couple of things quickly for the interest of the hon. members of the House. Let us leave out York township for a moment. I would like to point out to the hon. members of the House that there are four housing agencies in Metropolitan Toronto: The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited, the Housing Authority of Toronto and the City of Toronto Limited Dividend Housing Corporation Limited. That is a considerable mouthful in itself.

One of them is appointed by and responsible to the province of Ontario; another appointed by and responsible to the Metropolitan council, and the others appointed by and responsible to the city of Toronto. The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority operates as a management agency only for low rental subsidized family housing for the provincial and federal governments. The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited is a private company which manages and builds senior citizens' housing, owned by the municipality of Metro Toronto. The Housing Authority of Toronto is controlled by the city of Toronto and concerned with Regent Park North exclusively. The City of Toronto Limited Dividend Housing Corporation Limited is also controlled by the city of Toronto to provide moderate rental family housing such as the Moss Park project—that great irrelevant colossus that this government managed to produce and encourage.

All the individual housing authorities have different financing arrangements. All of them handle their losses differently. All of the maximum incomes for admission are different. All the minimum rentals are different, and the residential requirements vary. There is no sense of cohesion whatsoever and Parkinson's law triumphs.

Then you have a man like W. Harold Clark making a presentation to a meeting of the social planning council, you have him finally ending up in presenting us with a chart and a graph providing a legend by way of a delightful and satirical commentary, were it not for the fact that human beings are involved.

The final conclusion is simply this: In 1958 Metropolitan Toronto, with the encouragement of the provincial government, set an objective of 1,000 units of low rental family housing a year. That would be 5,000 units by 1963.

We now have reached 352 units, 7 per cent of the target according to W. Harold Clark. In senior citizens' housing, we have 1,106 units out of 2,500 proposed, or 44 per cent of the target. So I say to the hon. Minister that his words are simply sanguine. They strike a false note with the hon. members of the Opposition. Something is wrong.

To have proposed an Ontario Provincial Housing Corporation without suggesting how it will cut through the muddle of jurisdictional differences in Metropolitan Toronto is to have added simply another aspect of superstructure. I would think that the individual housing groups in Toronto, the individual authorities, would want to know.

Mr. Minister, having said that, I would hope he would be kind enough, as he has been so willing to reply on all other aspects, to let us know what his intentions are in this field, and whether the Provincial Housing Corporation will in fact be simply an added fabric of superstructure or whether it will have some relevance.

The second serious weakness which was alluded to by the hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. Minister predicates his speech on an amendment to The National Housing Act, an amendment particularly, I think, to section 16. But he gives no indication whatsoever to what lengths the province is prepared to go to add to, or to substantiate, the federal legislation. I add this because the curious thing about public housing and senior citizens' housing and all other similar aspects in the province is that even though mythology deems it otherwise, the province has done very little.

The hon. Minister may correct me, but I think I am right that on all the full recovery projects in Ontario dealing with housing, there has been no loss to the province whatsoever. And most of them, or at least more than 50 per cent of them, have been full recovery. On the land assembly project, Mr. Minister, the province of Ontario has made money. In the actual subsidization of housing projects, municipalities have frequently, because of operating losses and taxes, turned over more than the province. The only place the province was hit hard, if it could be described as that, is in the rent certificate programme which has now been abandoned because of lack of federal participation. Now, for a paltry \$120,000 a year, for which the hon. Minister was able to provide 245 units, that is not a very substantive reason.

We on this side of the House would like to know what, precisely, the Provincial

Housing Corporation is going to do on its part to supplement the federal legislation. Up until now, the Provincial Housing Corporation merely reflects the 12-point programme that Mr. Macaulay had, which I think will forever be known as Macaulay's miscarriage, or perhaps more accurately as Macaulay's miasma—

Mr. Singer: Or Macaulay's folly!

Mr. S. Lewis: Or Macaulay's folly, the alliteration can continue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not keep quiet?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Why don't you?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hon. Minister of Mines has only been in his seat for 30 seconds and already he is itching. I know he wishes to reply volubly, but I would ask him to wait until I extend my remarks so that he has something on which to base his reply.

Having said that, in referring to Macaulay's miscarriage, I simply add that the new Provincial Housing Corporation, which has been set up as a reflection of the 12-point programme, does not go past that 12-point programme at all in our minds. There is apparently no semblance of reality to it, so one asks the hon. Minister for a definition.

The final point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, and I shall be very brief on this, is that one of the things that concerns this particular party in the Opposition ranks is the general vagary which the hon. Minister put before this House and the qualifications which became characteristic of the latter portion of his estimates.

No one denies the virtue of eliminating ghetto-like isolation of public housing units. No one denies the value of subsidized families in low rental accommodation one day being able to buy their homes. No one denies the value of buying up lots of land for ultimate resale.

And let me say, Mr. Chairman, that there is a vast number of people already concerned in this field. When the hon. member for Downsview says "even" your department is concerned, I think he does it an injustice. I do not think the sarcasm is merited.

I think that the monthly publication, *Ontario Housing*, is one of the best in its field. It provides for you and your hon. Cabinet colleagues a basis on which to work.

All the various aspects which animate the minds of men in the new areas of town planning, community development and urban renewal are there—the case against high-rise apartments; the suburbs of today becoming the slums of tomorrow, the lack of integration between home and community; the disintegration of the family unit, and family structure; the effects of shelter on the attitudes and values and approaches of human beings—all these things have, at one time or another, been dealt with; and although one might urge a select committee on it, doubtless more and more thought will be given to them.

But the one thing with which the hon. Minister totally fails to come to grips, and the third aspect I would like to criticize, is the problem of slums in Metropolitan Toronto and urban renewal attendant on those slums. Mr. Minister, you had before you very recently, I think it was in September 1963, a first-rate study in the *Toronto Telegram* by Peter Reilly, who then wrote for that newspaper, of slums on Widmer Street and Napanee Street in the city of Toronto. There was the extraordinary situation where ten families on welfare rolls were paying more in rent to the slum landlord than the slum landlord was paying in taxes to the city. In effect, the Ontario government was assisting in subsidizing a completely uneconomic policy—one which cost the taxpayers an unnecessary amount of money.

Then, in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, Jurgen Hesse outlined the slum areas again somewhat later, with equally vivid descriptions. And throughout the province slums continue to be outlined. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, in a report in 1962, shows that in Sault Ste. Marie evidence of blight caused 55 per cent of the structures to be classified as "less than good."

Kingston: There are many homes which are overcrowded, seriously lacking in sanitary facilities. Dangerously exposed to fire hazards and in a state of disrepair.

Hamilton: Pockets of substandard housing in the poor areas, in the older sections of the city, where it is expected that the worst conditions would prevail.

Windsor: The central parts of the city, residential, commercial and industrial, are declining and give little incentive for improvement. Of over 25,000 structures 13 per cent are vulnerable to blight, three per cent are partly blighted and 9.7 per cent completed blighted.

And I am sure the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville knows a great more about this than I do.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt, if you do not mind? The percentage with reference to Windsor is incorrect, the decimal point is in the wrong place. I think the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville will confirm what I have just said.

Mr. Newman: That is right, Mr. Chairman, it should be 2,500 not 25,000; and point 97, less than one per cent, rather than 9.7.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine. I hope the hon. Minister will appreciate that I was quoting from a document on which the correction was not made—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes, yes!

Mr. S. Lewis:—but I think if one includes Sault Ste. Marie and Ottawa and Hamilton and the words of major critics in the field like Dr. Albert Rose of the School of Social Work, University of Toronto, plus the evidence of what newspaper reporters accumulated in the city of Metropolitan Toronto, then I think the case for the presence of slums in Metropolitan Toronto and the province has been made.

Of course, what is at stake, Mr. Chairman, is bad planning, unscrupulous landlords, penurious conditions, wretched morale and grinding misery; and it is not the kind of thing which a provincial government should be prepared to tolerate. So I would say to the hon. Minister that though he is certainly to be congratulated on the preparation of the estimates, and although we view with some little optimism the fruits of his labour over the next year; an analysis at every income level of the contemporary scene of housing in Metropolitan Toronto causes great anxiety—particularly in that primary area of low income where the pressures have accumulated beyond description.

We urge again that something vastly more concrete be done than the mere hints which have been given.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see that the hon. member for Scarborough West is on my side.

I have already acknowledged that we have some problems in housing and the province has the responsibility. And I think the actions of the last few days indicate that we take those responsibilities seriously. If we did not, we would wait for the federal authorities to bring down their legislation and then wait for next year before we did anything. I think

we have indicated that we are going to move in on these problems which the hon. member for Scarborough West has brought to us.

I would be interested to know if he has information as to how long these people had been on the Metro waiting list. There is a great deal of confusion about these waiting lists, which I have been able to have a look at and talk about in the last few months. I do not say these cases do not exist; I am quite sure they do; but I think there are always two sides to the story.

When it comes to building homes for senior citizens, this is a project which Metro Toronto undertakes. As an indication of that, I think we had in the press not too long ago a picture of this new home for 520 senior citizens in Etobicoke into which, the commissioner of welfare in Toronto tells us, if we go much further than this, we will perhaps not have people to put in them. I do not agree with him, but again here is a man who I think is in a position to know something about people requiring homes. He, again, has a different opinion to the gentleman I think you quoted a minute ago—Mr. Clark.

We think Mr. Clark is a very competent authority in many areas, but we do not necessarily agree with his arithmetic. I suppose it could be argued whether he is right or we are right, but on the other hand I say this points out the amount of confusion which exists among competent authorities as to what should constitute housing and how many people are looking for accommodation.

We have been advised by the housing authority not to build any more one-two bedroom accommodations. I think that is certainly something to which we should give serious consideration, because we are having problems with larger families looking for accommodation. I think your seat-mate there brought one to me the other day and we have had a look at it. We realize this can be multiplied many times over.

People may move into an accommodation with two children and, in a few years, they get four; then they get six; and they have to have somewhere to go. We recognize that some of the building restrictions, and some of the accommodation which should be provided in the future, will have to take that matter into consideration.

In answering your question as to what we are doing about it, I simply suggest again to you that we have formed a corporation to do all the things you are asking us to do and which we claim we are going to do; and with this housing corporation it can be done. I think we recognize, or we should recognize,

that the federal authorities have accepted their responsibility in regard to the amount of money required for housing, and they are prepared to put up 90 per cent of the funds on public housing. Up to now they have put up 75 per cent for some of these projects. As I said a little while ago, now they are prepared to be the banker on a larger scale. If they are, I think we can perhaps relieve the municipalities of some of their responsibility.

Not all of it. We think they should have a share in it. But I believe it will also reduce the levels of government involved which, you have pointed out, are working in confusion. I do not say that unkindly. I simply say that in the Metro area, where we have four levels of government, everybody has a different opinion and it is a very difficult thing to get a decision. I have before me here a list containing Staplewood Farm, the Malvern project, Thistletown, O'Connor Drive. I could go on for hours and talk about our problems, but I do not think you want to hear about those. You have already heard enough about our problems. We want to tell you what we think we can do to cure some of these problems. I am not going to burden you with the difficulties we have faced, the aggravation which has been holding up many of the housing projects we have in mind, but I certainly think that, with this corporation, we have solved many of the problems which are inherent in a housing project getting underway.

We must remember that in the urban renewal programme, as you pointed out and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has pointed out, we have several programmes under way. The Ontario provincial government, in its housing division, has a responsibility to find homes for those people who are going to be vacated. They also have the responsibility to build new homes in that area, if they are going to build new homes, and we hope we will have the responsibility under this new housing Act to rehabilitate a lot of old homes, so we do not build, as I think you mentioned, organized slums.

Many of the points that you have raised, we have been going over month in and month out, trying to find the answers. I think the answer is in the housing corporation and having the authority to act as the full authority on housing in this province, which we certainly did not have and do not have at the present time.

Again, I can only say to you and to the hon. members of this House, that if this housing Act is passed, and I am sure it will be, I think a year from now I will be very

pleased to take any criticism on the housing programme and I will deserve everything you say if it does not work out as we anticipate.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Minister, could I be more precise in one respect? Did you say that the Provincial Housing Corporation had been set up to solve the problems of existing confusion? Can you tell the House what will happen to the present four—actually it is more than that—but let us assume four major existing authorities in the Metropolitan Toronto area? What precisely will happen to them? Will they be integrated into one, as most seem to wish? Will they borrow independently? Will they be disbanded? What will in fact happen to them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The only one that we have any jurisdiction over is the Metro housing authority. The rest are municipal bodies. I would hope that by merging our director of housing and his branch into this new housing corporation, we can cut away some of the red tape that these various housing authorities have perhaps created. But the only housing authority that we have any responsibility for in this city at the moment, and which we have to work through, is the Metro housing authority. We have 39 such housing authorities across the province.

I think you can understand if you go into those various areas that we need responsible citizens in those areas to run those housing projects and we need one here in the city of Toronto. We do not need four or five, but if the municipality feels that it wants one to run a housing project of its own, and in some cases it does, that is within its jurisdiction. I think it has the authority to set up as many housing corporations within the municipality as it wants to set up. But we do believe that can be solved with the programme we have outlined.

Let me just suggest this to you. Our problems have not been entirely with the housing authorities. Our problems have been with the four levels of government—federal, provincial, municipal and Metro. The housing authorities have not given us the problem with the implication you have placed on it, but I would say to you that the more people we get out of the picture, the simpler it is going to be to get to the nub of the problem.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have used the word "authority" too frequently perhaps. I have perhaps given an incorrect implication when I said housing authorities—I am sorry. I meant in effect those housing groups which operated at the various levels of government.

I should have been more explicit in my terms. If in fact the housing authority that is specifically administered by the province is integrated with the Provincial Housing Corporation, then by no means have we eliminated a level of government. We still have the federal, the provincial, the Metropolitan Toronto and the individual municipal governments and the problem remains precisely what it was before. Is there any suggestion on the part of the provincial government that it could encourage the amalgamation of one major housing agency to handle building and management in the Metropolitan Toronto area?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think there is a little misunderstanding here. We are involved at government level in the development of housing. The housing authorities are only involved with managing. If we look after development, which we will do through this housing corporation, I think much of the red tape we have heard about will disappear. These housing authorities are management groups, to manage a project as you probably recognize, but they are not particularly involved in the negotiations between us and say, Etobicoke, or us and the federal government. They do not get in our way at all. We are the development group in this province and we are accepting that responsibility. But the housing authorities are management people. They run a housing project and that housing project only.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the exchange between the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. Minister and I do not think the hon. Minister really understands what the confusion was in Etobicoke, or the confusion that existed in Scarborough at Stapleford Farm, for instance. The Metro people said, and I sat on that council, that among other housing projects that they would like to embark on, is one in Scarborough, at Stapleford Farm, or one in Etobicoke, the Thistle town project. You had all of this multiplication of authorities and planning boards on the local level, on the Metro level, on the provincial level. The reason that it took two and a half years to even approach this stage—and the Etobicoke one is not settled yet, and the Scarborough one, I do not think—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Etobicoke is all settled.

Mr. Singer: It is all settled! Well I hope the hon. Minister is right and that it is not going to blow up in his face again. But the problem is this multiplicity of people who have authority to determine—not authorities

in the sense that my hon. friend was perhaps misinterpreting, but in the sense of authorities that have the power to determine. Take your provincial bodies—there are one or two of them—and perhaps you are going to get them into the same room and make only one authority out of them. But you still have your Metropolitan council. You have your Metropolitan planning board. You have Etobicoke council. You have Etobicoke planning board. You have all of these residents who, when they object, have a variety of people before whom they can come and announce their objections and delay and delay and delay.

When the hon. Minister says this is a municipal problem, this is no answer at all. His colleague sitting immediately beside him is the man he charged in this province for the responsibility of municipalities. Municipalities have no authority that this Legislature does not give them. There are no innate rights to municipalities. If the municipal procedure is such that it slows down a project that has great good, surely the Cabinet as a group has a responsibility to cut away that red tape and if necessary to change those municipal laws. It is no answer at all to say, "We are only doing what we can." The hon. Minister is building walls around his department and his responsibility. I say that he has not even the understanding of the problem that his colleague had with his 12-point programme that suffered such a dismal failure. The thing that is needed on the government benches is that one Minister sit down and talk to another one. This is not happening and this is why we have no housing programme.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to suggest to the hon. member for Downsview that we hope in this proposal to build a programme and avoid these big building projects that we got into in Etobicoke. On the other hand, I think the matter of confusion and red tape is grossly overplayed. Even as a private builder, if you wanted to build an apartment house, I think as an attorney working for somebody else you would have to send perhaps 25 or 30 of your subdivision plans out to get them approved by Hydro and the gas company and the water board and many others, so this is not necessarily the major hold-up. The hold-up has been what we previously suggested—in negotiations between municipalities.

We think perhaps a lot of that can be avoided by not building these major housing projects, but by using a builder proposal we have outlined where the homes are already there or will be built by a private builder.

Some of the situations that have developed in the past in the way of delays can be avoided, I think. But as far as I am concerned, I have had no difficulty since taking office negotiating with the various reeves and the councils and getting a programme organized, and I do not foresee any problems in the future.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I must say with the greatest respect to the hon. Minister that he just does not understand. It does not matter whether the building runs 15 storeys in height, or whether you are going to attempt to integrate houses in existing subdivisions, the same local objection not only can exist but will exist and will continue to exist. It has in the past.

I suggest the hon. Minister get out the files dealing with Stapleford Farm and see how many times that was discussed. This did not deal with any great mass project; this was a very intelligent suggestion made in 1957 and 1958 that there be integrated into a new subdivision a certain number of subsidized homes. The same reaction took place that has been felt in relation to all the big projects. And the same delays took place.

There were all these different forums before which people could come and object. The council sat and argued for interminable hours and listened to countless numbers of delegations. When they were not listening, their planning board was. When that avenue of exploration got a little weary, then they went down to the Metro level—and there is a Metro planning board and there is a Metro council. Then when those authorities got a little tired with them they came up here to Queen's Park and made representations to the planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs. And after the hon. member for Riverdale got into the department, he listened to representations, Mr. Chairman. The circle got ever bigger — there were more people to talk to and more reasons for delay. It was not the size of the project or the concept of the project; it is just, as the hon. Minister said, that there is an innate objection to this kind of thing.

If there is nothing in his new legislation he contemplates which is going to eliminate this municipal red tape, we have not taken a step forward; we are running hard to keep up with the *status quo*.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I should say if we are going backward that this looks like a pretty good record here. For 1964 the projects which should be under construction during the year are in Belleville, Chatham,

Cochrane, Collingwood, Delhi, Dunnville, Fort Frances, Galt, Hamilton, Kapuskasing, Kingston, Lindsay, London, Metro Toronto (5), Midland, Oakville, Oshawa, Ottawa (4), Palmerston, Parry Sound, Port Arthur, Sudbury, Timmins, Toronto township, and Woodstock. If we were having trouble with municipalities, there would be nothing going on. I think this proves that we can negotiate with the municipalities and are going ahead with the housing projects in many areas.

Mr. Singer: That proves nothing more than that you are housing by headlines.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to give some information for the benefit of the hon. member for Scarborough West in relation to the remarks he made a few moments ago.

If he would refer to the report of The Department of Municipal Affairs for the year 1963, page 72 and subsequent pages, he will find a report with reference to urban renewal projects under way in the province.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the hon. Minister and with deference to the hon. member for Scarborough West, I would say that we do not have the patience which they have in waiting for the heralded day when you really tackle the problem of public housing. I say that because we have listened year after year to proud enunciations about what you were going to do. And I am just going to table these because you might not have read them. We hope to hear this in your memory so that when you do come back next year you will set a new example in showing that you have taken action because the hon. Minister's predecessors unfortunately have let this go. The hon. members of the New Democratic Party have suggested they would wait until next year. I say that we do not wait until next year.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, I indicated only that next year, if nothing had been done in the interim, we would take certain action. I suggest to the hon. member for Dovercourt that the problems would be best facilitated without this kind of remark.

Mr. Thompson: I am going to try and take the action, which I assume is a critical action, right away. And I am going to label it.

Last year, the former Minister told us that:

In the coming year we will solve the problem of housing in Metro areas. We will produce an understanding between

the new federal government, the provinces and our municipalities, which will open the way to the purchase, on a participating basis, of the existing housing and expanded programme of urban development.

Now we hear from the hon. Minister that we are going to have a co-ordinated authority, and so on.

The reason we are cynical is because we even notice that you are able to fool certain newspapers. You come out with what you suggest is—I do not know if you suggested it but they suggested it—a new approach, that is of buying old houses in certain areas of the city, as an approach to public housing. This strikes us with great irony.

I would like to quote, for example, from *Hansard*, March 15, 1962. This again is on the housing, because I want to emphasize that we have gone through this steadily, year after year. On this, I asked the question:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the hon. Minister—

that was Mr. Macaulay at the time:

—is open for ideas. I presented an idea last year that I thought might be helpful in some of the downtown areas, particularly of Toronto. At that time I do not think the previous Minister—

At that time it was the Minister from Kingston, who has since retired.

I suggested that the previous Minister was not as fertile soil for ideas because he neither answered it nor paid any attention to what I was saying. So, in the hopes that I might have more fertile soil, I would like to read this from *Hansard*. This is in the debate of 1962. And I am referring to the progress in Sacramento, California, where they have a scattered type of housing project.

I do not know if the hon. Minister had an opportunity to study that project but I would say that I think they have gone into some of this rental approach that he is doing, and I congratulate him on doing that. But in connection with this scattered housing approach and these projects in the United States, they have about 10,000 of these projects. In other words, they take dilapidated houses in various downtown areas, take them over as a public housing unit—

I will not bother reading all this for *Hansard*, I will just summarize it.

In Sacramento they have found this really pays off because, by developing the public housing units, building up old houses on a rundown street, they raise the

value of the real estate on the whole street. The housing authority found there that the cost to the housing authority had been \$1,200. And yet two years afterwards the value was \$1,700.

I think one of the reasons for the great delay in the building of housing units in Toronto has been that we have always thought of enormous blocks. I, frankly, see some disadvantages in some of these large blocks. Much as I see the value of Regent Park, I often feel that the inhabitants there, grouped together because of economic circumstances, must feel like goldfish. I would suggest that having scattered units—buying, in other words, individual houses in rundown areas and using these—might be a way not only of holding back the deterioration of streets in Toronto but also in fact, Mr. Chairman, of building them up.

In 1962, Mr. Macaulay replied:

I thank the hon. member. Would he tell me—I usually read in the summer the *Hansard* of the winter before. Would the hon. member give me the pages to which he is referring?

So, sir, we went back to 1961; and I would say that I was not the only one in my party who was striving to get this scattered housing approach. Back in 1961 we were fighting for this.

We go back to 1962, go to 1963, and then an extraordinary thing happens. The Minister comes out and says he is contemplating it. An extraordinary thing to me is that in the crusade for this—I do not know how he does it, he must have a wonderful public relations department—we see an editorial in one of the papers saying, “a new idea by the Minister to have this type of housing”.

If the hon. Minister gets credit for this, fine, as long as he does it. Our concern, sir, is that year after year after year we have brought up the situation of housing, we have given suggestions to the Minister and always, as the hon. member for Scarborough West has said, it seems to be either “maybe”, or “if certain situations happen”, and “this is still applying”.

I, sir, could quote examples, as I am sure every hon. member in the Metropolitan area could, of families who cannot get low cost housing. I think of last winter. I think of people who came into my office and my riding. I am thinking particularly of one family who came, a man and a wife who had five children. One of the children had to get treatment at

the sick children's hospital. The man is a truck driver. He was living in a house in which, he told me, there was cardboard to patch it up, and he was searching to try to get some kind of low rental housing. I wrote to the city. I went through all the authorities and there was delay. I finally telephoned the mayor of Toronto to ask him if we could get this man into something since he has a wife and five children, one of the children attending the sick children's.

Believe me, if you were to phone the mayor, or you, sir, were to start trying to get some of these individual people into housing units, you become fully aware not only of the very human problem attached to it, but also the real lack of public housing.

I appreciate the hon. Minister talked about the senior citizens and showed us a picture. I realize that has been an enthusiastic drive. I think particularly of the former Minister. He was so enthusiastic he was going to build another senior citizens' place out in his riding.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That was just at election time.

Mr. Thompson: Just at election time he was going to do that. In fact, it will not be built. But what I am expressing is the concern we all share in the Opposition with respect to families, particularly with two or three children. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Scarborough West asks the hon. Minister to think of the children in this. This is not being sentimental. This is being realistic about the problem. Sir, we are cynical and we are highly critical of the performance of this government with respect to housing.

The hon. Minister can make a clarification that now he has a co-ordinated approach and we are going to see something. I would say we have to be shown. We stand here condemning what has been in the past. We have some hope that, with the new Minister, something will be done. But if he carries on with the philosophy and approach of the previous Ministers—it seems to be the Conservative approach to housing—very little will be done.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Again let me say that I will accept any suggestion from any hon. member of the House that will improve housing. We do not have all the ideas. We are open for suggestions. I would just like to point this out to the hon. members. Now, sir, they refer to the idea that the former Minister had down on Carlaw Avenue. This proposal was referred to the Metropolitan corporation,

which would be the body responsible for developing the project. After giving the matter some consideration, Metro advised us that for economic and other reasons the site was not considered suitable and recommended alternate sites in North York and Etobicoke. I showed the hon. members, I think, a few minutes ago—

Mr. Singer: Would the hon. Minister not think that a Minister would have investigated that before—

Hon. Mr. Randall: —there is exactly what he had in mind and the project is now under way. So his ideas did work out. Not on the elaborate scale in the city but it worked out where it would do the most good for the most number of people.

I have before me here a copy of The Housing Development Act, 1962, and one clause (c) reads:

The acquisition, improvement and conversion for housing purposes of existing buildings situate in any municipality.

We have had this for two years and tried to get the federal government to change their Act to operate with us. Just now they are listening to the proposal we have made. We hope to have that, as I say, before the session of the Legislature is closed.

So we have had the ability to go ahead and buy up homes and renovate. We could not get the federal authorities to move with us. We think we are ahead of the federal authorities in doing some of the things that the hon. member has recommended. This pressure from the former Minister previous to myself is now bearing some fruit, Mr. Chairman. The things I suggest we can do with this new housing corporation if we had been provided with the enabling legislation two years ago. I would suggest to the hon. member that this change in the legislation will do most of the things that he is recommending with reference to taking old homes and renovating them, and even taking big homes and making duplexes of them. These are the things that we think we can do under this Act, providing the federal authorities come along and help us with the banking.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, since coming into this House I have never ceased to wonder at the way the members of the Liberal Party continually castigate this government for responsibilities which are primarily those of the federal administration. This is not to say that the government of Ontario

has no responsibility here. It has, and it should have done much more than it has done.

We look forward to the new Minister doing far more and over this next year we will watch that with a great deal of interest. But never in any nation where housing has been solved to any degree has it been done without federal authority, federal participation in the matter of low interest loans, and legislation which makes rapid building possible. One of the reasons we are in the situation in which we find ourselves in Ontario today is the neglect of a federal administration in this field ever since the end of the war. An administration by first of all a Liberal government for many years, then a Conservative government for a short time, and now again a Liberal administration which now sits in Ottawa.

It is high time that our friends went down to talk to their friends in Ottawa, remind them of their promises prior to the last two federal elections, and tell them to get busy. I know legislation has been started; but legislation had better be stepped up and we had better see results from their friends in Ottawa. When that result comes, then I hope that this government will build upon the foundation, and will take advantage of every bit of legislation that is put on the statute books down there.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out one of the fundamental problems in the Metro area. It is the fear on the part of individual municipalities—and I pointed this out before in this House—of the costs that would emanate from low rental housing. The municipalities are afraid of unemployment, of welfare costs, of the kind of costs that automatically flow out of a low rental housing development. So while they do not always say this, and while they are able to trump up all kinds of excuses for delay, this problem is fundamental. Perhaps Commissioner Goldenberg, who is now sitting, will be able to answer this problem for us as far as Metro is concerned. It seems to me that until we have one treasury for the whole Metro area into which taxes flow and out of which will come the cost of welfare, education and all these expenses, that we are not going to get a solution in the Metro area to this problem.

The hon. Minister mentioned a short time ago that I had brought to his attention a certain problem in my own riding. I want to bring before the House this very problem which is typical, not only of my riding, but of every riding across this province. We have, perhaps, emphasized too much in Canada the

business of limited dividend housing, designed to help the top bracket of the lower third of our income earners. It is a private development with guaranteed profits of five per cent. But the problem comes here. Those private developers who have built limited dividend housing face the fact that as families go in and, as the hon. Minister has pointed out, more children are born and the families become more and more numerous as far as children are concerned, then the profits start to dwindle because of damage and because of the surplus population within those developments. So the tendency is for limited dividend landlords, as well as others, to frown upon large families.

In my own riding, one of these developments took action not long ago. I have in my hand the notice which one of the families received; a family consisting of a man and his wife and six children. This is the notice. I will read it in part:

This office has today received implicit instructions from the board of directors of [this development company] that all apartments housing more than five persons must immediately be sent official notice to give vacant possession of their premises.

Pressure has been brought to bear on the company by the authorities. We quote:

for the prevention of overcrowding and compliance of health standards no apartment will be permitted to house more than five persons. When this number is exceeded notice must be given by the company to the tenants to quit the premises.

I checked with North York health and other authorities and found that no pressure of this kind had been brought to bear. However, this was used.

We regret to take this action, however, but we must give you official notice to deliver up vacant possession of your apartment by May 15, 1964.

You must realize that due to the above explanation this office has no other alternative. Please confirm with our rental office the date of your departure.

In that one development 20 families with more than three children each have received these notices. I brought this to the attention of the hon. Minister and he has co-operated with us. The developer himself has agreed to co-operate by extending eviction notices a bit. The Metro Housing Authority has been approached and the hon. Minister has been setting up some discussions which might help this particular situation. I think that with

that kind of co-operation from the department something might be done.

But fundamentally the problem is that there are just not enough low rental apartments for the big families that the private developer does not want in his apartments. I know the old argument that so many of us perhaps have offered—that if private enterprise is going to take the profitable segment of the rental business, it should also take the unprofitable section, and if we believe in a private enterprise economy then private enterprise should supply the housing. But this does not work. The only way private enterprise will house the seven-children families, it seems, is by crowding them into one or two rooms and charging the high rent. It is the slum psychology and we just do not believe in that—not any of us, in any part.

We want to see even the large family have decent accommodation. We are not going to get that accommodation through private enterprise and so the state must move into this field. It must move into it with some imagination, and with some ability to comprehend the need, and to supply the funds and the drive and the initiative to do the job.

The hon. Minister has discussed in his presentation certain ideas that he is considering. One of them is the taking over of older premises which might be rebuilt and into which families of this kind might move. This is a long-term project. I saw some projects in the city of London, where the London County Council has brought out certain of the larger old apartment buildings, has refurbished them, fixed them up outside and, they say, put to shame some of the private developers on the same street until they had to do the same kind of thing. This has worked to some extent.

This might be an idea that could be explored. It may well be that developments of this kind where families have received eviction notices might be looked at by the hon. Minister from the point of view of buying them out if they can be acquired at reasonable prices. I would not advocate that the prices developers may ask should be paid, but if developments like this could be bought and then some partitions knocked out and larger apartments of four and five bedrooms developed, it might achieve very quickly the housing of some of these families who are unwanted today by private developers.

I bring this to the hon. Minister's attention. I know he is discussing this and is concerned

with it but I think this is a field where action is needed and needed desperately today. Twenty families at least are waiting with bated breath to know what answer this government might have. We know there are many other families besides these who have the same problem. It is a problem that only government action can solve, but it needs to be solved very quickly if these people are not to be crowded back into slum situations at the rents they can afford. Then these people, instead of having three bedrooms for six or seven people, may have one or two rooms for each family for the same rent as they are paying. This civilization and province can hardly be proud of a situation like that.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows I am a very genial and kind-hearted fellow and I do not take as harsh a view of our hon. friends on the Liberal benches as my hon. colleague from Yorkview. As a matter of fact I welcome evidence of sustained interest in the housing problem on their part.

For years the members in the NDP group, and the CCF group that preceded it, hammered away at the government with regard to housing. In fact the expression, "housing by headlines", Mr. Chairman, of which the hon. member for Downsview now appears so enamoured, was actually coined by Controller William Dennison when he was a member of this House—a CCF member—in the period 1948-51. I reintroduced the expression into the vocabulary of the House two or three years ago and the *Toronto Daily Star* has subsequently picked it up as the title for an editorial. It is a good term, as it applies to the efforts of this government in the housing field over the past 20 years.

Mainly have we had headlines; only to a very limited degree have we had houses. Certainly we have not had houses or housing units in anything like the degree to which they are required. Now we have a new Minister. As far as this group is concerned, we are prepared to let the new Minister show his mettle. We are not going to pre-judge him before he has even had a chance. He has indicated certain new developments which he is initiating. I think those developments indicate a possibility, at least, that there will be a more active and integrated policy than in the past.

The first major development that he has announced is the establishment of a housing corporation, which it is hoped will co-ordinate housing policy and take some initiative in developing housing programmes throughout the municipalities in the province.

It is also interesting to note another comment that the hon. Minister made two or three times when he said that he and the new corporation accept responsibility for development in the housing field. I think that is a fair summary of what he said. It may not be his exact words, but he accepts responsibility in this field. If that is genuinely true, it is a step forward of major importance.

I can remember the predecessor of the hon. Minister just last year bewailing the fact that although he was all dressed up and ready to go, he could not get any of the municipalities to move, and that the burdens which the municipalities imposed upon him were almost too much for any human being to bear. One of the difficulties was that the hon. gentleman was so rarely in Ontario that the municipalities probably did not have a chance to speak more than two consecutive sentences to him.

However, we now have it accepted, I take it from what the hon. Minister said, that the fundamental responsibility for initiating housing projects is on the provincial government and its agency. If that is true, then it is an important step forward and it may help to break the log jam that has so long existed in the housing field.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, when I look at the estimates that are now before us, I am by no means reassured that we are going to have an energetic and aggressive programme of development in the coming year. We are being asked to vote for capital purposes in the field of housing \$6,099,000. That is a bit higher than last year, Mr. Chairman. I believe last year we voted for \$4.37 million. But then, last year was down from previous years. I think if you look at the record over the years, you will find that the House has voted as much as \$7 million or \$8 million for capital purposes in regard to housing, and \$5 million or \$6 million has been the normal figure.

One of the difficulties has been that the government has rarely, if ever, spent the money which was voted to it. I suppose if it gets an appropriation of \$6 million, as it is hoping to do this year, and it actually spends it, that will be a step forward. But I am suggesting to this House, Mr. Chairman, that \$6 million for capital purposes—and I realize that does not represent the total capital investment, that only represents a percentage of it and the smallest percentage at that—but \$6 million for an entire fiscal year will be only a drop in the bucket in solving the housing problem with which we are now faced. I make that statement on the assumption that all of the \$6 million is going to be

spent. The past record of the government does not lead one to believe that it will, in fact, be spent.

I will speak mainly about Metropolitan Toronto, because it is the area with which I am most familiar. I would say to the hon. Minister, and to anyone else who may be interested in listening, that the housing situation in Metro Toronto has been and continues to be an organized mess. There is conflicting jurisdiction to the point where hardly anybody knows where to turn. Plans are announced regularly which do not mature at all, or mature years late. Some of them are completely perverted before they get into the final stage as, for example, the Moss Park project which I think can be described only as an abortion.

It started out as a good idea. It was completely ruined by a former federal Minister of Public Works, Mr. Walker, who is not now a member of the federal House, much less of the Cabinet. He wanted to turn the whole thing over to private enterprise. That was a ridiculous idea. But it ended up that Moss Park did not turn out to be what had been planned. It turned out to be a limited dividend housing project, which displaced a great many people with low incomes and did not provide any accommodation which was useful to them.

The failure of housing in this Metro area has affected, most severely, two groups of people—the poor and the elderly. I read an article in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*—I do not know if it is true, but it is close enough to be true so I think I will accept it—that rents in Metro Toronto are the highest in the whole of Canada, and they are particularly high for poor families.

I have seen statements to the effect that the poor are happier down in the slums; they get lower rents down there. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a complete misconception. They do not get low rents down there. In the slum areas rents are the highest anywhere in the whole city in relation to what the people get. Slum landlords are growing fat, and have been growing fat for years, on the basis of the misery of people who simply cannot afford to get out of the slums. As a matter of fact, they have to pay so much for inadequate accommodation that it is impossible for them to save any money. Thus they cannot get a down payment on a house and escape from the slum environment. They are in it, and they get deeper and deeper in as time goes on.

Some of our urban development projects intensify the situation. They clear out some

of the slum housing, which is desirable in itself, but the point is no provision is made for housing the people who are displaced, so that the demand for the stock of slum housing increases and the rents these people have to pay go up. So we have this vicious circle, in which the poor people are caught, of high rents for totally inadequate, in fact reprehensible, accommodation with very little escape for them. The failure of our public housing programme to provide housing units at rents they can afford, in the quantities needed, means that to date they have no apparent escape from this vicious circle.

The other group of people who have been seriously affected by the failure of our housing programme are the elderly. The hon. Minister quoted, I think it was, the commissioner of welfare and housing in the city of Toronto to the effect that when the Thistle-town project—and the one which I think is on the drawing boards right now, somewhere in the vicinity of Keele and Wilson—is completed, there is a possibility there will not be any demand for housing for senior citizens. I must say that is not the story I got from the commissioner of housing and welfare or from any of the other people involved in the housing problem in the city of Toronto.

The situation at the present time is that an elderly person who is a widow, a widower, or single, simply cannot get into any existing housing development. The only hope for them is on those rare occasions when a new development is built and there are some openings for those people. But as far as getting into an existing unit is concerned it is impossible, for a very obvious reason. The married couples in existing projects sooner or later lose one of their number, so there is a widow or a widower left. Naturally, the housing authorities have to give priority to a survivor, in a case like that, for whatever single units are available. The single units are filled up entirely from within the project and people on the outside stay on the outside for years.

I was working not long ago on the case of a lady who has been on the waiting list for over two years. She has at least another year to go until Thistle-town, or the project at Keele and Wilson, opens up; and to suggest that we seem to be within sight of solving the problems for the elderly, in my opinion, is a sheer delusion. It may be that when Thistle-town and Keele and Wilson open up, some of the people who have been waiting for years will be able to get in; but then we will have all the new accumulation of applications which will take place during

the coming year and will continue in subsequent years. Unless something is done on a much larger scale than has ever been contemplated before, elderly citizens, especially those who are single or widowed, are just not going to be able to get into public housing developments.

The hon. Minister has mentioned that he is now working on a programme of spreading low rental housing units throughout the community. He is also interested in pushing ahead if he can get federal assistance, in taking over existing housing units, rehabilitating them and making them available for low-rent housing. All this is good, Mr. Chairman. I think it is a step forward. But at the same time I am doubtful if projects of that kind, by themselves, are going to meet the urgent housing problem we have had for years.

You know, a few years ago we were presented with a rent certificate plan which was going to be a bold new attack on the housing programme. I never was too enamoured of it but it was undertaken at any rate. I do not know what the present count is on the rent certificate plan, but the last I heard there were something in the neighbourhood of 200 to 250 units involved in the rent certificate plan in Metro Toronto. I do not think any were involved anywhere else, certainly very few.

This sort of nibbling at the problem, Mr. Chairman, is of some value but it is basically an evasion of the whole problem. Let us face it, we have in the city of Toronto, and to a lesser degree in other cities, a major problem of redevelopment. In fact, I read into the record, two or three years ago, an extract from one of the government's own publications, *Ontario Housing*. I do not happen to have the issue with me here now, but I can well remember the point I was interested in. It was estimated that in the city of Toronto alone there are approximately 1,000 acres that are ripe for redevelopment. That was two or three years ago. Some, but very little redevelopment has taken place in the ensuing period, and I have no doubt the blight has extended beyond that area.

We still have these major problems of slum clearance, of clearing out housing that is totally inadequate and is beyond rehabilitation. Picking up a housing unit here or putting in a low-rent unit there is not going to tackle the real problem of slum clearance. There is no use going in for slum clearance unless we have housing accommodation to which the displaced people can go. We have already had experience with limited slum

clearance without adequate provision for the people displaced, and we find that all that does is to put more profits into the pockets of the slum landlords.

We cannot evade the overall problem of slum clearance and urban renewal. We can play around all we like with rent certificate plans, and with plans to buy up existing houses, and convert and improve them. We can play around with projects to place low-rent housing units in other developments, but we still have to face up to the problem of urban redevelopment. I cannot see anything in any of the plans the hon. Minister announced that indicates that the government is now even concerning itself with the problem, that it even cares about it. Yet we will never solve the housing problem until we head right into the problem of slum clearance.

I am going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that housing cannot be separated from the whole problem of community development. Unfortunately, in the organization of government in this province, the two problems of housing and community planning are put under separate jurisdictions. This is an unfortunate consequence because they really cannot properly be separated. What is happening is that we are building new slums for tomorrow because of a lack of proper community planning and proper control over community development. We have a tremendous problem of slum clearance right now and yet, because we leave most housing in the hands of promoters, speculators and developers, we are building—and have been ever since World War II—potential new slums all around our city, rows upon rows of dog kennels in which human beings are asked to live without any individuality or identity, with the trees all knocked down and with very little in the way of community services. This has been our unfortunate experience in the past.

I am not saying that is true of all developments. There are some notable exceptions, but it is true of far too many. People are simply put into uniform compartments out in the suburbs. I have often heard it said, quite wrongly, that socialists want to pour all human beings into the same mould. This is a gross misunderstanding of the aims of socialism, which is to do the exact opposite—to liberate the individual so that he can develop his own individual talents. But I am always interested to note how capitalism keeps pouring people into the same mould in developments along the fringes of our cities, and not only that, Mr. Chairman, in the apartment developments in the downtown areas of our cities as well.

This has become the great new housing development in our cities—high-rise apartments in the downtown areas, most of them carrying quite high rents. They are faceless monsters, in which human beings are put into their individual little cells, all identical to the other. In fact, you can go into these apartment buildings and the design of the apartments is not only the same within the one apartment building, it is the same from apartment building to apartment building. They are all the same great ugly monstrosities on our horizon: square boxes with their little balconies jutting out. I do not know who it was who made the first plan for one of these new apartment developments, but if he gets royalties he must have made a fortune, because nearly all of them are made from the same pattern, they all come from exactly the same plan.

I was interested to note an article in *Ontario Housing*, the government's own publication, in February, 1964, by Paul Ringer of the Metro Toronto Housing Authority, entitled "The Case against the High Rise." I will not read the article but I will read a summary of it which appears at the beginning:

The fact of high-rise living is here and now. One is prepared to accept higher densities as being necessary for urban life and necessary perhaps to overcome urban sprawl. However, must these higher densities all be the same and look the same? Row after row of "vertical filing cabinets" are replacing row after row of single detached "strawberry boxes."

I called them dog kennels, Mr. Ringer calls them strawberry boxes.

It is difficult to understand how this process adds either to the appearance of a neighbourhood or even its efficiency. Despite planning platitudes about mixed developments and pleasant relationship in space of high- and low-rise buildings, these things occur very rarely. The high-rise apartment buildings are built by "merchant builders" who generally have a tendency to play one note, the one that will sell or rent most easily and return the greatest profit.

This has been the basic cause of our failure, Mr. Chairman. The housing has been turned over to speculators in the main, the government's efforts have been most inadequate, and there has been very little planning control of development by private developers. So we get the strawberry boxes in the suburbs and the vertical filing cabinets within the city core and very little is done for the people who

have the most urgent need for housing, the low-income family.

Metro Toronto's great achievement under the chairmanship of Mr. Gardiner was in the field of public works, particularly in the field of expressways. A great many expressways were put on the drawing board and some of them were actually started and some of them are now nearing completion. We are also making some progress in subway construction, which in my opinion is more important than expressway construction, but I will recognize that both of them are necessary and desirable.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that we started to consider that a city is or should be a place, where people live, not merely a place where they move back and forth to work. Both Metro Toronto and the city of Toronto have failed dismally to develop the community in a way in which it will provide the sort of amenities that people need in order to have a proper place to live.

I would like to quote from another expert in this field, a gentleman called Nigel H. Richardson. In an article entitled, "Let's Stop Building Tomorrow's Slums," which appeared in the *Community Planning Review* of June, 1959, published by the Community Planning Association of Canada, Mr. Richardson said:

We must recognize that what we are dealing with is one of the most fundamental of human needs; that it involves not just the provision of shelter but the shaping of lives and ways of living; that, in many more senses than the merely physical, we are building tomorrow's Canada. The development and the subdivision just aren't good enough. If we continue to entrust the building of human communities to the ad man, the speculative subdivider, the real estate firm and the small private contractor, without any public control other than the primitive standards we use today, we are going to keep on building tomorrow's slums on a scale that will dwarf anything we know now. Surely, when our children and grandchildren have to deal with the heritage we are in process of leaving them, they are going to wonder if we were crazy.

Mr. Chairman, I put that sort of proposition before the hon. Minister as an indication of the magnitude of the challenge with which he is faced. It is all very well to say that we are now setting up a housing corporation. That undoubtedly will be a step forward.

But we are not going to make any real impression on the type of problem we face with a capital expenditure of \$6 million, even

assuming that the government will do what it has not done in the past; and that is to use all of the appropriation voted to it. A much more energetic approach has to be taken. We will await with interest the developments during the new year.

I think that the setting up of the housing corporation will be a step forward, but I sense that the hon. Minister has not really appreciated the magnitude of the task he is up against. He has inherited 20 years of total neglect by the present government and, one can say, even greater neglect prior to that because prior to World War II governments did not even consider that they had a significant responsibility in the housing field. Since World War II there has been a growing acknowledgment that there is some responsibility, but an almost total failure to accept this responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot blame this hon. Minister for what happened in the past; but I am going to suggest to him that the failures and neglect of the past make a herculean effort necessary in the future. I do not see evidence of a herculean effort in what he has placed before us in these estimates.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, the torrent of words, like a brook, about housing in all its phases goes on together. I guess, like the brook, it is losing itself into some sort of a sea. But I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. Has this department anything to do with the situation in Cobalt? I notice the headline says that "Cobalt tenants threaten gunfire". They are being forced to move off of mine land. An approach has been made by the mayor of Cobalt, Madam Cunningham, to the provincial government. Does the problem there have anything to do with this department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it has nothing to do with us. That land is owned by the mining company.

Mr. Troy: Yes. Then she would not be seeing the hon. Minister. She would be seeing the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would presume so.

Mr. Troy: Thank you.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the Toronto members and others about the problem of housing in Metro Toronto and its fringes, and the problem of public housing in general. I would like to deal with the problem as I see it in the city of Hamilton, and in partic-

ular in relation to a project we have there now. I might say I am glad to hear the hon. Minister saying that Hamilton was one of the projects that they expect will start this year.

I have been interested in this project and have had some doubts as to whether it was going to come to fruition because of the kind of a survey that was taken. In the last session of this House I raised, with the previous Minister of Economics and Development, what I thought was a problem in the Roxborough Park development in Hamilton, in regard to the type of formula established there—inasmuch as when the income went over a certain level the people were given notice to vacate. I had received several calls and letters from these people asking that something be done, that they would like to stay there, that they were willing to pay more rent because their roots had been there for the eight years the project had been in operation and their children were going to school there, and that they had developed a community spirit.

The Minister at that time gave me a very receptive reply inasmuch as he agreed with this kind of a problem and was in favour of changing the formula to one of geared income—which was being talked about much at that time—and that he would certainly support it and get some assistance from the federal Minister at that time.

I know that several of the residents of that project did contact the federal Minister with their problem to see if he could do anything; and they did receive an answer, to the effect that this was a provincial and municipal problem and that the initiative would have to come from the municipality. Well, this was fine. I was pleased that there was some recognition of that kind of a problem.

After several complaints had been raised at the Hamilton and District Labour Council about the lack of adequate housing and sub-standard housing, the council set up a public housing committee and we did approach the city council with our impression of the problem. At the meeting we had with the city council we were informed that they had requested a survey be taken in Hamilton to find out what the demands were for public housing, or more public housing, in the Hamilton area.

I did meet with the mayor myself prior to that meeting, in regard to the Roxborough Park project and the problems the people were facing there. He sympathized with the problem and promised me he would take it to the board of control to suggest an investi-

gation to see if there could be a change made from the formula to the geared-to-income formula, or even as to whether or not the people could buy homes in this particular project.

I do not know what happened in the meantime. I could not get satisfaction to the point where it was taken to the board of control. I was convinced, because I was told that when this kind of a subject is raised in a municipality then right away the free enterprise real estate people get their machinery going. They have the ability to put the damper on public housing. But nevertheless, we did get the assurance that the provincial government, under the housing board, was going to make a survey. I did receive a copy of the letter that the director sent to the city clerk telling him they were pleased they were going to be able to start the survey and asking him to make certain advertisements. The advertisement was made, and within less than a month there was a press release to the effect that a public housing survey draws little response. This sort of agitated me and, particularly, the Hamilton labour council housing committee because it appeared that this kind of thing may bring about inaction in relation to a public housing project for Hamilton.

I was little surprised at that kind of response because the kind of ad that went into the newspaper was one that you would put there if you did not want anyone to recognize it. It is the kind of ad that went into the *Hamilton Spectator* on the second to last page, among all of the advertisements for bingo games, bazaars and city by-law regulations. It was hidden in one corner. And you can see the kind of response that would raise with people in need of housing. Of course, I found out later that the survey was being made on the basis of trying to find out what people wanted and not what they needed. This again gave me some feeling that a real analytic survey was not going to be made—the kind that should be made to really determine what we need in regard to public housing.

I am very pleased with the announcement that the establishment of a provincial housing corporation is now a fact. I must say that the man who has been appointed as chairman is one in whom I have a lot of faith, a public citizen, a person who is dedicated to do something for the community and I am sure that Mr. Soble will do his utmost to see that the proper kind of a job is done.

But I would suggest that the Roxborough Park project is one that could be gone into

immediately. I think there is everything there to try the experiment of an integrated community. I know that most of the public housing planners are now in favour of geared-to-income projects and to the kind of project where they can buy homes and put the public housing into the general municipality's way of life. The Roxborough Park project is still under the old formula.

I have been called twice this week by families who are now in the fear of receiving their notice to vacate because they have now submitted their T-1 forms. They feel that because they may have gone \$100 over the allowable level, they will get their notice to get out. I have talked to several families there about a change to a formula of geared-to-income or a formula that would allow them to buy. They are very pleased with this kind of an idea, even though they would have to pay, in some cases, substantially more rent. They would rather do that and feel they could live there until they decided to move themselves, and pay the extra rent, rather than be given their notice to vacate.

The Roxborough Park project is one that could be turned into a real community project. It has multiple family units. It has single detached units. It has attached units, semi-detached units. I think that here we could immediately get into this programme and take the fear of frustration off most of the people who are tenants in those units. They are all frustrated with the fear that the time will come when they receive their notice to vacate because they have gone over a certain amount of income.

As I said, there is generally a good community spirit in that project. But there is also a great degree of suspicion amongst the tenants, wondering if their wife gets a job to help supplement the need for income, the neighbour is going to squeal on them; whether they have to be careful about working overtime and not let anybody know it. In some cases, overtime income has brought about the notice to vacate in some particular instances. So I would hope that this project could be given immediate attention in the Hamilton area.

I had a meeting with the Hamilton labour council housing committee, with Mrs. Levine, in regard to the kind of survey being made. We were disappointed when we learned that to this kind of advertisement, and the subsequent press release, there was little response. As you know, the person who would be interested would either have to go to the city hall or write for a questionnaire, fill the questionnaire in—which was quite

lengthy—and send it back, before the survey could be effective. We expressed our concern to Mrs. Levine and we felt that she should have more help in the field.

They should make a door-to-door canvass in some of the slum areas uptown, in the areas considered to be inadequate for housing, and find out just what is going on there. She told us very frankly that her job was not to analyze and make a survey as to the needs of people, but as to the wants of people. She was very frank in saying that, if you do otherwise, you get into the area of philosophy and not practical analytic survey.

But I think we have got to determine the needs, or we are not going to do the real job. I feel now, with the results of the survey up to date, even with the fact that we have a backlog of 300 applicants for admission into the Roxborough Park project and, up until a month ago, they had received 120 questionnaires in response indicating a desire for this type of public housing, that without any doubt there is justification for at least another 1,000-home project in the Hamilton area.

The main point I would like to make is that the present project should be changed to a geared-to-income project. I think it would develop a far better situation in that particular area.

There are a lot of things which arise from the type of project existing in Roxborough Park. It made me feel, when visiting many of the families, that there was sort of a "commissar" approach, inasmuch as the inspector—they felt anyway, although I told them it should not be the case—would walk in at any time. I had instances related to me where inspectors were doing just this, where the people could not paint their rooms unless the inspector came and looked it over and notified them some time later that they could purchase paint and paint their bathrooms or their kitchens. Other people complained that the inspector would come and tell them that men were coming at a certain time to paint. They had nothing to say about what time they would come. At three o'clock in the afternoon, if he said, "This is the time we are coming into your place to paint," he came then and he painted, whether they were ready for it or not.

I think there should be a real look at the formula of this existing project as to whether—I think it would be very simple—there were some people who were undecided as to whether the present tenants should pay the difference. I believe it was between \$11 and \$18 difference in rent, based on the year's

income project, as to the present type; but I feel that it is very simple to take a survey in that particular project to ascertain whether they would be satisfied with the geared-to-income kind of a formula. I also think it is the kind of project where several would entertain the idea of buying their own property rather than sit there, undecided, and always expecting to get their notice to vacate.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 412 agreed to?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. Minister was going to make some comments so I was holding back.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would like to comment on what the hon. member for Wentworth East said.

In the first place, the survey of demand and need is still going on in Hamilton. We did not issue that press release; I do not know where it came from. I am glad you brought it to our attention that the ad was not very compelling. Perhaps what we should do is prepare these ads for the municipalities. It is the municipalities which place the ads so we will take a look at that and make sure that the ads get more attention. But the survey on need and demand is still on; we have not completed it yet.

I would like to point out about these homes in Roxborough: In view of the project which was established there we are in no position to offer those homes for sale to the people living in them. But certainly we think that if we had other projects in the area available on a purchase basis, they would get first opportunity to buy them.

Mr. Gisborn: What I would like to ask the hon. Minister is: Is it not permissible to change the formula to a geared-to-income formula?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have that under study at the moment. It is one of the things we are talking about.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three questions I would like to ask the hon. Minister before the vote is passed.

First of all, with regard to item four under vote 405, the hon. Minister is asking for \$150,000 for the rent certificate scheme. I would like to ask him for up-to-date information on that project. How many units are now covered by the rent certificate plan and how many, is it envisaged, will be covered in this fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: At the present time there are 245 units, which cost the province \$120,000 last year. We set up a budget of \$150,000 this year because many of those units are now up for renewal of leases and the landlords all want more money. This is one of the problems we run into with a rental basis, which we hope again to solve in this new programme for housing.

Mr. Bryden: Would one be entitled to assume, from what the hon. Minister has just said, that it is not envisaged that the rent certificate plan will be expanded? I got the impression from what he said that any additional money provided is not to increase the number of units covered, but simply to cover the possible increased costs of rent. Is that a fair assumption?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is a programme on which the provincial government went alone, as the federal government would not participate, and that is one of the reasons why we stopped when we did. I think the new programme we are talking about will supplement that—in this rental and purchase of homes we are talking about in our new programme—so we are looking at it. But I think we can find a better answer than we have had in that programme of 245 homes. We think that the new programme will replace that without too much difficulty and at a lot less cost.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is a question I would like to ask under vote 412, which covers the capital end of the programme.

Last year I think the amount voted was \$4,370,000. I would like to ask how much of that appropriation was spent?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Approximately \$2.3 million.

Mr. Bryden: Well, that is about the poorest year we have ever had, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I do not think so.

Mr. Bryden: We cut down the vote last year because the government was not spending. We did not cut down the vote; the hon. Minister cut down the vote, presumably because the government was not spending even what was appropriated for it. And here we have the smallest vote in years and only half of it spent.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We had the money available but could not get the projects underway, so we spent whatever we could

spend on the programme. To go back on previous years: In 1960, we spent \$2,465,750; 1960-61, \$2,189,000; 1961-62, \$1,000,814; 1962-63, \$1,000,843; and 1963-64, \$2.3 million.

I think the hon. member asked before, when he was on his feet, what are we going to do with \$6 million? I would just like to suggest to you that I have not heard of any limits as far as the federal government is concerned. If they match that with a 90 per cent loan there is \$66 million which can be spent on housing. And if we split that 10 per cent difference with the municipalities and they put up \$6 million that is \$12 million, as against \$120 million we will have to spend on housing from the federal authorities.

Mr. Singer: Easier than making money on the market.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There is a limit. I presume there would be a limit as to how far Mr. Pearson would want to go. But so far, on a basis of 10 per cent, and them putting up 90 per cent, there is \$120 million available. I do not know whether the federal Minister of Housing would spend that kind of money or not but, as I say, there is the possibility we will spend our \$6 million.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we have heard this sort of story before about all the things which are going to be done. However, the hon. Minister was speculating at this point—or “hypothesizing”, if I may use that word. I would suggest that this should become his objective. I do not see why he cannot persuade Mr. Pearson to go along. Maybe these hon. gentlemen on the Liberal benches would provide a little help in persuading him if he gets difficult. Why not make it an objective of \$66 million?

I would also suggest that now that the federal government is thinking in terms of 90 per cent, perhaps the municipalities could be relieved of these capital expenditures altogether. Even the relatively small percentage they have been asked to put up is fairly burdensome for a municipal government. And if the federal and provincial governments can take over the whole cost—cover all of the capital expenditures—I think we might get something going—\$66 million would be at least a start for this year. I would say anything less is not good enough in view of the size of the problem.

One last matter I would like to ask the hon. Minister about, Mr. Chairman, relates to the nature of the programmes he contemplates. He has given us some outline of

that already. I am not asking him to repeat himself, but one of the unfortunate developments in the last few years, in my opinion, in the field of public housing, has been the almost exclusive emphasis on full recovery projects. The limited dividend sections of NHA have been used by municipalities to set up limited dividend housing corporations. Most of the projects they have constructed have been in the limited dividend field, the full recovery field. I am not saying that the projects they have constructed have not made a contribution. I have a couple of them in my riding which are very useful, particularly to young families in the middle income groups or the upper-lower income groups, those earning around \$80-\$100 a week. They get nice accommodation for substantially less than commercial rentals.

But this does not hit the real problem at all and that is the problem of housing the poor. The poor cannot even get into these projects; their incomes are not high enough. I have had several constituents who have been refused admission to limited dividend projects—the Donald Summerville Apartments and the Greenwood Park Apartments, to be specific—because their incomes were too low. It is a fine note when public housing is not available to people whose incomes are at the bottom of the level. That is where it should be mainly available.

I am going to ask the hon. Minister—perhaps it may be a rhetorical question but I am going to ask him anyway—if he has any plan in mind to restore the emphasis on subsidized low-rental housing as distinct from limited dividend, full recovery housing, because we are not really hitting the housing problem unless we do.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, answering the hon. member for Woodbine, all of our projects are on a rental-to-income basis—22 per cent of the income on a family basis considered for rent. There is no minimum income required for a family. There is a minimum rent of \$37.50 a month. I do not think it is impossible for a family to be taken care of. Of course, as you appreciate, we do not have anything to do with the limited dividend companies. Ours is the rental-to-income project. We appreciate some of the things that you have just suggested are necessary and we will take a look at them in order to provide perhaps a better basis for more families to get the kind of accommodation they require. Again I say I think that is what we have in mind, that is our objective. In answer to your previous question, I am quite sure that we will spend the \$6 million. It

might not make the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) very happy but that is the goal.

Votes 405 and 412 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, in rising to present the estimates of The Department of Education, I am fully conscious of the fact that I am asking the hon. members of this House to approve expenditures amounting to well over \$400 million—just about four times the total Budget of Ontario over two decades ago and almost one third of the total Budget presented in this House some few weeks ago.

It would, in my view, be extremely unfortunate if such massive appropriations were not preceded by a full and thoroughgoing debate and followed by the most searching examination of the individual estimates. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that we shall have such discussion, and I look forward to what I am certain will be very substantial and helpful contributions from my hon. friend, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), and others who will participate in this debate.

The hon. member for Brant is able to speak from knowledge gained from his experience as a teacher and as one who has from early youth taken a keen interest in public affairs. Since he entered this House in 1951, the hon. member for York South has demonstrated a keen interest and I would suggest, a wide knowledge of the affairs of this department. I would be surprised and perhaps somewhat disappointed if he did not have a great deal to say before we reach the final vote.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): In 1955, to keep the record straight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry.

Those hon. members will no doubt be critical—perhaps very critical. Let me say very frankly that I do not object to that, for after all, where there is no criticism there is no change, where there is no change there is no progress, and where there is no progress there is certain to be stagnation. In a word, Mr. Chairman, criticism is good for the soul and I may add that self-criticism is the law of growth.

But, sir, while it is the duty of my hon.

friends opposite to criticize, there is no doubt in my mind that their comments will be motivated not by narrow partisanship but rather by the desire to make Ontario's educational system one in which we can share a common pride and one that will be adequate to meet the problems and the challenges of the days ahead.

I trust, however, that our discussion will not be limited to a dialogue between myself and the hon. members of the Opposition. Since this session has been something of an "open season" for my Cabinet colleagues in the presentation of their own estimates, I have no doubt that private members, on the government side, will also want to speak freely, and if necessary critically, in the course of this discussion. That is as it should be, for I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that education is indeed everybody's business.

The magnitude of the task before us is reflected in the doubling of our school population in the past decade or so and in the estimate that by 1970 we shall reach, if not exceed, the two million mark—a veritable youth explosion. More than that, by 1970 it is now estimated that upwards of 100,000 young Ontarians will be entering the doors of the 17 or 18 universities we fully expect to have in operation by that time. From these institutions must come those young Canadians equipped with creative minds and skilled hands, possessing the intellectual, social and spiritual comprehension which will enable them to play their full part in leading Canada into her second century and forward to a greater future.

Mr. Chairman, such advances and developments and such exciting prospects as I have mentioned just did not enter the thinking of our people in the 1940s when we had only five institutions of higher learning.

Meantime, as the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) brought so forcefully to our attention in his address of some weeks ago, automation continues to sweep on, creating ever new problems and challenges. It is suggested that the 30-hour week may not be such a distant prospect and that we must guard against the danger of becoming a nation faced with extensive leisure without knowing how to use it.

Such developments must, of course, be the concern of the government, but they are far too important to be left to the government alone; they must be the concern of every member of this Legislature and indeed every citizen of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite clear that in the period ahead our problems are likely

to grow rather than to diminish. Such problems as school construction, school finance and teacher supply which have occupied so much of our attention during the past 15 years will be with us for many years to come. And so, Mr. Chairman, let me deal with some of the immediate problems engaging the attention of the department.

Last September the department sponsored a two-day conference on school construction and design. This conference was well attended by trustees, teachers, architects, engineers, contractors, municipal officials and representatives of many other interested groups. This extremely successful venture illustrated very clearly that much more communication is necessary among those responsible for the financing, design and construction of school facilities, sir. Those in attendance at this conference strongly recommended that conferences of a similar nature be held from time to time to facilitate an exchange of views among all parties interested in school construction. The department received many letters of congratulation on its initiative in sponsoring this conference, from organizations and professional bodies, such as the Ontario Trustees Council, Ontario Teachers' Federation, the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves, the Ontario Association of Architects, Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations, the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario, and the Association of School Business Officials.

It became obvious I believe, Mr. Chairman, at this conference, that because of changing educational needs and the impact of new teaching techniques and devices, school boards in this province need much more specific help in the planning of schools to meet present and future needs. It was felt further that more information was needed regarding materials and methods of construction and their effect on construction costs. The office of the technical adviser in the department has achieved a good deal in this field over the years through examination and approval of plans for grant purposes and through consultation with boards of trustees and their architects. It is now clear, as one of the results of the conference, that the investigative and informational service regarding school construction requires special attention by the department. The decision has been reached to establish an office of school planning and building research, and provision has been made, therefore, in the estimates of the department for this purpose.

As I acquainted the hon. members with the general basis of the Ontario Foundation

Tax Plan earlier, I shall not go into the details of this aspect of school financing at this time. For your information, however, I may say that payments on account of the 1964 legislative grants are again being made in four instalments this year, the first payment being made in February and the final payment being scheduled for November. I understand that boards of trustees found the payment of grants on a similar basis last year a distinct help in meeting their budget commitments.

Two steps have been taken during the past year to increase teacher supply: An agreement has been reached with the University of Western Ontario for the operation of an Ontario College of Education in London, in affiliation with the university, for the preparation of secondary school teachers; and a new teachers' college opened in Sudbury last September for the training of bilingual students preparing to teach in elementary schools attended by French-speaking pupils. Tenders have been called for the London college and its opening is planned for September, 1965. The Sudbury teachers' college now occupies temporary quarters in a secondary school, but it is the intention to erect a building for its use in the early future.

I am pleased to say that the establishment of this second teachers' college in the province for the training of teachers for French-speaking pupils has met with an encouraging response. A year ago, there were 302 bilingual student teachers attending the University of Ottawa teachers' college. Now the combined enrolments of that college and the one in Sudbury total 382, representing an increase of 26 per cent.

The overall enrolment in the teachers' colleges preparing elementary school teachers has also increased markedly, and now stands at 6,410, showing an increase of 896 over last year's total. The increase, fortunately, is principally in the one-year course which admits students with standing in eight grade 13 papers. The enrolment in that course is 3,755. When the enrolment in the one-year course is somewhat in excess of 5,000 it will be possible to consider the discontinuance of the two-year course for students from grade 12. This may be possible within a year or two.

The hon. members may recall that a committee was appointed three years ago to examine and report on the training of teachers for the secondary schools, and that its very useful report was submitted in 1962. The recommendations made therein are receiving careful attention in the department and have had a very substantial influence on the

planning of both building and programme for the new college of education in London, which I have mentioned. Decision has now been reached to establish a similar study committee to report on the preparation of teachers for the elementary schools of the province. I may add that the Ontario Teachers' Federation has expressed strong interest in having such a study made. The personnel of the committee will include representation from teachers, trustees, parents' groups, and school administrators as well as university officials. The last survey of the training of teachers for the elementary schools was made by the Royal commission on education that reported in 1950. It is felt that the whole field should be reassessed in the light of the situation in the nineteen-sixties.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that since I prepared the few remarks for the estimates that we have had a similar presentation made by a joint committee of the University of Toronto and the Toronto Board of Education, requesting a similar study be undertaken.

As far as the recruitment of secondary school teachers is concerned, I can report that in all courses—both winter and summer—the number of secondary school teachers taking first courses of training in 1963-64 totals 3,401, representing an increase of 695 over the figures of a year ago.

Pupil enrolment, teacher supply and the financing of school construction and operation are of great importance; but it is the qualitative aspect of education, of course, that will always concern us most as parents and citizens. It is the quality of our teachers, the wisdom of our curricula, and the enthusiasm and industry of our students upon which the effectiveness of our school system must be based. Bearing in mind the wide range in the mental and physical characteristics that must exist among more than a million and a half young people, we see that the responsibility of the schools to help each student to realize his own best self is very heavy indeed. We must recognize, too, the urgent and growing call for adult education, not only in the universities and other institutions for post-secondary education, but for the cultural and vocational development of persons no longer in school.

The curriculum branch of the department is busy completing the extensive revision of courses and the development of new courses for the reorganized programme in the secondary schools. In speaking of curricula, I should like to mention the interest of The Department of Education in the investigations being pursued independently by the recently

organized Ontario Curriculum Institute. This institute was founded in November, 1962, and its sponsors include representatives from five groups or bodies: the Ontario Teachers' Federation, the Ontario Trustees' Council, the universities, school administrators, and The Department of Education. Last year it operated under a provisional board of governors, but this year the first board of governors appointed under its new constitution has taken over—a board of 30 members comprised of six representatives from each of the five groups I have named.

The curriculum institute operates independently and has for its purpose curricula study and research. Its first two studies, begun last summer, were concerned with the teaching of a second language and with the teaching of science. The Department of Education is a participating member of the institute and last year contributed \$50,000 to its financial support. The institute is independent of the department, however, in its study programme. The department will give careful attention to the institute's findings and recommendations. I have asked that copies of the first two studies be made available for the hon. members so they too may study the results of the first studies made by the curriculum institute.

I have previously announced the establishment of a committee to inquire into and report upon the nature and function of the Grade 13 year, particularly in the light of the comments frequently heard that the Grade 13 year is a cram year and that it should constitute a more effective bridge from the secondary schools to the institutions of higher learning. The committee has had a number of meetings and I understand their deliberations are proceeding very satisfactorily.

In the field of curriculum we have become so accustomed to pinpointing new needs and questioning traditional practices that we may pause too seldom to take satisfaction in some substantial achievement. An example of progress that occurs to me, among a number, is the advance that has been made in the field of music instruction. Some thirty years ago, the first provincial supervisor of music was appointed for the schools of this province. Today, 1,000 music teachers, half of them with intensive training, direct instruction in this subject in elementary schools, and 450 continue the programme in the secondary school system. Of the latter, 250 have had special preparation in a university faculty of music or in departmental summer schools. At the Kiwanis music festival held in Toronto last month, 60 outstanding school bands, 40 choirs, and 20 orchestras demonstrated the

musical quality that is being achieved throughout Ontario by our young people, much of it the result of instruction received in our publicly supported schools.

I mentioned a moment ago the growing call for adult education. This is being met in part by night classes held in secondary schools and technical institutes; by local library services; by courses offered by community organizations working with the department's community programmes branch, and by free correspondence courses, chiefly in academic subjects, provided by The Department of Education. I shall comment this afternoon on two of these agencies: the public libraries and our correspondence courses.

The development of public library service in the past ten years has been substantial. Expenditure by public library boards increased by 200 per cent during this period, and there has been a corresponding increase in the legislative vote for grants to libraries. Circulation of books, films, and other items increased by 100 per cent in the past ten years. Our policy has been to encourage the development of municipal and county libraries, and also regional library co-operatives, which serve to co-ordinate and supplement libraries within regions. With this development, the need for research into problems of library organization and service has become apparent. We have, therefore, agreed to pay the Ontario Library Association a grant of \$10,000 this year and subsequently an annual grant of \$5,000 until a library survey which it has projected has been completed. The work by the Ontario Library Association will be supplemented by studies undertaken by the staff of the provincial library service branch of this department.

The correspondence courses offered to students not enrolled in school were originally established by The Department of Education to serve boys and girls in remote areas not served by accessible schools. As the pioneer fringe of the province receded, the number of children requiring such courses decreased, but the number of adults desiring secondary school courses increased. Employed persons wishing to upgrade their academic education from Grades 7 to 13 find such courses a convenient and effective means of doing so. In 1963, more than a thousand students prepared in this way wrote Grade 13 examinations with a 70 per cent record of success. More than two thousand students are studying Grade 13 subjects by correspondence at the present time. Correspondence courses in the theoretical work of certain trades are also available but a charge of \$10 is made for these subjects, which include

motor mechanics, carpentry, radio repair, and machine shop operation.

Three special groups with particular needs are currently receiving attention in The Department of Education. Trainable retarded children; unemployed adults; and young people who have left school, often prematurely, and who have educational and recreational needs.

First, for the trainable retarded children, a new plan has been devised to eliminate the necessity of financing a portion of the operating costs of their schools through charity drives and voluntary donations. While the details of the new plan are outlined in the legislation I introduced a day or so ago and will be considered here in the House it may be helpful if I say something now regarding the development of the programme for retarded children in this province.

The Department of Education has been involved since 1948 in providing financial assistance and educational advice to local associations conducting training programmes for children whose mental capacity renders them unable to profit from attending a regular elementary school. An experimental project in this field was carried out in Kirkland Lake between 1948 and 1953. The success of this pioneer effort resulted in an amendment to The Department of Education Act to permit the Minister of Education to make grants towards the cost of education of trainable retarded children enrolled in classes conducted by parents' groups affiliated with the Ontario Association for Retarded Children.

In the ten years since that time, more than \$5 million in provincial grants has been paid to local associations for retarded children to help with the cost of building and operating their schools. More than 45 associations have built new schools with advice and financial aid from The Department of Education. Last September, there were 2,759 children enrolled in these classes; and there are, at present, 84 associations in the province conducting a total of 87 schools.

The department has provided summer courses for the teachers of these schools, and it has on its staff two special services inspectors who visit the schools to assist the teachers with their school programmes. On behalf of the government I express to the leaders in the associations for retarded children sincere appreciation of their energy and devotion. Their efforts have paid rich dividends in better adjusted boys and girls, happier homes from which they come, and better understanding on the part of the public of the problems associated with the mentally handi-

capped. The movement has received enthusiastic backing from the citizens of the province, and there is general agreement that the time has arrived to take a further step in the development of a full programme for these children.

The second special group I have mentioned is the unemployed. One of the general objectives emphasized in the report of the select committee on manpower training was the provision for training unemployed workers who have obsolete skills or who are relatively unskilled. Such provision is made in the province under programme five of the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreement. Through mayors' advisory committees and local boards of education, or secondary school boards, training has been provided for 21,000 unemployed persons during the past three years. In January, 1964, some 5,400 people were enrolled in such classes in 35 centres. It is estimated that approximately 83 per cent of the graduates from these courses proceed directly into gainful employment.

To date, the cost of such training has been met by the federal government paying 75 per cent of the operating costs and of the trainee allowances, but from now on the federal refund of trainee allowances will be on a 90 per cent basis, as the result of a recent change in the agreement. The balance of costs is met by the province. To qualify for refund at the percentages noted, Ontario must provide at least 286,000 training days per fiscal year, but this requirement is greatly exceeded in our current programme.

The third group to which I made special reference is the young people in the age group, let us say, from 16 to 25 years who have left school and are in their first years of employment. In part, the problem, in the words of the manpower training report, is "salvaging drop-outs and enhancing their employability", but I should like to go further than that in assisting this sizeable group to adjust themselves to happy useful living in our urban and rural communities. With this aim in view, I announced six months ago that a youth branch would be established in The Department of Education for the purpose of co-ordinating the ongoing programmes of voluntary agencies, the community, and government in the interests of this particular group. The services of an outstanding educator have been obtained on loan, during the current year, to assess the needs of these young people and to make suggestions as to policy and programme for the new branch.

The survey in this connection is already under way. It is clear that automation in

business and industry has created problems other than those of employment. Linked with increased leisure time and the progress of urbanization, it has contributed to special problems among the youth of the community. The policy of the new branch will be directed towards fostering a co-operative approach among private, voluntary and governmental agencies in the endeavour to do something constructive towards meeting these problems.

I am informed by the director of the survey that the enthusiasm and the hope with which it is being met could hardly have been anticipated. More often than not there is the suggestion that if we would work with and for youth "to seek its purpose and pursue it" we would do well to find out what are the problems of youth right now and what, in general, will be the complexion of the very early tomorrow that youth will have to face. It has often been said that youth must be made responsible to the community. Has not the time come to find ways of making it possible for youth to share fully in responsibility for the community? This whole question will, I am sure, receive the close attention of the select committee on youth to be appointed during the session.

If we know the nature and extent of a problem there is a better chance that we can do something about it than if the problem is loosely defined, full of information gaps, and a mixture of truths, half-truths, and one or two distortions. The delinquency picture and the school drop-out problem are areas which come under scrutiny at once in this regard. Rumours about increases in the obsolescence of certain jobs are not helping our young people to develop the necessary courage and drive. At the same time, there is much said about new kinds of jobs growing out of the discarding of the old kinds. There is an air of uncertainty. If this new kind of world is to be an automated one, there will have to be borne in mind the implications of the comment that society is quick to be proud of its developments in the area of automation but is hesitant to accept the social consequences of such automation.

The youth branch may be able to give a real service by sharpening the uncertain edges of the economic trends of the very immediate future. It may be able to help the curriculum and course builders; it may be able to foresee certain trends. I am hopeful that the counsel it may be able to provide indirectly to concerned youth may contribute elements of stability in a situation which at present is somewhat vague and uneasy.

Perhaps the time has come to have other

disciplines helping the educator to maintain a continuing sense of balance. Under the general heading of youth services there might be a blending of research co-ordination, experienced economist's insights, recreation specialist's point of view, and practical social worker's concern for the identity of the individual.

In the meantime, the Ontario-wide survey which I mentioned is under way. Within a few weeks contact will have been made with, we hope, all known services to youth on the part of governmental, public and private agencies. The analysis of this data should tell us what is going on, who is doing it, who is paying for it, and to what extent.

Reverting to trends in the established school system, I would emphasize, as I did a year ago, the growing movement towards the establishment of the centralized rural schools, served by bus lines to transport the children from a much larger district than the traditional rural school section. These schools have been built in township school areas which have closed up their one- and two-roomed rural schools and have replaced them by centrally located graded schools of from six to ten or 12 classrooms. In this way, rural children gain the advantages of a graded school education; special subjects may be taught by special teachers, and good teachers are obviously more easily recruited and held.

The central school has been the result of the formation of larger units of administration, and it is unnecessary for me to repeat at this time the comments I made upon this topic when legislation was recently introduced for the purpose of increasing the number of such units in rural Ontario. I would remind you, however, that in pioneer days the small school section with its three trustees was an admirable unit with which to get education under way in this province. But some 40 years ago, public opinion in favour of a larger unit of administration began to stir—a desire for a unit that, by reason of its very size, might offer rural children broader opportunities in education.

The idea of township school boards was first explored, but it was evident that the time for adopting such a unit had not yet arrived. Yet the situation that existed, with some 5,700 school sections operating independently, called for some action. Finally, in the 1930s, the township school area was adopted as a partial solution. It was a flexible unit—it could be as small as two sections or it could be as large as the municipal councils concerned should decide. Its formation and

extent were determined by the people of the local community, through their municipal council or councils. And the township school area, when formed, could continue the operation of the existing schools if it so wished, or it could replace them, if desired, by a centrally located larger school, usually served by bus transportation. The trustee membership of the area board numbered five instead of three.

The township school area plan flourished in the 1930s and 1940s, but because of the economic depression and the war that succeeded it, the larger units did not do much school building. They did improve their educational programme, however, by bringing the physical plant of their group of schools to a higher standard, and by providing itinerant teachers of special subjects. In the 1950s, however, the explosion of school population made it necessary to build new schools, and then the attention of the township school area boards of trustees turned to the provision of central schools.

When the movement towards the township school area was begun, and when increased mileage in paved roads changed the travelling pattern in Ontario, it was not realized how much these two apparently unrelated activities would contribute to the rural central school movement in the 1950s and 1960s. In these recent years, the educational map of the province has changed rapidly in the townships and the benefits of the central school over the one-room rural school are increasingly recognized.

The township school area movement markedly reduced the number of school boards in the province, but in September, 1963, there were still 2,476 school boards in Ontario operating public schools. In years when school population is expanding rapidly, when school building is proceeding on an unprecedented scale, and when district high schools are well equipped to carry on the education of well prepared rural school children, it is important that the problems of rural education be approached in a broader way than is possible under the direction of so many local school boards, many of them responsible for only one school and one teacher. The organization of larger units of administration does not imply that all one-room schools will be eliminated in favour of central schools—local conditions in some cases may make such action neither practicable nor desirable—but it does make better planning possible.

Before leaving the field of elementary school education, I would report that the teaching of French to English-speaking pupils is becoming

increasingly common. At the end of September 1963, French was being taught as a second language to English-speaking pupils in schools operated by 160 public and separate school boards. In the majority of cases, French is introduced at the Grade 5 level but in an increasing number of schools it is being introduced at earlier grades. There were 104,206 pupils in the elementary schools receiving this instruction in regular classroom grades, and 3,047 pupils in special classes. Special or itinerant teachers were employed by boards, and of 224 such teachers, 120 are reported to have French as their mother tongue. In addition, 185 regular classroom teachers carried on the teaching of this special subject.

While the scope of the programme in this field is broadening it is clear that a shortage of teachers who are fluent in French is still a limiting factor. The first summer course for teachers of this subject was held in 1963 and 134 teachers attended. Plans have been prepared for a second summer course to be held in 1964.

At the secondary-school level, I may report briefly on the progress being made in implementing the reorganized programme of studies in the secondary schools. The manpower training report made two observations which are closely linked with the objectives of this programme: First, that the "holding power" of our schools must be increased through the offering of a sufficient variety of courses to appeal to the differing interests, abilities and aptitudes of our student population; and second, that to ensure efficient utilization of our human resources, everything possible will have to be done to provide every student with as much education and training as he is capable of effectively absorbing.

The hon. members will be familiar with the reorganization of the secondary school programme in the three branches: arts and science; business and commerce; and science, technology and trades. In each of these there is a five-year programme completed in Grade 13, leading to institutions of higher learning, and a four-year programme which gives a good general education but does not lead to a university. There is also provision for one-year and two-year occupational courses for students who have limited academic abilities and interests and who are preparing for almost immediate employment. These diversified occupational programmes, I may say at this point, are meeting the learning pace of about 10,000 boys and girls this year; last year the number was around 5,000. It is predicted that in a few years it will be over 20,000. If we add to this the growing enrolments of special

vocational schools, we find that the number in these occupational programmes will be well over 30,000 students.

When the three-branch reorganized programme was announced, concern was expressed in some quarters that there was little use in setting up the two vocational streams—business and commerce; and science, technology and trades—and in providing technical class accommodation in new buildings across the province under the federal-provincial agreement, because parents would be insistent that their children follow the traditional university preparatory course—arts and science. Happily, Mr. Chairman, this has not been the case. A survey last September, covering 22 representative high school districts, showed the situation to be as follows: Of pupils entering Grade 10 in September, 1963, 46 per cent were headed for the arts and science branch; 28 per cent planned to enter the business and commerce branch; and 26 per cent planned to enter the science, technology and trades branch.

Of the total enrolment in the secondary schools, approximately 40 per cent of the students are enrolled in vocational courses. Since many schools do not separate Grade 9 students into the various branches, but offer a more or less common course under the arts and science branch, the percentage who are actually and potentially vocational is likely somewhat higher than 40 per cent. This distribution of students is evidence that the variety of opportunity now being offered in the secondary schools of the province is being welcomed by parents and pupils alike. The fact that the vocational courses have a strong academic content, and that their pupils graduate with not only a marketable skill, but with a good general education, has contributed to this change in attitude towards vocational instruction.

With varied opportunities available in the secondary school, it is of importance that information regarding courses, occupations, and students' aptitudes and interests should be readily available to pupils and their parents. The role of guidance counselling in the school system has become, then, increasingly necessary. To give additional direction and assistance in this field the departmental staff of guidance inspectors was increased by one member last September, and another inspector will be added this year.

I am pleased to report that the attendance at our summer courses in guidance has doubled in the past three years. These courses were offered in Dryden, Toronto and Windsor

in 1963. In 1964 they will be held in Morrisburg, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Catharines, and Toronto. The training thus available will work to the advantage of the pupils in both elementary and secondary schools. But this is a field in which there is still room for more specially trained teachers, and persistent effort to this end is still a necessity.

I should like to mention, in passing, that new courses in agriculture have been introduced, which place stress on basic scientific principles rather than the practical processes which may be learned better out of the classroom. The topics include the roles of chemistry, physics, biology and microbiology as they pertain to the production of food and to the nutrition of plants and animals. I mention these in particular because of the interest in rural areas that such courses be available for district high school students.

In the field of physical education I will comment upon only two aspects of what is quite an extensive programme: activities under the federal-provincial agreement of fitness and amateur sport, and the camps operated by The Department of Education. Under the agreement just mentioned, a grant of \$5,000 has been made to each of the five Ontario universities offering courses in physical education, to be used to assist students taking such courses.

It is hoped that certain renovations at our camp properties and the installation of electricity at the Irondale camp will be accepted by the federal authorities as projects to be undertaken under the agreement. To date, some 23 projects have been approved with six more pending. Leadership clinics and seminars have been held in lacrosse, swimming, baseball, track-and-field, wrestling, hockey, basketball, skiing, badminton and field hockey. The new courses in recreation at Guelph have been granted \$16,400.

The department owns and operates two camps—and for the benefit of the new hon. members I would invite you to attend either or both of these camps—one at Longford Mills and the other at Irondale. At Longford Mills last summer the two-week courses in leadership were attended by 768 Grade 11 students, and if any of the hon. members have any fears about a great bulk of the young people in this province at this time, I would invite them to attend with me. I was at both camps last summer. I am sure you would go away from these camps with the same impression that I had; that there are many young people in this province who are capable of performing tasks of a very useful nature.

The camp facilities there are also used by many organizations for conferences in such fields as home and school, school athletics, adult education, folk school council, and physical education. In 1963, the camp operated from May to November. At Irondale, three camp courses for leaders-in-training were attended by 280 secondary school students, and a camp directors' workshop was attended by 120 persons. The camp site at Irondale provides almost an ideal situation for the study of camp craft, conservation, and water safety.

Until less than a year ago, the post-secondary school programme in technology and trades, including trade schools and technical institutes, was the responsibility of the secondary branch in The Department of Education. The exceptional expansion of this aspect of education made a change imperative. Last April, therefore, all activities in this field were transferred to a new technological and trades training branch. This branch, under its own superintendent, will give leadership in the development of institutes of technology and institutes of trades or vocational centres as they are now being called, and will supervise the various programmes initiated under the federal-provincial training agreement.

In particular, the objective of this branch is to provide technical and trades training opportunities for anyone over sixteen years of age who is capable of benefiting from such training in full-time classes, evening classes, part-time classes, or in co-operation with industry and business. Part of this instruction takes place in the institutes of technology where three-year courses beyond Grade 12 prepare technologists in a number of fields, such as engineering, business administration, hotel and resort management, radio and television arts, and so on.

Other courses, usually requiring one or two years beyond Grade 12, are offered in the institutes of trades or vocational centres, and prepare students as technicians. The graduates of such courses find employment in positions that involve the installation, operation and maintenance of equipment and appliances; food handling and processing; or mechanical and architectural drafting. The third type of courses are those in apprenticeship. These are short courses usually not exceeding one year beyond Grade 10 in the institutes of trades or vocational centres. They involve from 70 to 90 per cent shop work and lead to qualifications as skilled craftsmen or journeymen in the trades.

The vocational centres will provide related and skill training for the groupings of ap-

prentices as determined by The Department of Labour. In most cases the apprentice will be released by his employer for periods up to ten weeks twice during this apprenticeship to attend a vocational centre for related work and specialized training. Training combined with education will be provided in the vocational centres in all the designated trades and those other trades in which the apprentices are registered with The Department of Labour.

New vocational centres are under construction in Ottawa, London, and Sault Ste. Marie. Two more will be established, the centres selected for their location being Hamilton and Welland. New quarters are being constructed for the institute of technology in Ottawa, and an addition is being planned for the institute in Kirkland Lake.

At last year's session of the Legislature an Act was passed changing the name of the Ryerson Institute of Technology to the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, and transferring its management from The Department of Education to its own board of governors. This institute was established in 1948 as a successor in the field of technological training to a re-establishment institute that had been set up in the old Toronto Normal School buildings to train veterans of World War II for civilian occupations. In the next fifteen years Ryerson's enrolment grew from 100 to 3,200. The faculty increased from 20 to 160. The number and variety of courses multiplied, and the school earned the reputation of doing a sound educational job, a reputation that stood its graduates in good stead when seeking employment.

Although the bill just mentioned passed in 1963, almost a year has been required to work out a plan to safeguard the pension interests of the institute's employees; to get the new buildings completed; to deal with capital, operational, and equipment budgets; and to realign arrangements within the federal-provincial training agreement. In these activities the department has worked with the group of persons who were named last September as an interim board of governors and who will become members of the first board to be appointed under the Act. I am pleased to state that the somewhat complicated arrangements for the transfer of authority are now completed and that on March 26, 1964, the Act was proclaimed.

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 o'clock, I will now leave the chair and we will resume at 8 o'clock.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 28, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 28, 1964

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	2545
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Allan, agreed to	2568

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I think before we recessed for supper, I was dealing with Ryerson and the bill that was passed dealing with the new polytechnical institute.

I now want to touch on another Act that was passed in the last session establishing the Ontario Council of the Arts to consider requests for, and to award grants to, artistic organizations operating within the province. Council members were named last autumn, and under its distinguished chairman, the hon. J. Keiller Mackay, the council during its first four months of existence has been active in the discharge of its duties. It has awarded grants to the National Ballet Guild, the Canadian Opera Company, Canadian Players, Stratford Shakespearean Festival, Crest Theatre, Toronto Workshop Productions, Canadian Music Centre, the Art Institute of Ontario, Toronto Symphony Orchestra, symphony orchestras in Windsor, London, the Lakehead, Brantford, Kitchener-Waterloo, St. Catharines, Richmond Hill and Deep River, and the International Symphony Orchestra of Sarnia and Port Huron. Other orchestras receiving grants were the York Concert Society, the Toronto Chamber Orchestra, and Pro Arte Orchestra. Awards were also given to the Dominion Drama Festival, the St. Catharines and District Arts Council, the Quetico Conference and Training Centre, the Canadian Guild of Potters and the Hawkesbury Valley School. The council has also inaugurated a student-aid programme with a series of bursaries to students from all over Ontario who require financial assistance to enable them to attend the National Theatre School.

The council, in co-operation with the community programmes branch of The Department of Education, has now embarked upon an intensive survey of the state of the arts throughout the length and breadth of the province. It is hoped that results of this survey will clarify the roles to be played by the Ontario Arts Council, the Community Programmes Branch, and the Canada Council,

all of whom contribute financially to the development of the arts in this province.

A council of the arts on a provincial level is an innovation. I should like to mention another innovation which The Department of Education is interested in and which I hope will come into being. As Canada's leading industrial province, and as an area that has provided world leadership in many aspects of science, medicine, engineering, agriculture and transportation, Ontario has a proud technological story to tell—not only to those in the province, but to the hundreds of thousands who visit the province each year. It has a story that is a natural inspiration to its young people and a revelation even to the most sophisticated observer. This story is being told partly through small scattered museums, and annual fairs and exhibitions held throughout the province, including the Canadian National Exhibition.

But such messages are necessarily of a temporary nature and lack the effectiveness of continuity. As well, such displays are not designed for thoughtful research or exploration by students or the advanced scholar, and they cannot in their present form give the general public, including the 1.5 million school pupils in Ontario, a cohesive picture of the accomplishments of industry and science in this vast and varied province.

The scattered permanent museums and collections, such as the Bell Homestead at Brantford, while of great value in themselves, are of necessity specialized and are scattered about the province. The Royal Ontario Museum, though one of the world's great repositories of information, is essentially devoted to the passive sciences and arts and to archaeological subjects. Nowhere in Ontario and indeed nowhere in Canada is there a central point of reference on topics of contemporary science and industry. There is no show-window of Canadian technological accomplishments. The genius that went into developing and producing the Alouette satellite and such things as the cobalt bomb immediately come to mind.

With all this in mind, some months ago, I, on behalf of The Department of Education

and the province, appointed a special committee to give active study to the feasibility of establishing in Ontario a permanent museum devoted to the display of industrial, scientific and technological accomplishments here in this province and here in Canada. This group is made up of representatives of industry, education, science and other interested citizens prominent in their own fields who are generously devoting their time to this study. It is my earnest hope that out of this will come the establishment of a permanent museum of science and industry in this province.

Educational television continues to receive attention in The Department of Education. Thus far, annual grants have been made to the Metropolitan Educational Television Association better known as META, to assist it in its pioneering activities in this medium in Ontario. In addition, schools have been encouraged to use the Tuesday and Thursday national telecasts for some years, and the facilities of Ryerson institute have been made available for educational television workshops sponsored by the Ontario Teachers' Federation. During the past year, officials of the audio-visual aids branch in the department have investigated the use of educational television in Great Britain and in several areas in the United States.

As a next step in the development of policy with respect to this new teaching aid, an Ontario Advisory Council on Educational Television has recently been established. This body is broadly representative, including among its members, in addition to departmental officials, persons from teacher and trustee organizations, from the home and school group and, of course, from broadcasting agencies. The purpose of the council is to advise the department on the development of educational television in the provincial school system, and to suggest specific telecasts in this connection, and also to encourage teacher education in the production, presentation, and utilization of ETV programmes.

In this partial review, Mr. Chairman, of educational activities in the province, it will be clear that The Department of Education has a heavy programme on its hands, a programme that requires careful planning and administration. The whole question of planning techniques is worthy of attention in these days when it is so important that accurate data be assembled and considered before decisions are reached.

In education, what are the major elements on which we require information, accurate and sufficiently up to date so that we may

make valid decisions? The list is relatively short, as a matter of fact. We require information on the pupil, the teacher, instructional materials, school plant facilities, and school finance. In each of these, information is required at different levels—locally, provincially, and in some cases nationally. I am pleased to state that, recently, arrangements have been made in this province for discussion and co-operation among federal, provincial and university authorities in regard to the collection of data pertaining to students, staff and finance.

Already, in some U.S. states, educational data systems have been established through which a computation centre is set up in conjunction with a network of feeding installations, covering local educational units of administration. The plan is that information will be fed from the local agencies through to the central agency, and that most of the processing will be done on the central computer, with the results fed back to the state and local agencies for decision-making purposes.

I have given this type of innovation considerable attention in recent months. We have begun investigations in our own province to see what may be done in organization and working out forms and in setting up the necessary communication systems for the two-way feedback of raw information from local authorities to the centrally located computer; and processed information from the computer to the local authorities. As you are, no doubt, aware we have a computer in the department of educational research of the Ontario College of Education and several others are available which, in combination, are capable of handling any problem of processing and feedback that we may contemplate—certainly on a pilot project basis.

It is only fair to those who are working in the field of educational data processing in Ontario to point out that in many respects our province is at least abreast of what is being done in most educational jurisdictions. In some ways we are somewhat ahead. I would remind you, for instance, that all the information in the Minister's report is now processed by modern equipment, and that arrangements have been made to move from the slower type of machines to a computer as soon as possible. This step is well under way. It has, in fact, been under study for two years. I may also point out that the work on the Ontario Tax Foundation plan was done on computers during the past few months. In fact, for over ten years the principal part of the analysis of school grants and of the evaluation of existing and proposed

grant systems has been done on modern data processing equipment.

I would point out, too, that for several years now we have been administering aptitude and achievement tests at the end of Grade 12. These are marked by machine and the results reported by machine. The speed with which these results can be processed is almost incredible. For instance, last year some 50,000 Grade 12 students sat for a high level scholastic aptitude test which required two hours to write. Within ten days of the receipt of the answer cards from the schools, the tests had all been marked, the norms or standards prepared, and the results for each individual student mailed back to the schools. I am assured that through the use of a new machine that has recently been announced this process can be speeded still further and that many of the present difficulties and possible sources of error can be removed.

We have already announced, as you know, that much of the work in regard to the Grade 13 examinations is now done by machine. Last year it was done on a trial basis, in parallel with hand-produced results, but this year the processing and reporting to schools, universities and individual students, including the printing of certificates, will be done by computer alone.

I do not wish to leave the impression that through the adoption of modern methods of data-processing, education will be de-humanized in any way. The educational process must remain an inter-personal one, and teachers and administrators are the means by which it may best be moved forward. It seems only common sense, however, to free these people from as much administrative detail as possible and from time-consuming assembly of reports and factual information, in order that they may have additional time and energy for guiding the instructional programme.

There is one other matter of which I should like to make brief mention. Hon. members will probably recall that at the beginning of the year there was widespread press comment about the 149th birthday of one Sir John A. Macdonald. A number of surveys by press and radio revealed considerable lack of knowledge of the old chieftain—even among upper grade students. For instance, one student said he was the first governor of Toronto; another that he tried to unite Canada with the United States; and still another that he had organized a rebellion against the government.

Now I felt that the matter, as an illustration of what concerns me, was important

enough to take it up with the principals of our primary and secondary schools; to whom I addressed the following letter, to which was attached several of the press clippings:

Dear Principal:

The enclosed editorial and feature article from a number of Ontario newspapers of January 11 last, raises a number of questions that should be of interest and concern to all Canadians and, in particular, to our teachers.

Even though, in our view, the examples given of student ignorance of Sir John A. Macdonald and his role may be somewhat exaggerated, the fact still remains that there is a widespread, and to me, regrettable public disinterest in Canada's history and in the men who helped to make it.

Is this, as the article seems to suggest, the fault of our history text books? Is it due to our methods of teaching? Is it in part the fault of our newspapers and other mass media in failing to deal more frequently with historical subjects? Or, is it simply a case of people being so absorbed in the life and problems around them that they have little or no time left to concern themselves with the past? If this is so, then we must pay heed to the closing sentence of the editorial—"a nation that forgets its past is likely to have a short future."

In any case, may I suggest that you discuss the editorials with your staff and let me have the benefit of your reactions. I should also be very pleased to receive any suggestions you may care to make on how our Ontario schools could best participate in the province-wide observance of the 150th anniversary of Sir John A. Macdonald announced in the Speech from the Throne.

Looking forward to hearing from you, and with every good wish.

Up to now, Mr. Chairman, I have received over a thousand replies to this particular letter. There appears to be a rather widespread agreement that we should look into the whole question of history as it is taught in our schools.

These letters, which grow in volume from day to day, are being very carefully studied by our officials and will, I am sure, be of great assistance to us in our preparations for observing the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Sir John A. Macdonald's birth. Since I have not yet had the opportunity to acknowledge many of these communications, I take this opportunity of thanking our principals, their staffs and the school boards for the interest they have shown in the matter.

I should like to make it very clear, however, that our concern in this area extends beyond Canada's first Prime Minister, and as was stated in the Speech from the Throne, we are working on plans to see to it that other great figures in our history receive the attention due them; George Brown, whose great contribution to Confederation in the view of many historians equals that of Sir John A. Macdonald; Sir Oliver Mowat, Egerton Ryerson, who I would gather would be a non-political, non-controversial figure, and many others who helped to lay the foundations of our province and of our country.

I believe it was the late President Kennedy who said just before his own tragic death:

A nation reveals itself not only in the men it produces, but also in the men it honours, the men it remembers.

Or as one of our leading newspapers put it:

A nation which forgets its past is likely to have a short future.

And if I may borrow some words used a few days ago by Mr. Bascom St. John, let us not make the fatal mistake of letting history "go out of style."

In concluding my remarks, I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the practical help which the department receives from the many organizations in this province that are sufficiently interested in educational problems to submit briefs and resolutions and to visit the department in delegations to place their views before the Minister and his officials.

I would mention, in particular, such organizations as: the Ontario Teachers' Federation, the Ontario School Trustees' Council, the Ontario Educational Association, the Ontario Association of School Business Officials, the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations and the Catholic Parent-Teachers' Association.

These I believe are just representative of a larger number of groups whose activities deserve our warmest commendation and gratitude.

The Department of Education, in my view, must not be a cloister relying solely on paper directives. It must at all times be outward-looking, giving leadership and inspiration to our school boards, to our teachers and the many voluntary organizations who play such a vital role in the educational process.

In line with that concept I have made it a point to visit as many sections of the province as other duties will permit and I have found these personal contacts to be most rewarding.

It is my hope that in the coming period we shall be able to devise even more effective means of exchanging views with our boards and teachers on our common problems.

I know that we shall always derive great benefit from drawing on the knowledge and rich experience of the devoted men and women who share the field of education with us.

On vote 501:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister was at his disarming best this afternoon and this evening. In discussing his opening remarks with the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), who is almost my seat-mate, we came to the conclusion that perhaps we should let the estimates go by without further comment. But then, of course, on second thought, it is obvious that we, as members of the Legislature and as citizens of Ontario, are called upon to discuss and I suppose eventually approve the expenditure of an amount in excess of \$422 million being asked for by this department. Of course, the policies and regulations of the department administer far more money than that. All of us who have to accept responsibility as taxpayers on the local level know that a full 50 per cent of the funds we contribute to the municipalities are again spent on education, and certainly there are tremendous sums and funds coming from the federal Treasury, not only for the support of our vocational programme but in the university level as well.

Therefore, I would like to begin by talking about the topic that is most difficult, and that is educational finance. Over the past year we have been much concerned with this, naturally, and very interested in the policy of the present government in the introduction of what has been called the Foundation Tax Plan 1964. It has received a quiet reception across the province, probably because of the intricacies of the plan itself. The hon. Minister has already told the House that it requires the services of a computer to apply it. I am warning him that these computers can sometimes be programmed to the point that some Monday morning when he comes into the office there will be a message from the computer telling him that even he is no longer necessary.

Certainly the citizens of the province and those directly associated with education have adopted a wait-and-see policy as far as the government's foundation plan is concerned. We do know that the plan administers \$190 million for primary education alone, and we

have only the government's assurance, as spoken by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. Minister of Education, that the extra money involved in this plan which will be directed to the support of the separate school system, will in fact produce the equality of opportunity that is the intention of the plan and its supporters in the province and on all sides of this House.

One item in the report of the hon. Minister of Education with regard to the supply of teachers would indicate that there is still a shortage of teachers in the separate school system. Eventually I would like the hon. Minister to tell the House whether this is in any way associated with a shortage of funds available for the separate school educational programme.

In examining the foundation plan as carefully as I could, and with some advice, I believe it is saying that the government has judged that the supporters of the separate schools cannot call on a share of the industrial assessment beyond that which is indicated by the actual Catholic ownership in this assessment. In order to make up for this drawback, special grants are made available by this new foundation plan from government funds, and which are allocated on a ratio similar to the ratio of the assessment in the community and not associated with the ratio of students involved. It is interesting to see that this has been accepted by all areas so far in the educational community, and of course all of us will keep a sharp lookout to see to it that equality of opportunity is in fact achieved.

All hon. members of the Legislature were presented with a copy of a very interesting book by Franklin Walker entitled, *Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario*. I do not know whether all the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, have had an opportunity to read this—I certainly have not read it all—but having a special interest in the period beginning about 1934 I did notice this part very carefully. It is interesting to read this academic and historic account of what went on in this chamber at that time, when one of the previous "final solutions" to the separate school problem was debated and actually for a time effected in this House. Without trying to recall any of the animosities that were certainly very strongly expressed at that time, I would once again recommend to all the hon. members that this part of our history is one of the most important parts that those of us as party members should be well aware of. The reference of the hon. Minister to the importance of history might be taken as very important in this very connection.

But certainly the root problem in the financing of education persists, and that is that there simply is not enough money to do everything that is required, and the distribution of the funds for educational finance leaves much to be desired. The hon. Minister and many other hon. members of the House realize that this shortage of funds is the biggest stumbling block to even the legislation that the hon. Minister himself has presented to this House. I am referring specifically to the bill which would amalgamate the school sections into the townships school areas. This has already been debated here and at one of the few education committee meetings that have been held up until now.

The big objection, of course, is not to the plan *per se*, but to the fact that the introduction of the plan is going to work economic hardship in many of the school sections concerned. Representatives of the school sections were present at the education committee meeting where they were able to prove in chapter and verse and dollars and cents precisely what this hardship would be. I was glad to hear from the hon. Minister on another occasion that the government is seriously considering some amendments to this enactment, which will at least ease this burden that has to do with the financial difficulties at the local level.

All of us are aware of the fact that the financial burden of education at the local level has reached the point beyond which it cannot be increased. No one feels that it should be rolled back to any great degree, but I am sure that the government will take definite, carefully planned steps to see to it that the ever-increasing cost of education will be met from sources of revenue other than those directly on the municipal taxpayer. This is of immediate importance. Certainly the announcement of the solution to the present federal-provincial problems having to do with pensions and the whole area of finances will make available additional sums, which it is my fervent hope will be allocated in large measure to the support of this very important responsibility of the province.

In continuing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some remarks about curriculum development and its ramifications in many areas of the education system. Certainly we were very pleased to receive this afternoon reports from the hon. Minister on the work in the development of the curriculum as far as science and French as a second language by the Ontario Curriculum Institute, which is heavily supported by the province of Ontario.

Certainly all of us wish this new institute the greatest success in their deliberations. But

we must also be aware of the fact that their deliberations are in no way directed by the government, nor the hon. Minister of Education, and their researches take place on a rather broad spectrum. It will be some time before their specific findings can be enacted into the regulations governing the school system as it applies in this province.

With this in mind, we would bring again to the attention of the hon. Minister of Education the words of the Deutsch report of the committee of university presidents. I will not bother looking up the very words, but he would find on page 47 the reference made by the committee to the effect that without an efficient curriculum in the schools, the money and planning that is being and will be spent on our university system is largely wasted.

Efficiency, then, at the two basic levels is paramount. We would urge the government to take every step and bend every effort to bring our curriculum into line with modern and efficient needs. Specifically, I would refer to the announcement again in the hon. Minister's report that a hard, careful look is going to be taken of the curriculum in the area in Grades 1 to 6. I have heard this before, twice, and it is about time that definite action is taken so that this area of the education system will be toned up to meet the needs of the whole system, which must be viewed as a unit.

Once again referring to the university presidents' report, in which they felt that they could range in their considerations out of their own field and concentrate in the area of the schools rather than in the universities, they have criticized the department for a tendency to fragment the system and examine it in sections and pieces. This is true, not only of the curriculum, but of the problem of teacher training, which we will deal with a little later.

We have waited a long time for The Department of Education to have an overall look at the curriculum. It is time certainly that the following things should be examined closely.

First, the need for uniformity in this system. I hesitate to use the word because I know that the hon. Minister opposite is offended by the suggestion that the same thing should be taught in a rigorously uniform manner in all our schools. I do not mean to imply that by the use of uniformity, I mean the rigorous uniformity that he is liable to throw back at me.

Nevertheless, there is much virtue, surely in seeing to it that a basic core curriculum, amounting to 85 or 90 per cent of the work

given in the schools, is presented uniformly in the schools of the province of Ontario.

Specifically, I think of the confusion over the presentation of physics and chemistry in Grade 11 or Grade 12; the fact that a course of study in one particular area has so many optional topics involved that the teacher can select the areas in which he has certain interests to the detriment of others. The result is that the product of our school system lacks the uniformity that is essential, surely, in this day and age. The curriculum, then, must be modified in an overall view to present a core of basic subjects which will be taught uniformly in the schools of this province.

As well as this, I feel that the time has come when a hard look must be taken at the material included in the courses at every level. There is a tendency, particularly in the senior grades, to add new material without excising the superfluous material that has developed over the years. This is true, certainly, in the Grade 13 courses and I understand and know that they are in the process of being revamped. We expect great things from these new programmes.

But I am convinced that it is possible to present a curriculum beginning with Grade one and ending with Grade 13 which would allow the average academic student, or a student with reasonable academic ability, to achieve his matriculation standing in 12 years. I want to stress this to the House and I want to state it carefully, so that my words do not indicate the abolition of Grade 13. This is under study now—not its abolition, particularly, but making it more effective. It is true that 40 per cent of the students who do go through our system achieve senior matriculation in 12 years, and, of course, they eventually graduate from Grade 13.

It is also true that there is no uniformity in the system whereby this acceleration can be offered to students of average and above average academic ability. It is also true that in many parts of the system such acceleration is not possible. The result is that our best students have to tread water or mark time somewhere through the system. I would urge the government and the hon. Minister of Education to examine this carefully and come up with a policy that the various jurisdictions in education throughout the province can follow so that there will be uniformity in the system in this regard as well.

Mr. Chairman, I was most interested in the hon. Minister's comment about the specific area in the curriculum relating to the teaching of history. As a matter of fact, in preparation for this debate I myself had selected this

area as one which would bear special study. Certainly everybody considers himself an expert in the curriculum. But although I admit to limited teaching experience, I in no way consider myself an expert in this line, or any other educational line for all that matter. I want to make that clear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Most parents consider themselves expert.

Mr. Nixon: That is true, and as one reads the various articles in papers and magazines one has seen the styles of criticism change. To begin with, our science was in a terrible mess. The Russians had orbited an earth satellite and we really could not get off the ground. Finally, this area was abandoned and we went on to discussing mathematics and "why Johnny don't read good", and a number of things of this nature.

But it seems to me that the area of history teaching in the province of Ontario, and the curriculum as it applies to history, is certainly in need of revamping. Of course we tie in many things with the coming centennial and, surely, our thoughts are directed to the teaching of history because of this.

Then I think of the series of small articles that is running in the *Toronto Daily Star* and in papers across the province involving quite a well done sketch of one of the historical figures having to do with Confederation and a brief write-up about these individuals. I suppose that many of the hon. members would agree with me that as we see these day after day and realize that we have never heard of some of these people before, that either we were very inadequate as students or the teaching of history at the time we were exposed to it left something to be desired. It is certainly true, as well, that what has been expressed as historical fact is really in question in many special interest groups, and minorities in the province of Ontario.

If you would permit me, Mr. Chairman, I would think of the reaction in my own area to the announcement by the government of the fact that Fort Ste. Marie in the Midland area was going to be excavated and rebuilt as an historic site and as a tourist attraction. You might remember that this was the fortified centre from which the Jesuits undertook to Christianize the area in the very earliest times of the province of Ontario. Of course the people that were being proselytized were the Indians. We all know the fact that the Jesuits were the forerunners in the bringing of the Gospel and the Christian word to this part of the world. Their success

was probably the beginning of Christianity in the province as we know it.

On the other hand, it is interesting to know that some of my constituents, the Six Nation Indians, feel that there is another side to this story. From their point of view these were strange people invading their own land with a strange faith, establishing it in an area with warlike fortifications.

The Indians claim their icons, if I can call them that, were destroyed by the white man, who came with great power. They say that their only way of fighting back in those days was in warlike measures. We all know of the tragic martyrdom that the Jesuits suffered in those days. They feel that there is another side to the story. Now that we are so remote historically from the time of the occurrence; here is a minority whose tale has never been told.

The French population in the province of Ontario has often complained that their part in the historical development of the province has not been properly put to our students. And there is another minority that has complained down through the years, and my hon. colleagues and I in the Liberal party belong to that. We have heard the hon. members of this House extoll the great John A. at length—

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: —at sickening length, and we certainly would not contest for a moment that this great statesman was one of the prime builders of this nation. But, as the hon. Minister himself has said, it is a sad lack in the history teaching of the hon. members of this House that certainly the hon. George Brown was at least on a par as an architect of Confederation. It was political selflessness on the part of Mr. Brown, whose fine portrait is just to the right outside the doors of this chamber, that enabled the Legislature of the day to carry the first resolution leading to Confederation.

So the Indians and the French and other minorities want their voice heard in modern history.

There is a solution to this, I submit, Mr. Chairman, and it goes along the lines of so many solutions that have been offered in the past few weeks because it takes the form of a centennial project. But I hope it is a project that appeals to the hon. Minister. I am suggesting that he commission, through The Department of Education, a new history of the province of Ontario, and that this history—

An hon. member: Who do you suggest writes it? Anything would be better than the first one.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): How about the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope)?

Mr. Nixon: —be acceptable by modern critical standards, that it be prepared in an excellent binding and have incorporated in it the very best colour reproductions amplifying not only our history but also our culture. I am not suggesting that this should be inserted into the schools as a mandatory text but if it were put in the hands of the students as a centennial project, it would find its way into the libraries of every home across the province and be most worthwhile. I am sure that the hon. Minister is quite capable of refraining from having his own handsome picture in the frontispiece but even if he were to insist on this, I suppose we would have to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would have George Brown's as well.

Mr. Nixon: All right. So this is a suggestion that the hon. Minister might take into consideration. Through such a book the development of our free institution based on the British model, but adapted to the Canadian circumstance over the past 100 years and more, could very effectively be taught.

Certainly the teaching of the history of the province itself has tended to be reduced in importance in some of our school systems and in fact left to the good teacher to see to it that it is properly handled. The curriculum must be put in a modern cast so that the history of this province is presented in an acceptable way.

Leading out of the references to curriculum development, of course, comes the place of Grade 13, which is under investigation by a committee that the hon. Minister appointed, and which I understand has been directed to report in June of this year. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have asked for a report as early as possible and I am told it may have an interim report in June. Whether this will be a conclusive report at this point I would say would be doubtful but we hope it will have some information to guide us as early as June. It has been working very hard.

Mr. Nixon: I want to say a word or two about the curriculum as it presently applies at this level. I think it is true that the number of senior matriculants is increasing faster than the increase in the number of

places in the universities and in other post-secondary fields of education, particularly universities anyway. This means that the pressure on the Grade 13 student not only to succeed in his exams but to be in the upper section of the class is increasing year by year. It is true as well that the course has expanded, particularly in science and mathematics, as new material is inserted into them without proper revision so that the material that gradually passes out of date is removed.

This means then that our students at the Grade 13 level are subjected, as the hon. Minister suggested in his report, to a "cram year" experience. They do not get the advantage of a meaningful year of education, in which their participation in the work in the laboratory, or the exchange between the individual student and the teacher is at a level which is most useful. All of us, of course, sense the great value of this pressure, and the students, parents and the teachers know that the moment of intellectual truth that is embodied in the external departmental examination is a hurdle which may be good for the soul.

On the other hand, it is true that the university entrance, which is based almost entirely on this, might be more effective if The Department of Education were to undertake some sort of college-board entrance-examination type of programme which could be viewed by the university registrars as well as the recommendations of the teachers concerned, so that the departmental examinations would not be a one-shot ordeal. Certainly the hon. Minister's committee will have recommendations along these lines but I felt that this was an opportunity when we could urge such a move on the hon. Minister.

I would like also, in connection with curriculum reform, to say something in general about technical education. There is no doubt that the Robarts plan is gradually assuming another name but this is one way to refer to it. As it is developing across the province, it is working a great change in the educational system. We have seen this government, with the participation of the federal government, direct tremendous building programmes centred on vocational expansion.

There has been a great deal of apprehension about this. For one thing, there is the massive commitment of public money along the single line of vocational expansion. The hon. Minister has drawn attention to the practice of pointing to the fact that many of these courses may be teaching obsolete skills, and that the students coming out of such a programme will perhaps be in a posi-

tion where after four or five years of pretty intensive training, they will have a skill which is either not immediately saleable, or they will be in a position where expensive retraining will be required before they will be able to take a proper place in the industrial community.

There is also the apprehension that there is not enough academic content in the vocational courses that are provided. This is a matter of opinion. We have the assurances of the hon. Minister that this is not so. Nevertheless, in talking to teachers associated with the curriculum there is a feeling that further emphasis on English and history, particularly, might be in order so that these students who do have the benefits of a vocational education will also have a broader background to better enable them to take their place in the society, that certainly they must do.

There is certainly the apprehension as well, that although there is no doubt a large staff concerned with this, the constant upgrading of a curriculum so that it is as nearly up to date as possible is perhaps not taking place. The programme is relatively new. It will be another four or five years before this sort of criticism can be more pointed, but it is a great responsibility for the hon. Minister and those working under him to see to it that this is kept as much up to date as possible.

Certainly then, the programme needs careful and constant course revision. It needs an overall programme permitting practical participation of those taking part in the vocational courses. Some schools do this now. In the education committee a few days ago, we were discussing an enactment that would permit insurance for students who do take part in factory experience while they are taking the vocational course. But it seems to me that this practical participation is essential.

In general, under technical education, we have our vocational schools and the trade schools which evidently are now called vocational centres. We have the schools of technology at the top of which is the Ryerson institute, and then of course beyond that, the technological field at the university level. There is a suspicion on the part of those viewing the educational programmes in general, that this whole area of technical and vocational training requires integration and more overall planning than it is presently receiving. For example, I understand that because of lack of facilities and space at Ryerson, the Toronto Board of Education, and perhaps the London board as well, is presently presenting and paying on its own for the teaching staff and facilities to teach the first year,

or what is equivalent to the first year, of the Ryerson course out of Ryerson, that is in the schools of the city of Toronto and some other centres.

I want to know if this is going to be a continuing government policy, because it may be a good one. The vocational institutions that are found in every part of the province, and frequently two or three of them in every city, might very well be integrated in such a way so that the first year of the Ryerson course could be given at the local level.

It is also true that there is an outcry on the part of many municipalities that have been passed over in the distribution of the trade school plums. I think of one near my own constituency, Brantford, an industrial area which has not been in receipt of this. In this connection, I was quite surprised this afternoon when you referred to the one that was going to be built in Welland, that my friend, the hon. member for that area (Mr. Morningstar), did not take part in the general round of applause. There is one in Hamilton, one in Welland and I would urge on the hon. Minister that there could very well be an establishment of one in Brantford as well. It is a long way between Hamilton and London.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How far is it from Brantford to Hamilton?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, my point is this. It is possible for you to give the first year of the Ryerson course in the vocational schools of the city of Toronto. I submit it would be possible for you to give the first year of this course in many other centres of the province. It is also true that some of the trades training that is given at the present or the developing trades institutes, might also be incorporated in the vocational training schools that are found in such numbers across this province.

This is what I mean by the need for integration and overall planning. These expensive facilities might be put to use for more than just the third stream in the high school system. I would like the hon. Minister's comment on this at some later date, perhaps this evening.

In connection with technical education, I would draw the attention of the House once again to the comments in the report of the university presidents, which admittedly are about a year out of date now, in which they said their closest scrutiny of the government's plans for expansion in technical education would indicate there would be about 6,000 places in schools of technology by 1970. They said that the government should be thinking

in terms not of 6,000 places, but 18,000 places. Certainly we want to hear the comments of the hon. Minister in this connection.

I understand there are presently in schools of technology 4,500 students and so it appears that the goal as predicted by the university presidents of 6,000 will in fact be surpassed. But it is a question in my mind, whether the present plans of the government would provide the necessary 18,000 places in time for the tremendous need of these students in the next six years.

In general then, post-secondary education is an area of most important concern as far as the government's line of thinking is concerned, and we are going to discuss the universities and the special problems there on a separate occasion. But in general, extensive post-secondary education is, I would say, a relatively new thing in Ontario. There was a time when students who achieved their entrance would be sent some distance from home to go on to high school, and certainly the churches led the way in the establishment of these schools at the secondary level. But we now take for granted extensive secondary facilities in every community.

It is also true that in most communities, once a student reaches the level of matriculation he must then leave town for further education. For training in nursing and for advanced technical education—certainly to attend the teachers' colleges, as I mentioned, this is necessary.

The technological institutes are not distributed in a way that would do too much to alleviate this problem. Certainly the planning of these expanding facilities is a great responsibility so that in each area there is some measure of post-secondary education. It may well be when we are discussing the development of universities into the proposed community colleges that there will be some word from the hon. Minister in this connection.

Now, as far as the curriculum is concerned, it is a great responsibility, not only for the government but for all citizens. I well remember some months ago when the hon. Minister was reported as saying that he would hope that this could be kept out of the realm of politics. Before his supporters got too interested in that particular statement, I hope that his conception of politics is different than mine, because I believe in the same speech he also announced something to do with text book grants and the announcement of a conference having to do with the planning of school architecture. He took very dramatic steps indeed to introduce

education into politics in the pre-September 25 period of time. However, I would now like to make some reference to teacher training.

The hon. Minister announced in his remarks this afternoon that he was going to constitute a committee to look into the problem of teacher-training at the primary level. Of course this is greatly needed and we will look forward to the report of this committee with much interest.

Once again, we would say to the hon. Minister that his decision to study the training of teachers at the secondary level, separate from the primary level, was an error in judgment and that this contributed more than ever to the separation of these parts of education, where no separation is needed. In looking at the statistics that were given to us in the report of the hon. Minister, it was interesting to note that in the area of secondary school teacher training, there were, I believe, 464 students enrolled in the full-year winter course at the College of Education, but well over 3,000 taking advantage of the summer course in education. Yet we have these facilities for the training of secondary school teachers at the present College of Education, and at the expanded facilities that are under construction in London and contemplated in Kingston.

It may be that the report that the hon. Minister referred to in such glowing terms is already a bit out of date. It appears that those who wish to go into secondary school teaching, practically all of whom have a university degree, feel that they do not need to subject themselves to the full-year course and are definitely taking great advantage of the summer courses offered. It certainly is time, in my view, that the government took a new look at the whole problem of teacher training, particularly for those applicants who hold a university degree.

The hon. Minister knows that we have discussed this before, but the report of his committee gave only passing reference to the suggestion that these people, who in fact are undergoing post-graduate training, might be put directly into the schools from university on an intern basis, if I can use that phrase, and in fact take their training as assistant teachers. The plan has much to recommend it. These people have already undergone a course of instruction at the academic level which has given them a Bachelor degree. They are then quite capable of taking part in the instruction in the classroom under the supervision of a teacher with some experience.

I do not want to belabour the point—as I

say, we have discussed it in the House before. But he would not only observe the experienced teacher, he would have an opportunity to teach the lessons himself under the direction of the experienced teacher. He would not have a passive role to play in the classroom; he would be able to assist in the many chores having to do with the setting of tests, the marking of tests, setting up the laboratory apparatus, and doing any number of jobs around the classroom and the school. This experience could be in several types of schools. In this way surely there is an alternative to the present system, which is really getting seriously out of date, with such a tremendous majority of applicants making use of what was supposed to be just a stopgap project to provide the teachers needed and hardly any making use of the full year course so heavily recommended by the hon. Minister and his committee.

In conjunction with this plan, there is also the suggestion that the topics of educational value themselves, which every teacher in training must be exposed to at least, might well be given at the university level as he is taking his undergraduate work. It would not be for me to suggest that the full training of the teacher should take place there because the valuable time which would be used in the teaching of the educational subjects would be lost as far as the academic instruction of the candidate would be concerned. But certainly the basic subjects of educational philosophy and psychology could very well be covered at the undergraduate level, permitting such a plan to be effectively introduced in Ontario. I am convinced it will work and surely it is time we gave it a try.

The hon. Minister has also been kind enough to mention, Mr. Chairman, my great interest in educational television. In reading the report of the hon. Minister to see what happened to last year's \$50,000, I must say I was deeply disappointed in what has been accomplished or not accomplished. It appears to me that the money was spent in support of the Metropolitan Educational Television Association—and I am not just sure how much it got—and in sending someone to observe what is done in educational television in other jurisdictions. The hon. Minister has announced that an advisory committee would be set up for this. I submit to him, Mr. Chairman, that this is not in the realm of experimental departure now. It is time we had educational television in the province of Ontario, and not on a scale where every third Thursday some programme is beamed out across the province through the generosity of the owners of the

present stations so that the schools may tune in if they choose.

It would require an earmarking, I would say, of one per cent of the educational budget so that a system of educational television could be set up in the province of Ontario, giving regular courses in many fields whereby equality of opportunity in all parts of the province would be a fact. I would never for a moment suggest that educational television would be a replacement of the teacher, but surely in the teaching of science, languages and in many other fields, it would be a most useful addition to the present tools used in education.

To continue on a favourite theme of mine, the report of the department would indicate that the thing that is holding up the extension of teaching of French on a conversational basis in the public school system is that there are not enough qualified teachers. Television surely is a solution to this problem.

The qualifications for a teacher like this are twofold. Not only must the teacher of conversational French have a good working knowledge of the language and a proper accent, but the teacher must have a personality so that he can get it across to these young people, probably beginning in Grade 3, Grade 4 and Grade 5. People with these qualifications are few in number, but surely the hon. Minister could select some who would be able to deliver a course of French language instruction, perhaps on a basis of 20 minutes a day, that would be received in the classrooms across the province. In this way we could give a programme of French instruction which would fit in wonderfully well with the present programme that begins at the Grade 9 level. The graduates from Grade 13 then would come out of our system with a working knowledge, not only of a second language, but of the background and the culture associated with it.

I cannot urge this programme on the hon. Minister too strongly. He feels, I am convinced, that educational television is an expensive gimmick and in my opinion he is wrong in this. The province is falling behind in its use.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have said it is expensive but have never used the word "gimmick".

Mr. Nixon: Just in closing this section of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to say that another thing very much in favour of the introduction of a real educational television network in the province of Ontario is the fact that by the year 1970, the best laid

plans of the government are going to leave them in an embarrassing situation where their facilities at the post-secondary level are going to be inadequate, to say the least. It was suggested in the Deutsch report that a useful safety valve might be found in educational television, whereby a course for university credit could be given to any student with basic qualifications who cannot gain admittance to an institution of higher learning. I have seen similar courses offered in the United States. They are effective and certainly within the realm not only of possibility but of great usefulness. It is in this connection as well that I would recommend the introduction of a programme of educational television.

Mr. Chairman, as we know, the government is introducing a system of grants and legislation whereby the school boards in the province of Ontario are required to provide textbooks for all students to the end of Grade 10. The grants will largely assist with the provision of the textbooks, but I understand there will still be reasonably heavy burdens on the local school boards in this connection. Let us say a burden will be on school boards in this connection, and the government is not footing the entire bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It will be a very minor burden.

Mr. Nixon: You supply one adjective and I will supply another.

As I have already mentioned, the announcement of this was made at a politically opportune time. Nevertheless, the citizens of the province welcome it.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Is there any other time but a politically opportune time?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): For once, education needs rather than political considerations might get first consideration some time.

Mr. Nixon: It is interesting to note that these new regulations and new grants did not go hand in hand with any particular change in the policy regarding the production of textbooks themselves. They are still produced in large numbers, authorized and put on a selective list; and the hon. Minister has an argument, and I say a good argument, to support this process. Nevertheless, as we get into the realm where the people of Ontario, through their tax monies, are required to provide the text books, it is time that a new policy was evolved with regard to this very expensive procedure.

In this connection I would recommend heartily to the government that they introduce a plan whereby, with the co-operation of the teachers' professional organizations, a yearly book—which I hesitate to call a text book, but a work book associated with the various subjects—be introduced and printed in paperback form by the Queen's Printer. These would be supplied free of charge, I would say free of direct charge, to the students across the province.

These books, admittedly, would be cheaply produced. They would not have within them, and they would not pretend to contain within them, all of the excellent material presently contained in the good textbooks which are available on the authorized list. This would not be their purpose. They would parallel the core curriculum which the revised curriculum will eventually produce in the province of Ontario. The money saved in this way would be used to greatly expand the library facilities in the individual schools.

The students would be urged—as a matter of fact, it would be required of them—that while they would use the material provided in the paperback book for their day-to-day course work, sir, background and project work and further information on all of these subjects would be obtained through the use of the school library. So often these expensive library facilities are provided with a trained librarian and good facilities and a very small percentage of the students make use of them.

In this way, we could train the students to get away from their reliance on a single textbook, which they clutch under their arm and memorize for examination purposes. We would broaden their whole view of education, and we would improve the system immeasurably in this regard.

I would say that this is a personal suggestion. I favour it personally and very strongly, but certainly the whole question of the development of libraries in this province is one of great concern to all of us. This is certainly true of libraries at the university level. I have a report here prepared by Edwin E. Williams, which is a report of a survey for the national conference of Canadian universities, in which he did examine the state of the libraries in Canada, particularly at the university level.

In that report, he said that the best university library in Canada—I particularly want to mention this, because it was mentioned previously in debates and questioned by the hon. Minister—is that of the University of Toronto. It ranks not 14th, but 13th, in North America.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does he not include the graduate library facilities in his assessment?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, the library facilities at the University of Toronto for the whole university and all the colleges—everything taken together.

But I believe it is true that the support of the libraries in this province is not what it should be. In another place in the report he says that the library systems in all of Canada are falling behind, with the exception of the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta. I am afraid I cannot extend that into any of the other western provinces, but the implication is clear; that the province of Ontario is not keeping up the level of library facilities, which are so much an important part of the educational requirements in the 20th century.

It may be that the library facilities of Ontario are good, by the absolute standards we are used to, but when compared with facilities in other jurisdictions we are lagging behind. I would say that the beginning of a new plan of library development might very well be based on a new and improved and efficient textbook policy, which could be introduced at the school level, and the training of the young people in the use of these facilities.

Mr. Chairman, it is not possible in the capacity at my disposal to give a criticism of all areas of education. It is true, and we are all aware of it, that the problems are many and almost overpowering, but it is also true that the goodwill of the public is extremely great for this government department. They are most anxious for leadership. They applaud any move which is construed as an improvement in the educational system. The money spent for education is perhaps begrudged less than any other, and it is certainly in this department that we have our best chance to improve the world as we know it, and the part of civilization which really lies within our responsibility. We must concentrate very heavily on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my first words would be words of warm commendation to the hon. Minister.

After that outburst, I wonder if the Tory backbenchers are capable of responding to constructive criticism, rather than just praise. I do not want to qualify my praise of the hon. Minister of Education and I will not, in spite of their intervention. What I wanted to say was that I think that he and his predecessor before him, the hon. Prime Minister, have rescued The Department of Education

from a process of ossification, which was little short of terrifying in its later stages.

Indeed, this afternoon, we had the hon. Minister present us with a report on the department's activities and its hopes and its plans which, I think, confirmed the grasp he has of the department and of some new steps he is making. Indeed, I could not help but think, Mr. Chairman, that since the hon. Minister is a very young man, indeed the youngest man in the Cabinet, I trust it will not escape the attention of some of his hon. colleagues that maturity and breadth of information is not necessarily the accompaniment of old age and baldness.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: And perhaps when they contemplate the superior job he is doing as the youngest member of the Cabinet, they will not be propelled, when a very young member in the Opposition makes a telling point against them, sir, to resort to cheap jibes with regard to his youth, while ignoring the substance of the comment he makes, because I think the hon. Minister of Education is a model for them to contemplate.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I want to proceed to some introductory comments with regard to the estimates.

I want to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I have never been quite so perplexed in preparing the introductory comments to the estimates to know exactly what I should pick and choose. At the present time, in The Department of Education, we have a range of problems, a range of challenges, which cannot be matched in any other department. It was one of the favourite comments of the previous Prime Minister, Mr. Frost, that education is our greatest problem. Well, if it was our greatest problem back in his day, how much more it is our greatest problem today is underlined by many facts. Not the least is, as the hon. Minister pointed out, that something over \$400 million, close to 40 per cent of our normal Budget, is going to be devoted to education at the present time.

I want to say at the outset, just by way of underlining a point I think is of some significance, that the government has complicated the problem of choosing what should be discussed in the introduction to the estimates by the division they have made between The Department of Education and The Department of University Affairs. The government has decided that The Department of University Affairs is going to deal with universities alone. In other words, in their wisdom they have chosen to divide post-secondary

education, separating universities from all of the other aspects of post-secondary education, whether it be teachers' training, nurses, technological institutes or what you will.

I want to be perfectly fair; I think there is some very valid reason for placing University Affairs by itself. Perhaps for the foreseeable future, for the years that lie immediately ahead of us, it may be well that this is being done. But I hope the hon. Minister has not missed the fact that in separating universities from other post-secondary educational activities he is perpetuating what might be described as first- and second-class education, something which this government sought to eliminate when it introduced the Robarts plan at the secondary level.

One of the great problems we faced when we introduced the Robarts plan was to erase from the minds of the general public the idea that commercial or technological training is not something worthy of being put on a status with academic training. Unfortunately, one of the psychological effects that I think is going to flow from the division that has been made of universities in a category and department by themselves, and all of the other post-secondary training still being tucked away with secondary and public education, is to some extent the establishment of first- and second-class education, which I think is unfortunate. While I acknowledge some validity in the division that the government has made, I do not think we should ignore some of the consequences that may flow from the decision. Certainly, of minor consequence, it creates some difficulty for us in dealing with the estimates today.

I want to deal first with some of the general aspects of education. In the hon. Minister's comments this afternoon with regard to retraining, he had one phase in which he referred to "uncertainty". There was a very brief and poignant little sentence in which he referred to uncertainty. I want to suggest to him that the one characteristic that is common to many fields of education today, indeed I would almost say to most fields of education today, is that of uncertainty. There is uncertainty, for example, with regard to goals. We are engaged today in an agonizing reappraisal of the whole purpose of education in the face of the revolutionary changes of our age. There is uncertainty as to the techniques in face of the persistent problem of drop-outs, a wastage at the secondary and the higher levels of education that is so great as to seriously question the whole basic efficiency of our educational system.

The reasons for this uncertainty lie in part

in the problems arising from an unprecedented extension of educational opportunities to a growing proportion of our people. In fact, I sometimes wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we realize that we are in a period which if it has any parallel in history, it is the period of about 100 years ago, when we broke away from the concept of education being restricted to a very few people and we began to move into the whole concept of a public educational system. Now in our day, in our generation, we are going so far beyond that in terms of educational opportunities in many, many fields.

But this reason is compounded by the fact that educational research has been sadly lacking, so that we are not exactly certain where we are going or how we are going to get there. Indeed, I was very interested this morning to read in the *Globe and Mail* of a speech that was given by Sister Jacqueline Grennan, executive vice-president of the Webster College of St. Louis, to, of all people, a group of ad men yesterday. In the course of her speaking to the advertising men, she is reported in the *Globe and Mail* in the latter part of its report this morning as saying this:

She raised chuckles from the 600 advertisers at the conference by reminding them of the plight of the railways—"the only industry which invested as little in research as the education industry has."

This is the basic point I want the House to recognize—that in education we have done very little research, we have done virtually no research in terms of what should have been done. As a result, we do not know exactly where we are going or how best to get there simply because we have not devoted enough time or energy or resources to find out.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, this uncertain atmosphere is one of the major problems facing us in the field of education today. To a considerable extent we are operating blindly, and for that reason I have a basic and overall recommendation to suggest to the government. It is the establishment of a continuing committee of inquiry which would initiate investigations into the many interrelated problems which we face in education today. I envisage this committee of inquiry as tackling a job that may extend over the next five years or perhaps more. Its personnel should be the very best available, drawn partly from the field of education, but partly from outstanding citizens who can bring a fresh outside approach. Its purpose will be not only to initiate through subcommittees research in depth into the many

perplexing problems, but also to assess and to co-ordinate the results so that the committee might be able to advise the government.

It might be argued, Mr. Chairman, that this is a job for The Department of Education and for the new Department of University Affairs. But in my submission, because of the very nature of their operations, they are so preoccupied with the day-to-day administrative problems that they are not free to do the detailed study and assessment.

In suggesting such a continuing committee of inquiry, I do not want to suggest that the field has been neglected completely. On the contrary, as the hon. Minister pointed out this afternoon, investigations have been launched into a number of worrying questions.

For example, the whole role of the effectiveness of Grade 13 has been referred to a committee. But the point I want to make is that Grade 13 is not an isolated problem. It is simply the most controversial link in the whole educational chain from Grade 1 to the increasingly diversified field of higher education. In short, a study of the problem or of the role of Grade 13 should be co-ordinated with a much needed re-examination of our whole educational system from kindergarten through to the post-graduate field, or general adult education throughout our working lifetime.

Second, there are the important studies of the Ontario Curriculum Institute. The Department of Education has joined with the teachers' federation, the trustees' council and other bodies, in a study of our curriculum through public and secondary schools. This is something that is long overdue. Ontario and Canada have lagged behind European countries in efforts to modernize curricula in order to meet the needs of our day more effectively.

In part, the function of this continuing committee of inquiry will be to co-ordinate studies which are already under way and to fit these individual pieces into the broader educational mosaic. But in addition, there is an impressive range of neglected problems that are crying out for investigation. Some or all of them might be included in the terms of reference for such committee of inquiry and I just want tonight, within the limitations of the time that one should take in some introductory statements, to cite four different examples.

First, I think it is not too early to assess the operation of the effectiveness of the Robarts plan, which seeks to provide the three streams of academic, technical and

commercial education in our secondary schools.

There are many problems inherent in the nature of this reshaping of our educational system at the secondary level. Many of these problems are born of the relatively unplanned manner in which it was introduced, as a result of which there are grave misgivings in the minds of a good many of the teachers whose role is vital for the success and the implementation of the Robarts plan. Therefore, I submit to the hon. Minister that the time is now, rather than some time later, to examine and review the whole implementation of the Robarts Plan so that we can find to what extent we are just paying lip service to an ideal, and to what extent it has really been implemented. We have found, for example, across the board rather than in the limited area he has assessed and reported on this afternoon, that there is at least some balance between the academic and the commercial and the technical. It seems to me that the sooner we take a look at this and find the limitations in its operation—because we all agree that it is a desirable objective—and perhaps make up for the rather hasty and unplanned way in which it was suddenly dropped like a bolt from the blue upon the province of Ontario, then the sooner we are going to be in a position to do something by way of correcting the errors that may be creeping into its implementation.

Second, there is the drop-out problem which I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, is not so much a problem of our schools as of our society. Indeed, at this point, I want to borrow from the writing and the reflection of one of the regular commentators on educational matters in the city of Toronto, Mr. J. Bascom St. John, in the *Globe and Mail*, when he was discussing on June 10 of last year, the whole question of drop-outs. He said it is commonly assumed even by those who work in schools, that the drop-out problem is mainly a school responsibility. Then he goes on to debunk this and he gets into what I submit to the House for its consideration for a moment is the whole basis of this problem of drop-outs. I am quoting from his article. He said:

It is a simple fact that nobody anywhere has yet been able to conceive of a perfect educational programme which would grip all young people from the beginning to the end of their course and keep them learning. Theoretically, knowledge in all or any of its forms is in itself fascinating—a matter of unquestionable interest to all ages and every person. Actually, this is far from true.

There is a period in every childhood when it would seem that curiosity is insatiable and learning is as easy as breathing but for whatever reason this lively concern does not last. The cynics will say that the school destroys it. It dies even in children who do not go to school, with rare exceptions. In asserting that the drop-out problem is not primarily an educational problem, we would say rather that it relates to society, to human nature, to the structure of the mind, character, will and imagination and all that makes persons different from each other. The school people should stop chiding themselves for failing in overcoming the drop-out problem and society at large should start a vivid self examination to find the causes of the refusal to learn and the contempt for knowledge.

In 3,000 years we have not been able to define successfully what an education is, or ought to be. There is a passage in Aristotle's politics in which he deplors the inability of people to decide what ought to be studied and how. We are no closer to agreement now than the Greeks were then.

That is the end of the quotation. Then Mr. St. John goes on to discuss the thought that education in the centuries since the days of the Greeks has been centred in the science faculties and in the humanities, and this is the whole core of the concept of education that we have lived with up until very modern days. Then he makes this very pertinent point:

The concept of an education for work in its various forms is relatively new and it has to overcome the enormous prestige and continuous opposition of the entrenched humanities.

Later he adds:

Education for hand occupations is so new that there are many people still alive who were born before the first experiments in this field were tried. Naturally there is still much to learn on what to teach, how to teach it, and how to relate these new forms of schooling to the essential elements of knowledge in the old education. Man is still a person with a mind and a soul as well as two hands, and neither aspect of this nature should be neglected in school.

I do not want to go any further into this for the moment. As a matter of fact, in subsequent articles, in October, 1963, Mr. Bascom St. John continues to go on to explore the problem of the drop-outs.

One point we should bring into our consideration here is the kind of thing that was revealed in the past year by the inspectors' report in the Metro area, as reported in the *Toronto Daily Star* on July 3, 1963, by Ross Henderson. He referred to the fact that the educational "establishment" in Metropolitan Toronto had come out fighting when Ed McGibbon on his radio programme on the CBC made some comments with regard to school classes and failure policies. Mr. McGibbon charged that pupils who should not have been passed in lower grades were passed and then when they were in high school these students were squeezed out, so that they would not be trying Grade 13 examinations at all.

Mr. Henderson goes on to deal with the results of what is described as the "survival index" in three or four of the downtown Toronto schools as contained in the inspectors' report, showing that you have this serious drop-out through each of the high school grades. Then Ross Henderson concludes his article with this rather significant comment:

Each year Toronto trustees get a report stating that their school Grade 13 results passes, as a percentage of all papers written, were above the provincial average and there are proud smiles all round. The report they never get—little unpleasant news is reported to them—would say that the high pass rate is accomplished by failing problem children who take up needed space, so that they get discouraged and quit, to become unemployment problems.

I leave the matter there, but I want to suggest to the hon. Minister and to the House that the whole problem of drop-outs is part of the broader question of moving from an educational system which was related to the idea of providing something for the leisured aristocracy—or the professional groups, a few people in society—to the concept that education for work is something that is so basic and is so new that the ramifications of it and the problems related to it are something that we have not yet really come to grips with. I think the sooner we do it, the sooner we are going to be able to be in a position to come to more intelligent decisions with regard to it.

I give this government credit. Indeed, I go back to the period of the hon. Prime Minister, when he was Minister of Education. Somehow, if I judge The Department of Education on the basis of the previous record, I do not think it would have been capable of the vision and the imagination to have seized

upon the fact that the federal government was making money available to expand this withered arm of our educational system on the technical side. Certainly the department has shown little appreciation of it because of its whole academic orientation. But I think the impact of events combined with the kind of leadership that the hon. Minister gave, led us to seize upon this with the result we have the so-called Robarts plan, in which we have diversified our educational system to the commercial and the technical as well as the academic and the department is now seeking to make it available across the whole province of Ontario.

But Mr. Chairman, the point I draw to the attention of the hon. Minister is that while the department has grasped the significance of this at the secondary school level—and I shall dwell upon it in more detail later—it has apparently not grasped the necessity of this at the post-secondary level. As the hon. member for Brant pointed out, the university presidents in their first report emphasized that there are only 6,000 places at the present time in our technological institutes. With the muted undertones with which university presidents normally speak when they should really be taking the club out and going after the government, they stated that what we should have is a tripling of this objective to 18,000. They said this two years ago and nothing has happened since then—nothing that was not on the drawing board before.

In other words, here is a revelation that even this government, which grasped the importance of a diversification of our educational system to include technological training at the secondary level, had not grasped it with a degree of conviction so that it is moving forward with vigour to make it available at the post-secondary level, which in our day and age is certainly just as important as the secondary level itself. That is the second point I wanted to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister. First, the reassessment of the Robarts plan; second, the whole question of drop-outs, and the broader concept of education.

The third one I want to deal with is the whole confusion of job retraining, in an age when it is said that a worker may well have to be trained and retrained two or three times during his lifetime. Let me go back and document just how incredibly confused and bewildering this picture is at the present time, Mr. Chairman. I have here an article from the *Toronto Daily Star* of April 24, 1963 entitled: "Teachers blast 'confused' job retraining."

Part of it reads as follows:

Retraining for unemployed workers was described yesterday as confused by the teachers who do it, but they agreed it worked. Reporting to the Metro school board, secondary school superintendent, J. R. H. Morgan said he never engaged in an operation "with as many loose ends." Mr. Morgan said the retraining programmes paid for by senior governments did not know who they reported to, who set their policies, or who could end the confusion. "We do not know where the responsibility is. If something needs doing, we just go out and do it," he said.

The trustees decided to study Mr. Morgan's proposal to ask the province for a statement outlining responsibilities in the proposal to set up a new school for retraining.

It is all very well, Mr. Chairman—if I may pause here for a moment to comment on this documentation of the incredibly confusing picture of retraining at the present time. It is all very well to say that this was an emergency and that the two senior levels of government, have provided the monies and the degree of leadership and have said to the local level of government, which has the facilities to come to grips with the problem, "Go ahead and do it."

It is all very well to do it on this kind of helter-skelter, confused basis if it were only on emergency. Undoubtedly, in the first instance, it was an emergency. But Mr. Chairman, the simple fact of the matter is that to anybody who has assessed the implications of automation, the implications of the changes which scientific revolution is bringing with relation to our working force, this is not an emergency. This is a problem which is going to be with us for the foreseeable future; therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to you that here is a problem we have to sit down with and take a look at. We have to research it in depth. We have to study it.

Let me quote just one other incredible aspect of the present situation, as referred to in this article:

Federal and provincial authorities asked Metro to appoint a co-ordinator for the scheme. A. W. Fair, former vice-principal of Central High School of Commerce, was appointed. But then The Department of Education specified each principal of a school operating a retraining programme would run his own programme.

Maybe there is some reason for this, but what is the result of this confusion and other

aspects of the programme? I want to come to that.

It was rather dramatically, and in headlines, revealed to at least the Metropolitan area in another story in the Toronto *Daily Star* in January of this year:

"Can't afford to be educated; 1,000 quit the retraining school."

This story relates the details of one individual, one Lloyd B. Jones, who is one of the more than 1,000 men and women who quit the Toronto adult retraining programme because they cannot afford the luxury of improving their education. I shall quote:

Mr. A. W. Fair, the programme's co-ordinator, yesterday shocked Toronto's welfare committee when they listed the number of people who have dropped out of the scheme designed to teach skills to the unemployed or to give new skills to those replaced by automation.

Here is a direct quote from Mr. Jones, this one man, taken as a case history:

"I am not going back. I am not going to put my family through that again," the tall army veteran maintained. "They would have been all right if I could have gone through. I worked hard and got good marks."

But he was a man who was married, who had a family, who was trying to live on \$36 a week, \$6 a day for the six days of the week, and he simply could not do it.

The hon. Minister spoke this afternoon, for example—and I was very interested to hear this announcement, but I was saddened by the fact that he did not grasp the opportunity to push this kind of situation—pointing out that the federal government is now going to assume 90 per cent rather than, I believe, 75 per cent of the cost of retraining. But instead of the provincial government pocketing the remaining 15 per cent, when you have a programme that is as much of a failure as this because of those who happen to be in a financial position where they require more than \$36 a week to live on, why not devote the amount of money which is free at the provincial level to increasing the \$6 a day made available for those who are seeking retraining.

However, again, I do not want to go to any greater length in spelling out the nature of the problem. But here you have a problem of retraining which everybody agrees is not simply an emergency; it is a problem which will be with us for a long time to come. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that before we waste more time and money in

this programme more research is needed, so that we can get it onto a permanent, working, efficient basis.

Mr. Chairman, I want to turn to the fourth area which I suggested as proof of the need for a continuing committee of inquiry, and that is with regard to technological education. I mentioned it briefly just a moment ago. The university presidents in their first report, a copy of which I have in my hand here, pointed out on page six of their report—which was really written back in the year 1962, though it was tabled in this House early in 1963—that:

There is need for drastic reorganization and expansion of the facilities for technological education.

Again, if you move on to pages 16, 17 and 18, you will find the gist of their comments with regard to technical training at the post-secondary level. They point out, for example, that the committee was informed that the present enrolment in technological institutes in Ontario is 3,800 and that the present plans are to raise the accommodation to 6,000 with a new institute at Kirkland Lake, a new building at Ottawa and additions to the Ryerson Institute at Toronto.

On page 17 they point out the need for technological training so that we can get teachers in our secondary schools, and the unprecedented and very desirable development of vocational and technical schools across the province of Ontario.

Finally, they come once again to this rather muted proposal to the government—which the government will have to accept for all its full impact, namely:

We recommend strongly that a capacity of the order of 18,000 rather than 6,000 be the goal for the expansion of technological institutes by 1970.

Mr. Chairman, that proposal was made to this government two years ago, in 1962.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that, as far as I know, there has not been a whisper of suggestion that the government is acting on this proposal. True, you are developing Ryerson, but that was on the planning boards. True, you have developed Kirkland Lake, but that was on the planning boards. True, you have built a larger eastern institute of technology, but that was on the planning board.

I should be fair, because I understand from a little birdie which whispered to me that there is some contemplation of replacing of the Institute of Technology at Hamilton, primarily to provide more adequate facilities,

but conceivably, in the process you will expand its capacity somewhat.

But the proposition of responding to the challenge of 18,000 being the minimum requirement by 1970, rather than 6,000 is something of which we have heard no whisper of action from this government. And to my mind, Mr. Chairman, it is a double tragedy, because there are many people trying to get into our universities today who should not be going to our universities. They should be going to technological institutes, because they might be more adaptable to the education available in the technological institutes. But how can they get into a technological institute when we have not got them? When we are turning them away by thousands, tens of thousands; if all who needed this training were sought out, it certainly would be thousands.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You would have to seek them out, though.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, maybe it is our task to seek them out, because if we do not seek them out now we will find them in the unemployment lines ten years from now. We will not need to seek them out then; they will be on our hands for the rest of our lifetime, or we will have to process them through the—I trust it will not be—the continuing confusion of our retraining at that stage. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the government has not responded.

I come back to the basic point that I am making. The university presidents, who I think being humble folk, acknowledge that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which cheek does the hon. member have his tongue in?

Mr. MacDonald: —that they were straying somewhat from their immediate field of concern into the technological field, nonetheless they stated rather emphatically, and I think, correctly—I am quoting from page 18:

We think that the relations of the vocational secondary schools and technological institutes—indeed the entire development of technological and technical education in Ontario—should be investigated in depth by a competent and representative group, backed up by a fact-finding and research staff. Direction, co-ordination, and research are sorely needed in this field.

Mr. Chairman, this is the basic plea that I am making. I want to suggest to you that direction and co-ordination and research are needed in the whole field of education, if we

are going to dispell this atmosphere of uncertainty as to in what direction we are going, and how we are going to get there. We need a Robbins' type of investigation, such as has been recently completed in Great Britain by Lord Robbins, into the limited field of university affairs. We need it extended in the province of Ontario and indeed we need it for Canada. But let us forget for the moment the rest of Canada and deal with our own problems at home—throughout the whole of our educational system. This is the task which I believe should be tackled by a continuing committee of inquiry.

As the hon. Minister pointed out this afternoon, it is about 15 years since the Hope report was made in the province of Ontario. Tragically, that report was to a considerable extent abortive, because it was virtually shelved amid a bitter renewal of the controversy over public and separate schools. But that issue, it would be my hope, has been resolved for the moment with the implementation of the foundation programme. That major pitfall has been removed, and I trust therefore we are in a position to be able to get at the other aspects of education and not feel that we are going to have a report or any consideration of it overshadowed by this controversy that has threaded its way through our history.

The committee of inquiry, Mr. Chairman, should not be just another Royal commission that goes off for two or three years and produces a weighty tome that few people are going to read. Rather, the result of subcommittee reports should be assessed in the broader studies which the committee has inaugurated, and recommendations should be made to the government as soon as possible. In short, it should be a working committee, providing the necessary research in depth for The Department of Education and The Department of University Affairs. And, incidentally, I will relate this proposal I am making here to the role—if indeed there should be a role, because though the government has said it will continue, I am not sure that it is wise—the advisory committee on university affairs—when we get to consideration of university matters themselves.

Meanwhile, of course, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the government has to forge ahead. We cannot wait in face of the pressing problems we have, while we go off and study exactly how we should go about them. The problems are so urgent that there is no alternative but to forge ahead. The sooner we undertake this basic re-examination the sooner we will be sure that we are on

the right course, and if perchance we find that we are not on the right course, then we will be in the position to move and correct the mistakes that we have been making up until now so that they will not be perpetuated in the future.

That is the main point, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to make in my introductory remarks. I want to move on now, however, to two other matters that I think are so important that they bear some comment at this stage. The first one has to do with the foundation programme on financing education.

One could get rather hilarious at this point, even though it is a very serious matter, because I well remember that afternoon when the hon. Minister of Education, with some difficulty, waded through the treatise that, with deference, I will say was prepared for him. I do not think he prepared it, and he obviously sometimes wondered whether the thing was comprehensible on reading, let alone on hearing. In fact, I was rather interested after the hon. Minister was finished because—maybe I am mistaken on this—as far as I know, there is only one newspaper in the province of Ontario which had an article seriously attempting to analyze what the government's foundation programme on educational finance was. Unfortunately, most newspapers do not have computer systems. I think perhaps this is the answer and the government has given us the clue to it now: they could not figure it out.

The one man, and I think The Department of Education should strike a leather medal for him, was T. J. Allan, of the *Toronto Daily Star*. Rather than go back to try to wade through the perplexing details as the hon. Minister presented the government's programme for the educational finance foundation programme, I want to read a few comments of Mr. Allan. I must say that not finding time myself to delve into it to the extent that I should have, I found myself almost in complete agreement with the assessment that he came up with. For example, in his article, which was carried on February 4, 1964, approximately a week after the hon. Minister's statement—let it be said of Mr. Allan, it took him a week to figure it out—he said this:

The statement was so complex that the MPPs jeered, unable to understand what he was talking about. And the system of grants is so complicated that it will take W. J. McCordic, executive secretary of the Metro school board, another week to work out how much it means in dollars and cents to Metro schools and taxpayers. Yet

Mr. McCordic and his staff are experts in this field and have the statistical apparatus at their fingertips.

As for the separate school boards and the separate school ratepayers, expecting to get considerable relief from the new system, they are completely in the dark. John Middleweek, secretary-treasurer of the Metro separate school board, won't even hazard a guess as to when he can come up with some firm figures.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He had a very rough idea though.

Mr. MacDonald: Did he? This may be true. There is another point in here, and if he had a rough idea I wonder who he got it from.

One school administrator told the *Star* if Mr. Davis had wanted to confuse the situation, he couldn't have succeeded better. My guess is that even the boys up at The Department of Education don't know the score.

Now there is a harsh comment.

Mr. Nixon: That cannot be true.

Mr. MacDonald: Cannot be true?

Confusion reigns at every school board in the province. This is a deplorable start to a brand-new policy of school finances, one that could have enormous effect on the quality and cost of schooling.

This is a basic point that I want to pause and dwell on for a moment. I had hoped in the incredible confusion and patchwork of grants that we have developed over the years, indeed over the decades and generations in the province of Ontario, that the government's decision to move toward a foundation programme in educational finance might have resulted in a simplification. As far as I can figure out, even from the people who have attempted to analyze the government's statement, the difficulties and the complexities have become compounded.

Mr. Allan makes one or two other comments that I want to put on the record.

Equalization and tax relief were the purposes given by Mr. Davis, and a year ago by Premier Robarts, when introducing the foundation programme. Indications are that there will be little equalization and less tax relief, this year anyway.

The obvious purpose of a foundation programme is to control mounting school costs. With the government committed to school

boards amounting this year to \$285.5 million, its iron hand is showing through the new scheme. A foundation plan for financing public education involves a central authority establishing a cost level, a foundation sufficient to provide adequate schooling. These costs are divided among those who will pay the bills—in Ontario, the school boards through local taxes, and The Department of Education through provincial revenue.

Then he gets down to a basic assessment of what the government said was its programme. Here we come to the points that raise even more doubts as to the basic efficiency or validity of the particular foundation programme with which this government has come up.

The foundation Mr. Davis has established for operating the schools is \$210 for each elementary school pupil, \$420 for each high school and collegiate pupil, and \$550 for each vocational-technical school pupil. The government has decided to pay a little over a third of these costs, 35 per cent. This will be its basic grant.

If a school area has a lot of assessment on which to levy taxes, this is about all it will get. If it is assessment poor, it will get an equalizing grant which may end up with the local taxpayer putting up only five or ten per cent of the \$210, the \$420 or the \$500.

The basic point Mr. Allan makes—and it seems to me it is a valid point—is that here the government has accepted the foundation for underwriting presumably an equality of educational opportunity in this province—\$210 at the elementary level, \$420 for high school, and \$550 for vocational school.

He points out, however, that the comparable figures at the moment in North York are: \$442 for elementary, not \$210; \$620 for academic secondary, not \$420; and \$974 for vocational, not \$550. Some may say this is the rich affluent city of Toronto, or the suburbs of Toronto up in North York. So he makes another point which puts the whole issue into a rather interesting perspective: That if we go back to the government's own averages, in the year 1961, throughout the whole of the province of Ontario the average for elementary pupils was \$293.64, yet they fix the foundation at \$210. The average for academic high school students was \$592.84, yet they now fix the foundation at \$420. The average for vocational was \$743.79, yet the government has fixed the foundation at \$550. So the foundation is so low as to be meaningless in terms of providing a base upon which

you can really lift; because if it is an "assessment poor" area then you will find that very little more is going to be able to be raised in the local area.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, he comes to this conclusion, and I quote it with full endorsement:

The government has approached the foundation plan of financing schools so gingerly and at such a low level that it seems little more than a new name for the old hodge-podge of grants. It is, however, new. Its operation will have to be watched carefully lest education itself suffers a new poverty.

Having said that, I concur with Mr. Allan. I acknowledge great difficulty in comprehending anything as complex as the government's foundation programme. I suppose the only thing we can do is to wait for at least a year until even experts like Mr. McCordic, or the secretary of the separate school board, can figure out what it means to them—as well as all the amateurs who are engaged in trying to operate this educational system in the rural and small towns and villages across the province of Ontario and then take another look at it at that time. But I do so with a degree of misgiving, which I emphasize at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, the final point I want to raise does not really deal with any specific item in the estimates at the moment, but rather with an atmosphere and an attitude towards education and, more particularly, its costs today. I was rather interested, for example, in reading the advisory committee's latest report, which the hon. Minister made available to all the members just three or four days ago, to find that in the true and tried familiar pattern of the Frost approach to discussing costs in education or anything else, about the first third of the report went on in a manner meaningless and futile review of the percentage increases which have been made in education costs and everything else at the university level.

When we get to a discussion of university affairs in the latter part of these estimates, we will find out just how far short the government has fallen of the need, quite apart from trying to build statistics on the basis of the hopelessly inadequate amount we were making available a few years ago. But all this, combined with the problem at the local level, where we have left too much of the cost of education as a burden to be borne on homes and farmlands, has created in the public mind the idea that we are spending too much on education. It is

an excessive amount; it is an exorbitant amount. The result is that every little frill which happens to emerge in education is seized upon by the papers and is given great headlines; thus the public prejudice regarding educational expenditures is bolstered still more by the mistaken belief that a great proportion of our money is being spent on unnecessary elements in education.

I want to relate this to the province of Ontario. I have in my hand here, just to get this into proper perspective, a brief which was presented by the Canadian Teachers' Federation within the last two or three months—I do not happen to have the date here—to the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson in Ottawa. In the course of this brief—I might interject here: Was it November?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): November, 1963!

Mr. MacDonald: November, 1963!

I might say that is only bringing up to date something I have repeated almost every year in the hope that I might counter this whole public attitude towards excessive expenditures in education, because I think it is one of our great problems.

I want to quote into the record here—and I shall quote it directly so that it may appear in tabular form in *Hansard* and be more comprehensible. The first table is the personal income per capita, by province, in 1961 in the Dominion of Canada:

Ontario	\$1,829
British Columbia	1,809
Alberta	1,582
Canada-average	1,535
Manitoba	1,476
Quebec	1,332
Nova Scotia	1,191
Saskatchewan	1,184
New Brunswick	1,054
Prince Edward Island	952
Newfoundland	904

In other words, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the amount of wealth which is available for all of the needs of today, including education, the province of Ontario is heading the class. We have the largest per capita income and, of course, with the largest province, we obviously have the largest pool of income which is available to be devoted to education.

On page 7 of their brief there is another table, indicating the total school board expenditures for education as a percentage of the personal income by province, in 1961. And once again, let me give this so that it

may appear in a more comprehensive tabular fashion in *Hansard*:

Saskatchewan	6.3%
Alberta	5.4%
New Brunswick	4.6%
Newfoundland	4.5%
British Columbia	4.2%
Canada-average	4.2%
Nova Scotia	4.2%
Prince Edward Island	4.1%
Manitoba	4.0%
Quebec	4.0%
Ontario	3.9%

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we stand at the top of the class, in terms of capacity, to meet the needs of education; but in terms of the percentage of that available wealth which we are devoting to education, we stand at the bottom of the class.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder, Mr. Chairman. I recall reading that before it was presented to Mr. Pearson. That did not include, as I recall it, the expenditures on universities in the per capita rate, which alters the figures just a touch.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to be fair with the hon. Minister on all occasions. I was just going to emphasize once again to the hon. members of the House that these figures are the latest DBS figures for 1961. They are always at least three years behind, and I will concede, for example, that we have expanded our contributions at the university level. However, to what extent this is relatively going to change the pattern, I just do not know.

For example, let us examine the increased grants which were made available to the University of British Columbia and the New Simon Fraser University in B.C. A battling namesake of mine by the name of MacDonald is principal of UBC, and he really took on the government out there—not in muted tones but as a good clansman—and got real contribution. Once again I think we may find that most provinces have increased their contributions to higher levels of education, nearly as much, if not as much, as we have in the province of Ontario. I just do not know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can tell the hon. member, for his information, that these figures of DBS of course do not include any expenditures we have made under the federal-provincial agreement for technical and vocational training. This will include Ryerson and many other post-secondary institutions,

as well as the close to \$300 million we have spent for the vocational additions at the secondary level. I can assure the hon. member that we have spent, percentage-wise, far more than any of our sister provinces in this particular field in the last two years. If these figures were reflected in those averages they would not vary that much; and I think you would find that Ontario would not be perhaps in the same relative position.

Mr. MacDonald: I would hope that Ontario—if only for its own self-respect—would at least have gotten out of the bottom of the class and moved half way up. I am sure the hon. Minister would not want to leave in the public's mind the idea that the province of Ontario has spent \$300 million; because 75 per cent of that is from Ottawa, so you have spent only 25 per cent of that amount on this whole development.

However, the basic point I am making is that the province of Ontario in the last ten years, which I have been following regularly every year, has stood either at the top or close to the top in terms of available wealth to devote to education and it has stood at the bottom, or close to the bottom, in the percentage of that available wealth devoted to education. Therefore, I think this is something we should bear in mind.

Maybe even the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) should bear it in mind. Because, you see, it gets us back to a sense of priorities and this is really the point. Unfortunately the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) is not here tonight. Every time I have discussed this in years gone by, he has come in with a good rural, parochial debunking of my attitude towards educational expenditures.

Last summer I had a very interesting experience. I went up to Bruce county and had an opportunity to speak to a club right in the hon. member's own riding. I thought I would go in fearlessly, like Daniel into the lion's den, and speak on the topic, "Are we spending too much on education?" I documented the conclusion, which I threw out to them as a challenge, that we are not spending too much on education; we have to spend more and if we do not we cannot survive in this world today. And I got resounding applause from the audience: I wish the hon. member for Bruce had been there.

Mr. Newman: How did you do in the election?

Mr. MacDonald: Do not confuse the matter. As a person who ostensibly is interested

in education, I thought the hon. member might have grasped this point.

Mr. Newman: The point is: You can get a resounding applause with any gathering.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Can I ask the hon. member a question? Is it not so that the people of Ontario pay the Dominion government 45 per cent of all the taxes they receive in the Dominion; would that be considered a contribution to education?

Mr. MacDonald: Like the hon. member who just interjected here on his political point, the hon. Minister missed the point I am making. I shall not waste my time to try to make it for him, but he has missed the point I am trying to make—as usual.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member loves to puzzle people.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no puzzlement in the point I am making. The point I am making is that in terms of available wealth in the province of Ontario, as measured by the most accurate yardstick, namely, personal income, we are devoting a smaller percentage of that personal income to education than any other province in this country.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is an untruthful statement.

Mr. MacDonald: I think the final point in reference to this—he is interested even if the hon. Minister is not—the final point I wanted to make in this connection, Mr. Chairman, is that this gets us back as a society to examine our priorities.

We talk about education. We talk about the needs of the rising generation as being of highest priority. I have quoted in the past in this House, and I repeat here—though they are out of date because I think they go back to about 1960—other figures which became available by those who researched the issue, to the effect that the average expenditure per capita, man, woman and child, in Canada for education, was \$60. The average expenditure for liquor and tobacco was \$90. The average expenditure for the purchase and maintenance of cars is \$120.

I am not attempting a temperance sermon, and I am just as interested in my car as anybody else, but I ask this House, and I ask the people of the province of Ontario to examine our priorities. What a warped sense of values we have come to accept, perhaps unthinkingly, when we are willing to spend

half as much again on liquor and tobacco, and twice as much on the purchase and maintenance of cars, as we are doing on education!

During this past week, Leonard Bertin, the science editor of the Toronto *Daily Star*, made the point in another way, which is perhaps a bit more pertinent now. He examined the military costs we have in this country today, and pointed out that our military budget for a number of years has been \$1.6 billion. And he asked: How much does the average man get for this \$1.6 billion? What does he see for it? He sees a fly-past of the aircraft, or something on Armistice Day. And he makes the very pertinent point that that military budget for one year could build six universities the size of the University of Toronto.

Once again, I think it is time we began to examine our priorities. If we are willing almost unquestioningly, to spend \$1.6 billion on the military budget, why should we be so reluctant, so hesitant, so Scrooge-like in our approach, in spending on university expenditures or other educational expenditures—when that one year's budget could duplicate six times over the largest university we have in this country at the present time?

I leave this point as a final consideration without specific reference to the estimate itself, but in terms of reshaping our attitudes towards educational expenditures. I think

only when we have done a job in getting people to recognize that it is not a question of how much we are spending on education, but it is a question of whether we can afford not to spend much more on education, that we are going to survive in the economic and educational world of the second half of the 20th century.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, it is intended to continue The Department of Education estimates tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.25 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 29, 1964

Motion that second reading of certain bills be discharged and referred to the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	2571
Executive Council Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	2573
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	2573
Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts	2576
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	2579
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2612

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests in the east gallery, students from Essex District High School, Essex, Ontario.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by hon. Mr. Cecile, that the orders of the day for the second reading of Bills Nos. 103, 104, 105 and 109 be discharged and that the bills be referred to the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the motion moved by the hon. Attorney General brings to mind a similar motion moved a few days ago by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in relation to Bill No. 99. We objected quite strongly to the procedure on that occasion. We feel just as strongly about the procedure today. If these bills had been allowed to proceed to their second reading stage we would be bound, as an Opposition, to take a very vigorous position in opposition to many of the sections contained in the bills mentioned by the hon. Attorney General today. Because they are, in their present form, wholly unacceptable as far as we are concerned and we would have been bound, I say, to have opposed them vigorously.

Apparently that is the position the government find themselves in today. They are moving to put these bills before the private bills committee, I guess it is the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, and in so doing I imagine that the leader of the government or the hon. Attorney General would say that at that time they are prepared to make rather extensive amendments to these bills in the committee stage.

This brings up again a very vital point, it seems to me, in parliamentary procedure.

Always it has been the custom and the practice that on the second reading of a bill we discuss the principle of the bill. Now we are reversing and backing away from that time-honoured position in our parliamentary procedure. In this instance we are going to the committee, and really the committee will decide on the principle of the bill. That, I suggest, is not the proper procedure.

We are not going to, today, make a formal move to stop these bills from going to committee but I am going to say to the government and to the House that I hope this is the last time we have a procedure of this kind for the purposes which are contained in the resolution of the hon. Attorney General. I hope the government from this time on, when it introduces legislation in the House, will have its mind made up and will be concerned with putting government legislation through the House rather than having it go to some committee of the House to be torn to pieces and come back in its remodelled form.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the hon. leader of the Opposition before we came into the House that I was going to make this motion and I did not hear these objections.

The position is simply this: We have certain amendments to make to these bills and the bills will come back for second reading; and when they do come back the principle of the bills can then be debated. We are not in any way derogating any right of this Legislature to deal with these particular bills. I have no examples here, but in one other debate in this House, when this question arose, I quoted many examples from previous years.

Mr. Oliver: Not many; all from one year.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I will get them all out again. I had them back to 1957. If necessary I will have them typed out and I can send them to you.

In other words, the point I am making in any event is that it is not a new procedure. This motion is being made as a matter of convenience. An alternative would be to call

these bills for second reading. In that event the hon. Attorney General would simply say that when the bill reaches committee stage I propose to make the following amendments; that means the bill would then be debated here on the second reading, with a series of amendments which are proposed to be made of which the hon. members really would not have proper notice or understanding.

All I am suggesting is with this procedure, and all the government is suggesting, is that the bills can go to the committee, the amendments as proposed can there be made, the bills will then come back on to the order paper in exactly the same position as they stand today, and will be called for second reading when the bills can be debated. But the bills at that time, on the order paper, which the hon. members will be able to see and examine, will contain the amendments and will be the bills with which, in fact, we are going to deal.

Now, I realize—

Mr. Oliver: It will be the bill you should have introduced in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, that is a matter of conjecture and I will not go into that today. But, in any event, our desire is to produce the best legislation we can before this House, and this procedure really is simply a method of dealing with these bills in a way which will make it easy for all the hon. members in the House to understand what we are debating, when they are called for second reading. It is purely a procedural matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on this motion. I think, quite frankly, there are two aspects here on which we should focus attention.

One is this principle of whether or not it is within our rules to refer a bill to a committee before you have had debate on second reading.

I recall that the hon. Prime Minister indicated, in our debate on Bill No. 99 some month or so ago now, that there are precedents for it. Mr. Speaker, there are precedents for everything in this House—absolutely everything. As somebody once said about the Bible, you can find a quotation to justify almost anything; and you can find a quotation to justify almost anything here because of the rather irregular procedures which have sometimes been followed in this House. So, on point one, Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the hon. Prime Minister's reliance on some precedents back in 1957, I want to say quite

clearly here that I agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition. When we have a bill brought into this House, I think the proposition that we should debate second reading before it goes to a committee is the logical and intelligent way of handling it. I would suggest we wash out these precedents from the past and get back onto what I think is a more regular and sensible kind of procedure.

The second aspect of it is how we deal with these particular bills here. Again, I am forced to agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that what we are really dealing with is the problem of four bills the government brought in, about which they have had serious second thoughts and are going to amend so extensively. There is perhaps some wisdom, in terms of tidy and intelligent handling of them, to do this in the committee rather than in the House, because in the committee at least you can have copies of it and we can find out what the bill is with which we are really going to be dealing. But this is an *ad hoc* problem of how we deal with this particular miscarriage of bills.

I am willing to go along with it without making any big display or performance here today, but I come back to my original point. Whatever may be the odd precedent in this House for sending a bill out before we had debate and second reading, I think that the one we should review and get back into is what I think is a rule under May: That it cannot be discharged until it has had second reading. I think that is the valid and the intelligent rule.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on this procedure. I object to it most vehemently. In view of the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of my own party (Mr. MacDonald) have indicated they are willing to go along with it at this time I consider that I am bound by any undertaking my own hon. leader has made, I will therefore go along but only under extreme protest.

Reference has been made to certain precedents for this procedure. I believe the precedents were all in one year; or, at any rate, all in one period; and they were undertaken, I believe, in all cases by consent. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the precedents were bad precedents and I do not think we should consider ourselves bound by bad precedents. They are certainly quite contrary to the long-established traditions of the British House of Commons and its precedents as recorded in May.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they are flatly in opposition—the practice is flatly in opposition—to the written rules of this House. The rule of this House is quite clear and explicit that no bill may be amended or committed until after it has been read twice. Now we have been told on a number of occasions—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I should just like to correct the member. If it has the unanimous consent of the House, rule 60 says that it can be then committed to the standing committee.

Mr. Bryden: That no doubt is true, Mr. Speaker. I would imagine that almost anything can be done even if it is not explicitly stated by unanimous consent, and I suppose we can get around this particular difficulty by granting unanimous consent. What I am trying to avoid is being faced time after time with a proposal to give unanimous consent to a bad principle. It has been suggested on a number of occasions, no doubt with some justice, that practice gradually takes the place of the rules—in other words, in a sense the common law takes precedence over the written law. If our practices are so out of accord with our rules, I think we should take another look at our rules so that hon. members will at least know what the rules of the House are.

I would say in this case that the rules should be reaffirmed and that they should not be allowed to fall into disuse. The hon. Prime Minister says that it is a matter of convenient procedure. Well, there is a perfectly convenient procedure, a well-established traditional procedure available to him, and that is to withdraw the bill and introduce a new bill.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that where the government having first introduced a bill, has come to the conclusion that it must make such significant changes in it that it does not wish the bill in its present form to come to second reading, then it should withdraw the bill and bring in a new one that incorporates those changes. As a matter of fact, under May that can be done by a fairly convenient procedure. There can be one motion to discharge the bill from the order paper and to give leave to bring in a new bill. It can be all done in one motion. What is wrong with that procedure?

What is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is that public bills are being treated as if they are private bills. Private bills quite properly go to committee after first reading because there is no question of government policy involved in them, but where government

policy is involved, I think the government should take responsibility. It should not try to slough off its responsibility, as I have said on previous occasions, to a committee.

I believe this is a thoroughly bad procedure. I believe a perfectly reasonable alternative is available to the government. I cannot understand why the government does not accept that alternative on this occasion. Since the hon. leaders of the Opposition parties have reluctantly consented to go along, I will not dissent, but I will give notice that if this procedure is followed on any occasion in the future and I am in this House, I will dissent if I am the only one in the House who does dissent, because it is a bad procedure that should not be followed any more.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member bearing licence number 3076 on his automobile please go to the front door. They seem to be waiting for the owner there at the present time. Licence number 3076.

Introduction of bills.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves, seconded by hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer), first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, this bill merely brings the names of the various Ministers into line with the changes that have been made this year.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves, seconded by hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture), first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there are three areas in which changes are made in The Labour Relations Act by this bill which I have just introduced.

First, to transfer the power to grant conciliation in the Ontario Labour Relations Board to the Minister of Labour in order to expedite the conciliation process; see sections

1, 2, part 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, and 14 of the bill. Sections 3 and 10 of the bill are complementary.

Second, to give greater status under the Act to the voluntary recognition by an employer of a trade union as the exclusive bargaining agent of his employees in a defined unit.

Third (a) to extend to post-conciliation proceedings the protection which is now given in respect of formal conciliation proceedings under the Act; (b) to extend to the members of conciliation boards the protection that is now given under the Act to conciliation officers.

By transferring control of the entire conciliation process to the Minister, it is my thought that this will relieve the Ontario Labour Relations Board of a burden and at the same time speed up the process of making conciliation available to employers and trade unions. There will be much more informality in disposing of such requests. I cannot over-emphasize the need for prompt handling of such matters in the field of labour relations, whether by the Ontario Labour Relations Board or by The Department of Labour itself.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that voluntary recognition by an employer of a trade union as bargaining agent of his employees will also be well received. Recognition must be in writing and in respect of a defined unit.

In connection with voluntary recognition, there has to be a safeguard against "sweet-heart deals" and this is also included in the bill. The power is given to the Ontario Labour Relations Board to examine into the validity of a collective agreement made after voluntary recognition in the first year of its operation.

The third matter dealt with in the bill is to extend to post-conciliation proceedings the confidential protection from disclosure in any court or before any tribunal of material or statements made by or to a conciliation officer, the Minister, deputy Minister, and chief conciliation officer.

I think that it will be obvious to every hon. member of the House that statements made in confidence to an officer must be protected. If an employer or trade union representative felt that he could not speak freely, the whole process would be defeated. I am mindful of the fact that delicate checks and balances must be maintained if this type of legislation is to do its best work. That is why I felt that I could come forward with this bill covering conciliation and voluntary recognition without disturbing the general picture.

Labour and management in Ontario have attained a degree of sophistication that they are able to bargain out most of their problems. I recognize that the process of organization and of bargaining is not complete and may never be complete. We cannot forecast the future to know whether the principles expressed in our Act will be valid ten or 15 years hence. However, we have a role to play and that is to provide services to the two sides in their difficulties, to assist in meeting the challenges of changing conditions and to help to keep the peace.

I trust that the changes which are sought in this bill will commend themselves to the hon. members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, may I make reference to the minimum wage programme of the province of Ontario? During the discussion of my department's estimates, I undertook to outline to the House at a subsequent sitting details of the extension of the government's minimum wage programme to other parts of Ontario. This I propose to do now.

By way of background, I would like to point out that on June 30 last year, we brought into operation in the Toronto-Hamilton-Oshawa area, a minimum wage programme which now provides for the following:

1. A general minimum wage of \$1 per hour for men and for women.
2. A hotel and restaurant minimum wage along similar lines.
3. A construction minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour.

This was, of course, the first step and it was a first step into a highly sensitive and difficult area of legislation, particularly in view of the fact that no comprehensive programme had previously been in existence. Nevertheless, the programme has succeeded in meeting the objectives set forth. It has established a floor to prevent exploitation and it has done so in relation to the economic realities of the area.

As I informed the House during my estimates, we undertook an extensive survey of small businesses throughout Ontario to determine actual employment conditions and levels of wages paid in various parts of the province. In addition to this survey, we have examined other existing statistics available from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and elsewhere. Analysis of all this information now provides us with the basis for the next steps in our minimum wage programme.

I must say that the information points up

a number of situations which have led us to certain conclusions. The first is that a general minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour, however desirable, is not feasible across Ontario at the present time. Our statistics indicate that a sizeable proportion of wage and salary workers in Ontario are being paid less than \$1.25 an hour. Moreover, it is apparent that if a rate of \$1.25 were established at this time, many small employers who employ fewer than 15 persons, and some large employers as well, would find it very difficult to do business in Ontario and might have to cut back their operations or even move outside the province. In either case, this could obviously result in loss of employment for a considerable number of people in Ontario and we have no desire to write a prescription which could have such serious side effects.

Nevertheless, the line must be drawn somewhere, below which wage levels should not go. But the line must make economic sense as well as prevent exploitation. As far as I am concerned, a general minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour is an objective which we can and will strive for in the future, but it is unrealistic to consider it at the present time.

Our second conclusion is that a \$1 an hour general minimum wage rate cannot be applied throughout Ontario immediately without difficulties of the same type as I have just mentioned, even though the degree of disruption would obviously be less than in the case of \$1.25 minimum. In fact, our survey results and other studies indicate that just over 132,000 persons, or 6.5 per cent of all the non-agricultural wage and salary workers in Ontario, are at present earning less than \$1 an hour. Of these 132,000, approximately 100,000 are in the service industries and trade; 19,000 in manufacturing, and the remaining 13,000 in primary industries, construction, finance, insurance and real estate. Some 65 per cent of this total of 132,000 are women.

Because the proportion of employees receiving less than \$1 an hour varies considerably in different parts of the province, being closely related to prevailing industrial population and other economic variations, we have decided that the province must be zoned on the basis of economic conditions and our current minimum wage objectives must be attained by stages. Employers providing work for our people in the province's less economically favoured locations cannot in the first instance be expected to pay rates exactly the same as those paid in more favourable locations. They require time in which to

absorb the impact of the programme. Starting with a zone system makes it possible for us to initially establish rate schedules which bear a logical relationship to the economic capabilities of employers and the most basic economic needs of employees, but also to provide for gradual upward movement of these rates in order to reach province-wide uniformity within a reasonable length of time.

We propose therefore to create two zones. Zone one will take in the more highly industrialized and more populous areas and centres of the province, apart from the Oshawa-Toronto-Hamilton region, which has already been covered by last year's orders. This zone will move to the new minimum wage objectives more quickly since it is economically better able to do so. Zone two, which will take in the remainder of the areas of the province in which there is relatively less industry and lower population, will start at somewhat lower initial rates and will move through more gradual stages to the end objectives, to provide the necessarily longer period of adjustment. Among other things, zone two also has the problem of having a considerably higher proportion of its total work force receiving less than \$1 an hour at the present time, again because its economic development is not as concentrated. For example, approximately ten per cent of the estimated 408,000 wage and salary workers in zone two now receive less than \$1 an hour, while only about five per cent of the estimated 1,632,000 in zone one are in this category.

While it is difficult to define the division of the two zones without the use of a map, I would like to provide the House with a brief description which will give a reasonably clear indication of the areas encompassed by each zone.

Zone one will be that part of Ontario lying south of a line following the northern boundaries of the counties of Lambton, Middlesex, Perth, Wellington, Peel and York, continuing eastward along the northern boundary of the bottom tier of townships in Victoria county, and on easterly to include the more populous portions of the counties of Peterborough, Hastings, Lennox and Addington, Frontenac and the counties bordering the St. Lawrence river up to the Quebec boundary.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, zone one will also include a number of other more populous and industrialized areas which although lying outside this geographic area, have economic conditions comparable to it. These are the Ottawa and Lakehead areas, including the cities of Fort William and Port Arthur, Sault

Ste. Marie, Sudbury, Timmins and North Bay.

Zone two will be the remainder of Ontario lying to the north of the general zone boundary line I have just described. However, I should emphasize that the Oshawa-Toronto-Hamilton area will not be classed as a part of either of these two new zones, since this region was already covered by the new minimum wage programme last year. It will remain under the orders originally established for it at that time, subject only to some minor amendments.

Through the use of progressive stages of rates in the two new zones, we will be able to achieve a general minimum wage of \$1 an hour and the construction industry minimum of \$1.25 an hour across the province by December, 1965—that is 18 months after the initial stages of the programme go into effect around the end of June this year.

This will be achieved in this way: Under the general and hotel and restaurant orders, the minimum for men in zone one, excluding the present Toronto-Hamilton area, will be \$1 as soon as the orders go into effect on June 29 this year. In zone two it will start at 85 cents, rising to 90 cents at December 28, 1964, and to \$1 at December 27, 1965.

The minimum for women will start at 85 cents in zone one — excluding the present Toronto-Hamilton area, which is \$1 for women—rising to 90 cents at December 28—to 95 cents December 28 this year, and to \$1 on March 29, 1965. In zone two, the women's rate will start out at 80 cents, rising to 90 cents December 28, 1964, and to \$1 on December 27, 1965.

Under the construction minimum wage orders, the minimum rate in zone one will be set at \$1.25 as soon as the orders take effect on June 29 this year, while in zone two it will start at \$1.15 on that date, rising to \$1.25 on December 27, 1965.

I should mention that there are some specific categories of employment to which the general minimum wage orders will not apply—such as registered apprentices, some student categories, salesmen who determine their own hours, professional persons, domestic servants and farm labourers. There are also other categories, mainly involving part-time or seasonal work, for which special rates are established slightly below the general minimum level, and some training rates are provided for in a similar way. All of these exclusions and special conditions are detailed in the official orders, copies of which are being tabled and are available to hon. members for more detailed information.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I consider this programme to be one of the most significant ever introduced by your government, in its effect on the wellbeing of working people throughout Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister agrees to answer.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he and his department have given consideration to removing from the minimum wage orders, both the new ones and the existing ones, what I would describe as loopholes—whereby people on piece work in certain cases, people doing certain types of seasonal work, and so-called learners, can be paid less than the prescribed minimum?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The subject of learners and piece workers is, along with some others, knotty in its involvement—and spelled k-n-o-t-t-y. It is more than somewhat involved due to the various matters which are affected and involved.

We are not interested, in the department, in providing loopholes, but we are interested in seeing that an equitable, just, and fair set of regulations is the result of our efforts.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to table answers to question numbers 13, 14 and 16 on the order paper.

The hon. Prime Minister tabled answers to questions as follows:

13. Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Inquiry of the Ministry:

(1) Does the Canadian Thoroughbred Horse Society give the Provincial Treasurer an accounting of its distribution of the annual grant made to it?

(2) If not, on what basis is the amount of the grant arrived at?

(3) If so, how many breeders received grants in (a) the fiscal year ended March 31, 1963; and (b) the current fiscal year to date?

(4) In each of the said periods, what breeders received individual grants in excess of \$1,000, and how much did each of them receive?

Answer by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan):

(1) Yes.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) (a) 160; (b) 160 (to March 3, 1964).

(4) Fiscal year ended March 31, 1963: Beasley, W. R., \$1,443.25; Conklin Farms Ltd., \$4,750.75; Dew, Mrs. R. A., \$2,014.75; Maclean, Mrs. F., \$1,277.50; Pasquale, E. C., \$1,763.50; Smythe, C., \$1,439.87; Stafford Farms, \$1,883.75; Taylor, E. P., \$18,385.50.

Fiscal year ending March 31, 1964 (to March 3, 1964): Armstrong Bros. Co. Ltd., \$1,476.00; Beasley, W. R., \$2,319.75; Conklin Farms Ltd., \$2,724.00; Dew, Mrs. R. A., \$1,458.00; Mann, Mrs. C. C., \$1,484.25; McClelland, D. G., \$1,661.50; Pasquale, E. C., \$1,426.25; Smythe, C., \$2,401.62; Stafford Farms, \$1,124.50; Taylor, E. P., \$20,996.25.

14. *Mr. R. Gisborn* (Wentworth East)—Inquiry of the Minister:

(1) On what date did the OPP occupy their present station on Bronte Street in Milton?

(2) Is there a lease, and, if so, what period does it cover?

(3) How much rent does the OPP pay for the premises?

Answer by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart):

(1) July 1, 1960.

(2) No. Monthly tenancy.

(3) \$110 per month, paid by Public Works.

16. *Mr. E. G. Freeman* (Fort William)—Inquiry of the Ministry:

(1) How many trees were raised in government nurseries and planted on Crown lands for the last year for which figures are available?

(2) For the same year, how many trees were raised by all private corporations and planted on their licensed limits?

(3) Specifically, how many trees were raised in their own nurseries and planted on their own limits by: (a) Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper; (b) Great Lakes Paper; (c) Marathon; (d) Ontario and Minnesota; (e) Abitibi; (f) Kimberly-Clark?

Answer by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts):

(1) In the fiscal year 1963-64 there was a total of 30,750,000 trees raised in government nurseries and planted on Crown lands in Ontario.

(2) In 1963-64 a total of 2,204,000 trees

were raised by private corporations and planted on their licensed limits.

(3) (a) Spruce Falls Power and Paper, 1,022,000; (b) Great Lakes Paper, nil; (c) Marathon, nil; (d) Ontario and Minnesota, nil; (e) Abitibi, nil; (f) Kimberly-Clark, 1,182,000.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given to him.

My question is: In view of the urgent problem presented by the relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer, has the hon. Minister read of the advertising code which the cigarette manufacturers in the United States are going to introduce and, if so, would he care to comment on the possibility of a plan similar to this being introduced by the tobacco companies in Ontario?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have only read a very brief newspaper report on the advertising code to which the hon. member for Scarborough North referred, which would appear to be an important step forward by the cigarette industry which should add to the already extensive programme of education now underway. I cannot at this time say if the Canadian cigarette manufacturers will follow suit.

The province of Ontario, and I think rightly, is a partner in a Canada-wide programme of education but I have been so far unable to ascertain if the matter of advertising has yet been the subject of discussion. I would expect, however, that it has been, since only a short time ago representatives of the tobacco manufacturers met with me to discuss all aspects of the relationship between smoking and lung cancer. At that time they pledged their full support and co-operation in any programmes we might undertake.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. Would the hon. Minister comment on the report of a grand jury describing conditions at the Ontario Hospital, 999 Queen Street, Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the grand jury reported that there was overcrowding. They spoke of fire hazards and they spoke of the old buildings and they spoke of sanitary facilities. Overcrowding does exist in the Ontario hospitals serving Metropolitan Toronto; there are two of them. The capacity

of the two hospitals is 1,875 patients and the patient load is 2,200, or 20 per cent more than rated capacity. However, Mr. Speaker, this exists because we have to house and maintain a large number of people as residents; patients who have been discharged from hospital when they no longer need treatment; who have no homes, and for whom their home community cannot apparently provide a place to live.

In the Queen Street hospital, the one to which the hon. member referred, there are 344 such residents, 331 of whom give their home address as Metro Toronto. In New Toronto, there are 426 such residents; 207 of these give their home address as Metro Toronto. Thus, in the two hospitals, we have 538 residents of Metro Toronto who are now being housed in residential units of these two Ontario hospitals and are not patients in any sense of the word whatsoever.

However, we have known of this for some time, and have tried every means possible to get these people back into their home communities; but apparently this is not possible. So, to correct the situation, steps have already been taken and are in hand.

One hundred and seventy additional hospital beds are being provided in the new psychiatric institute now under construction on College Street. And there is a bill presently before this Legislature, designed, as already announced, to authorize The Department of Health to find homes for special care so that those now in our institutions as residents only can be housed in other and more suitable accommodation, thus releasing the hospital facilities for their proper use.

As to the fire hazard, sir, I have to advise you that the fire department of the city of Toronto inspect our hospital regularly, this one at Queen Street. In the last report signed by the fire chief, Frank G. E. Coakwell, no mention is made of a fire hazard. Certain routine matters are brought to our attention, such as reminding us to check for drop in pressure in pressurized water pipe extinguishers, and to be sure that no combustible material is put anywhere near a fire—the usual warning things. Our own fire inspector, who works in very close harmony with the fire marshal's division, in his latest report, states as follows:

The principal hazard throughout this institution, in all buildings except the new one, is still wood floors. Apart from this, the building is in good condition and the general housekeeping excellent.

I therefore feel, sir, that it is rather unfortunate that any grand jury would state

that the building was structurally a fire hazard. All of our hospitals, as well as these two, are under the fire marshal's supervision and we have within the department a permanent staff of fire inspectors who are carefully and at frequent intervals inspecting all our buildings.

Therefore I do not believe I am wrong in suggesting that it is a great disservice to many who have relatives, friends or members of families in our hospitals, to lead them to believe that their safety has been ignored in the manner suggested. It is quite true, sir, that part of the building is old and, as Controller Dennison said on the radio this morning, part of this building was built some 20 years before Confederation. But when I think of this, I think of the great old institutions scattered throughout this world of ours, sir, not only in Canada, but far beyond our bounds, many of them outstanding institutions still in our day, old as far as years and the calendar may go, but youthful in outlook. I have to repeat what I have so often said in this House and other places that it is not the age of the building nor the structure of it but the programme that is going on inside the building that matters. In Ontario hospitals that is of high quality and most progressive.

In respect of sanitary facilities, if the residents of Queen Street were hospital patients in the usually accepted context, it would be quite fair to say that more toilet space and baths, and so on, would be needed. But these are all ambulatory residents, people capable of and permitted to go anywhere in the building and therefore are able to find adequate sanitary facilities at all times.

In summary, therefore, I think it should be made clear that no treatment is needed by nor is being given to those residents in these hospitals. Indeed the areas which they occupy are no longer actually part of the hospital but are by law designated as residential units and, I repeat, are used only because no one else appears willing or anxious to provide housing and food for those who formerly were patients suffering from mental disorders.

I would remind you and the House, Mr. Speaker, that a large part of The Department of Public Works budget is spent annually on updating and providing new accommodation for the Ontario hospitals. Over the past five years, this has been in excess of \$70 million and has in that time provided almost 5,000 new beds.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister allow a supplementary question?

Accepting the comments on accommodation and fire hazard, is the hon. Minister in a professional capacity suggesting that because of ambulatory patients it then becomes justifiable that 80 men on one floor should share four toilets, two showers and two bathtubs?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have no further comment to make, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart).

Can the hon. Minister inform the House when a decision will be made by the milk industry board with regard to the discriminatory practices of the West Side Dairy in Kitchener?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. member that this matter is under active consideration by the milk industry board. I am advised that a special meeting is being held by the milk industry board in the very near future at which the producers may be in attendance as well.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-ninth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 501:

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, perhaps at this time while these matters are still fresh in my mind, I might reply to some of the matters raised by the hon. members for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and York South (Mr. MacDonald) in their speeches yesterday evening.

I want to say at the outset that I appreciate the constructive nature of their remarks last evening and I want to assure them that I shall very carefully study the suggestions that have been made.

Both of these learned gentlemen made mention of the foundation plan, the hon. member for York South dealing with a certain article written in the *Toronto Daily Star* by Mr. Allan, and also making some reference to the complexities of the foundation plan in this province. I have had prepared a very short statement which I am distributing to the hon. members outlining some of the reasons for the complexity of this

plan so that they may be more fully aware of the problems that are facing those responsible for the establishment of this type of foundation plan here in this province.

I think many of you are familiar with some of the factors that led to the complexity of the foundation plan. The number of boards alone, of course, is one of the very important features. The number of areas of education—public, separate, vocational, academic, continuation—and the differences between the urban and the rural boards are all complicating factors as well.

While I appreciate that some of us may regard the regulations as being difficult to understand, I think if the hon. members will peruse this document—and I will not read it to them in detail this afternoon, it will be provided to them—they will get some appreciation of the factors that are involved in implementing a plan of this kind. I think, quite frankly, that we should be rather grateful to the gentlemen who worked so hard to draw up the regulations and lay the basic foundation for the new plan. I think if you could compare it, and it is very difficult to do so, with other foundation plans in other jurisdictions, you would find that perhaps more thought and consideration have gone into the development of this plan than perhaps that of any other jurisdiction, certainly in Canada, and I think it compares very favourably with areas elsewhere.

I would also agree with the hon. member for York South that we will have to wait perhaps until the plan has been in operation a year to evaluate properly the effects on the boards. But I would like to give you some indication from various parts of the province as to the reaction to the foundation plan, at least to date.

From the Niagara Falls *Evening Review*:

The Niagara Falls, Chippawa and Wilmoughby taxpayers will pay less for education this year. The reduction, made despite an increase in the budget approved Wednesday by Niagara Falls district board of education, is brought about by increased provincial grants.

Woodstock:

Reduction of separate school tax rates was made possible this year because of a big increase in provincial grants.

The Windsor *Star*:

Of the estimated revenue, it is expected that \$1,982,000 will come from the Provincial Treasurer in grants and for use of the schools for practice teaching by Windsor teachers college students.

The anticipated \$1,982,00 in grants, if realized, will be \$325,000 more than the amount received in the 1963 budget.

Fort William:

Largely due to increased provincial assistance the higher cost of education in Fort William will barely be felt at the municipal level and in property taxes.

The North Bay *Nugget*, which I am sure will be of interest to the hon. member for that area (Mr. Troy):

SEPARATE SCHOOL TAX REDUCED AT STURGEON

The Kingston paper has the same story. From the Brantford *Expositor*, which I am sure is of some interest to the hon. member for Brant:

Brantford's education tax rates this year are down 1.5 mills for industrial and commercial and down 1.35 mills for residential and farm.

The total cost of education in Brantford is up more than \$444,000 but because of higher provincial grants the \$2,525,000 which must come from municipal tax represents a drop of some \$50,500 from last year's actual levy.

The same story from Sarnia is in the Sarnia *Observer*:

The Sarnia board of education chairman, Brian Woodside, has been able to pare commitments to a level which in 1964 will allow for a slight reduction in the mill rate for educational purposes while still providing for sound educational organization.

Mr. Woodside said that increased grants from The Ontario Department of Education assisted considerably in the board's deliberations.

Once again, the North Bay paper:

In 1964 the separate school mill rate took a sharp drop at the North Bay separate school board's budget meeting Thursday night.

There are other references, Mr. Chairman, from North Bay, Peterborough, Welland, Windsor—two more from Windsor, including the separate school board, and Napanee.

The best impression we can get to date is that the foundation plan is working effectively throughout the province, in both the separate and public school system.

I would be the first to acknowledge that there will still be some problems to be solved. You cannot introduce a plan of this magnitude and of this complexity without facing some difficulties. But, at the same time, I think

we should accept the fact that this, as a matter of principle, is sound; and that if we can work the principle into concrete regulations, which I believe we have done, we will be serving the interests of the educational programme in this province as equitably as possible.

I should also like to refer for just a brief moment to the observations made by the hon. member for York South in respect to the article that appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star*. I hold the writer in very high regard in educational matters. I read him very carefully and, while we obviously do not always agree, there are many occasions when he has been most helpful to the cause of education in this province; but when it comes to the matter of the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan, then with some of his observations I think, Mr. Chairman, in fairness, I should make some comment.

Mr. Allan, when he was assessing the implications of the foundation plans, certainly very early in the period when it was being considered, suggested, as I recall and I am going primarily from memory, that the possibility of a foundation plan in this province was somewhat limited. I can recall another editorial, sometime in November or December, I believe, when he suggested we should dispose of the computers—I am not sure that Mr. Allan wrote it but it was certainly in the Toronto *Daily Star*—and that the gentlemen calculating should sharpen their pencils and go to work.

However, I think we have been able to establish by the early printing of the regulations that the computers were, in fact, somewhat helpful.

Mr. Allan's article was, in many respects, quite helpful but in others perhaps he did not take into account one of the very basic principles of the foundation plan: that it is referring to current rather than to capital operations. And when we refer to the total costs and are drawing a figure, say, of \$210, this refers to current cost. If you average this out, say, for a classroom of 35 pupils at \$210, it amounts to \$7,350 per classroom; this represents current operations alone. Since the average public school salary in 1962 was roughly something under \$5,000, including principals, and under \$5,500 even in the cities, it would appear that there should be sufficient left over to operate each classroom on a fairly generous scale.

In referring to the higher levels, and the suggestion that we should be establishing this basis at a higher level—I think he used the figures in North York—I referred in my

statement that we had to be very careful about the financial time-bombs inherent in such a foundation plan. These figures, of course, are very rough and subject to correction, but if we use the North York figures as the basic level it is conceivable that the amount of increase in grants to this province in 1964 alone could be close to \$240 million, which is rather substantial. It applies in the same way as when you add 65 cents, just 65 cents, say, to the \$210 limit per pupil, you are adding \$1 million approximately in grants.

I think you will find, Mr. Chairman, that if you study this in all its ramifications and assess some of the problems which are raised, and if we look at the operation of this plan over this year—and we can debate this more fully a year hence—I think you will find that the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan for 1964 is fairly substantially based and is, in fact, distributing money in a very equitable way across this province.

I hope that hon. members will read the observations which are made about the complexities of the scheme, so that when we do debate this, I hope, next year at some length, after we have had an observation period, we will be able to deal with this matter in some detail.

The hon. member for York South raised two or three interesting points—and I am going backward rather than forward in that these points are perhaps fresher in my mind. One point he raised, of course, was this question of priorities. Late last evening I re-read, which made rather dreary reading, my speech on the estimates of last year and I would suggest to him that I also used this term “priorities” in that speech on several occasions. I could not agree more that it is very definitely a case of priorities in this province and, in fact, in Canada today.

It is obvious, at least in my mind, and I am sure that hon. members of this House would agree, that first priority must be in the field of education. I think this was obvious at the federal-provincial conference which I attended a few weeks ago when, as far as many of the provinces were concerned, their feeling was that the first priority today was in the field of education.

I would comment very briefly on the figures given by the hon. member in respect to the brief presented to the federal government, which illustrated that Ontario was spending less per capita than the other provinces. These figures, Mr. Chairman, are very difficult to assemble. The figures for Ontario may or may not include certain expenditures

in the separate school system. They are figures related to 1961 and you can see that in 1964 we have increased, just through the grants alone, roughly 20 per cent to 25 per cent. It also does not include, as I stated last evening, any consideration of the technical or vocational programme here in this province.

Nevertheless I would agree with the hon. member completely, Mr. Chairman, that whether we are in fact now above the other provinces, or on a par, this perhaps is not sufficient. I would suggest to you that not only is it necessary to spend more on education but that the very future of this province will depend on the amount this society is prepared to spend.

I think in these areas, Mr. Chairman, while we may not agree on the actual figures presented last evening, we do agree on the matter of principle.

I would also suggest to the hon. member for Brant, who raised the question of the teachers' salaries in the separate school system, that while I cannot say this conclusively, I would suggest that one of the problems these schools have had in obtaining competent people has been the question of salary.

I can give you a reference to the Ottawa board. I had a very kind letter from the Ottawa separate school board which indicated they were able to reduce their mill rate this year in that city by two mills and, at the same time, offer an increase in salary to the people on their staff. I think the foundation plan will go a long way toward assisting the separate school boards in this province in obtaining capable staff. I cannot tell you if this is the sole reason, but it very definitely has been one of the contributing factors.

Dealing with another matter raised last evening, the question of this committee of inquiry, this question of educational research; I intend to make a very brief statement about research in education, perhaps during the consideration of the estimates of OCE, because this is really where the research branch, to a degree, is centred. I will relate to you some of the other areas of research in which the department is involved. But I agree with both hon. members who mentioned this, that we should be doing more in research. Yet, at the same time, when I make my remarks during this part of the estimates on OCE, you will see that perhaps there is more widespread research going on in education than most people are aware of.

I would like to comment on the suggestion of establishing some form of committee of

inquiry which would, I gather, be a committee of a continuing nature, to review certain aspects of our educational programme. It certainly indicates that the hon. member is concerned, as I think we all are, about a sort of overall look at education. It is certainly a suggestion which one cannot pass over lightly.

I would relate to you that the consideration of the effectiveness of the Robarts plan, or the reorganized programme, in the secondary schools, is of course receiving our attention. It is very difficult at this point, with the programme operating only in Grades 9 and 10, to come to any type of conclusion today, other than that the programme we feel is more effective than originally we had hoped, certainly as far as numbers are concerned. But obviously the fact that a larger percentage of the student population is availing itself of the technical or commercial stream, is not in itself conclusive proof that the programme is 100 per cent effective. I can see two or three areas where we will have problems. One is in the very early part of the programme, with the selection of courses. This gives me concern. Of course, I think towards the end of the programme, in Grade 12 and what may happen relating to Grade 13, is another area to which we must give careful consideration. Yet, quite frankly, I cannot tell you at this time that we are in a position to assess the programme in its entirety, and I do not think we will be in this position perhaps for another two years—I would say roughly this period of time.

The hon. member also raised the problem of drop-outs. He raised it perhaps more in relation to what was going on in the technical schools and yet perhaps it is related, to a degree, Mr. Chairman, to what we are attempting to do in the youth branch. The youth branch, when we initially established it, was, quite frankly, a nebulous sort of a branch. The gentleman who is directing it, Dr. Koerber, is a very knowledgeable man, I think we would all agree, in this field. Our problem is going to be to try to ascertain which areas we should pursue. I think this question of drop-outs throughout the entire system—is one that we will obviously consider. It is one that has to be considered apart from, as well as from, the educational standpoint. I think there is far more involved here, as the hon. member mentioned last night. I think to a degree it becomes a social problem.

I am dealing with these points perhaps too briefly, and yet I realize if we want to cover this department within some reasonable amount of time, that I cannot go into the

detail I would like. The question of the post-secondary problems in technical education was also raised last evening. Without getting into the debate at this time about the principle of having the new branch or department looking after universities alone, certainly at first, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member really answered his own query, at least to a degree, as to why perhaps this department should not consider the other areas of post-secondary education. I want to assure the hon. member that I think there are very few individuals who have spent more time in this past year attempting to tell the people, particularly the parents of this province, that technical education is not second-degree education, than the Minister of Education. I assure you that as far as I am concerned, post-secondary education at the technical level will not be considered as second-degree education.

The hon. member also raised the problem of the lack of expansion of our facilities. He referred to the Deutsch report, sir, which touched on this very briefly. It used the figure of 18,000 and if you will excuse the terminology, I would suggest that maybe Deutsch has used a very conservative figure when he came to that conclusion. I think it could be substantially more than that. He also refers to institutes of technology and I think he has not really assessed the whole field of post-secondary education in any detail, except as it concerns the universities.

I want to make it very clear that the vocational centres are going to become a very important facet of post-secondary education in this province. They will take graduates of any four-year branch in the secondary schools. Their courses will be related to the courses at the institutes of technology. If you take, say, a technician's course at the vocational centres, you can receive credit after a two-year course there for one year in the institutes of technology in this province. We are making a very concerted effort to relate the programmes in technical education at the secondary level with our vocational centres and with our institutes of technology. These vocational centres, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I should have made this plainer during the last two or three months to the House, are something quite different in concept. This is why the name has been changed. These three new vocational centres that are being opened in London in September, and Ottawa in September, and in Sault Ste. Marie the following September, will be in a position to accommodate a large number of these students that my hon. friend is concerned about and very rightly so.

No consideration was given in the figures that were mentioned last night by both hon. members, to the probability of at least Ryerson and perhaps the other institutes of technology and the vocational centres operating on something other than a one-semester system. I will not go into detail with all the figures here this afternoon, but assuming the possibilities of night school accommodation and the tri-semester system by 1965 in the institutes of technology and vocational centres, both those now existing or under construction with day and evening students, we have potential accommodation for roughly 26,500 students. By 1967—and this is three years earlier, I think, than what Deutsch has suggested, sir—with day and evening students, and this does not include the tri-semester system which, I suggest to you, I can perhaps deal with in more detail when we get around to Ryerson, we conceivably will have accommodation for roughly 46,000 students.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister permit a question at this point?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: I was wondering if he feels that evening accommodation is really on a comparable basis with what the Deutsch committee had in mind? People who might go in for a two-hour course in the evening cannot really be said to be receiving education on the same plane as those taking the regular course. I would also like to ask the hon. Minister what the average number of students accommodated in the vocational centres will be. He says they are opening three. What would their average accommodation be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The average accommodation could be, say 1,000, but I think, to be frank about it at this point, we should say 800 to 900 in all three vocational centres. The one we are planning for Welland will accommodate perhaps between 400 and 500 and the new one for Hamilton will be in the neighbourhood of 800.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that the evening courses correspond necessarily to the day courses at all and I am not sure what the Deutsch report was considering when it was referring to institutes of technology, but evening courses are, however, part of the whole field of post-secondary education, outside of the university area. I notice that Dr. Bissell very recently, and I was going to mention this on the debate on university

affairs, suggested that one of our solutions might lie in community colleges, which we have been studying for the past year. I shall have something to say about this during the estimates of The Department of University Affairs. There was no spelling out really of what type of course, or the length of course, or whether it be a day or evening class, and the type of community college that Dr. Bissell might envisage.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that really one of the great problems facing us is this whole field of post-secondary education and how it is treated. I can assure the hon. members opposite that while these figures do not represent what you might call the type of accommodation that Deutsch has referred to, nonetheless I think they indicate that there will be substantial accommodation with our existing plans for this type of class or this type of course by 1965 and even more so by 1967. The hon. member for York South was concerned that we were not perhaps paying sufficient attention to this type of accommodation. I want to assure him that this is not the case. We are very definitely concerned and I think we are making some real progress in this regard.

With respect to the other area—and this is programme five—I would be less than frank if I did not admit that when the programme was first started it was something of a crash programme. I would admit there was some organized confusion. I think you would be interested to know that in the article that the hon. member referred to last evening of the roughly 1,000 drop-outs, while we cannot say this conclusively, NES and the department people through the co-ordinator have attempted to find out just what happened to many of these drop-outs. Our estimate is that close to 80 per cent of those who left before their training course was completed did receive employment. Now this to me is a rather encouraging figure, yet at the same time it does not solve the whole problem of retraining or upgrading under programme five, and what I hope will become even more important under programme four.

I am not one of those who are unrealistic enough to believe that we can dispense with programme five. I think programme five, in some form or other, is with us for a number of years. And yet, at the same time, we in the department are endeavouring to place greater emphasis on programme four—this is the retraining or training within industry before people become unemployed. We would like to think that this is a better way of treating this problem and this is where we will concentrate our efforts.

With the exception of the school here in Toronto, we have had, quite frankly, very few complaints as to the general nature of the courses. The figures indicate that something over 80 per cent of programme five trainees have obtained employment in other centres throughout the province. The employment rate of the Toronto school has been close to 84 per cent, and yet at the same time I would not say to the hon. members that the programme there represents perfection. I think this is another area which we must determine very shortly, that is whether we are to have a permanent type of adult education centre for the retraining, upgrading of this group of our people. I think, quite frankly, this is a decision which will have to be made fairly shortly.

The programme is functioning reasonably well, but I think we must have some degree of permanence, or at least some attitude as to what the future holds for this type of programme here in this province. This is a matter, Mr. Chairman, which is receiving very careful consideration at this moment. I hope that perhaps some time in the future we can discuss this at greater length.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the hon. Minister might permit another question? Would he care to comment on the difficulties in the programme five work in the Windsor area now, or might we ask about that later in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps if the hon. member would like to ask about the difficulties in the programme five area in Windsor, perhaps we could do this under the vote for the technical education branch. This would be the appropriate place. Or I would be very pleased to answer any question he might have now, but the other might be a more appropriate place to do so.

Dealing with the other matters—the uncertainty to which the hon. member referred, the goals of education, the techniques, the philosophy of education—these are matters, Mr. Chairman, of a very general nature and of a very important nature. I think it is an area which should give us all concern and one which I think we should explore at greater length. It is very difficult, in limited debates like this, to deal with the philosophy of education, to establish a set of goals for the educational programme in this province, but I think it is certainly worthwhile that these matters should at least be mentioned and that we realize their great importance.

Dealing with some of the suggestions of the

hon. member for Brant on the question of curriculum, I can recall similar statements made in his speech last year to this question of a core curriculum. I have spent some considerable time discussing this with our own officials, and people in the profession out in the field. I am told that we have some form or degree of a core curriculum in the elementary school but that at the secondary level a core curriculum, if I understand it the way the hon. member was explaining it last evening, would perhaps to a degree defeat the purpose we are attempting to achieve under the Robarts plan.

I am concerned that such a type of core curriculum might leave us in a position which is not flexible enough for this day and age. I think, if I can recall correctly, the report on automation, and the manpower training report, would further indicate that this type of programme, a very flexible one, is one we need certainly for a good number of our students. However, I can assure the hon. member that we have listened carefully to his suggestions; they have not been overlooked; they have been discussed with other people and certainly will be kept in mind.

Dealing with this question of history, I certainly have made note of his suggestion that we do not neglect minorities in our consideration of these areas of history in this province. Certainly, when he is referring to a particular minority I concur.

The development of this textbook for centennial projects—I certainly shall keep that in mind. I, of course, was pleased to hear him suggest that it should be nicely bound and that he was not suggesting this be in paperback form.

Mr. Nixon: It has to last for 100 years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think this is very commendable, Mr. Chairman.

Now, in regard to the question of Grade 13; I think there perhaps is little purpose in my commenting on this aspect of education at this time. A committee is studying this at some length. I shall certainly make available to them a copy of *Hansard* containing the observations of my hon. friend with respect to this particular problem; but I think there would be no purpose, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this at any length on this particular occasion.

On the question of textbooks, which was raised also by the hon. member for Brant, I should make one thing very clear. I did at one time state that I would be pleased to see us consider education as a matter apart from politics if possible. I should like to make it

very clear that this matter of the design conference was planned, and I think announced in letters written asking the boards to send representatives, prior to any date for the election being announced. The reason I recall this is because I happen to represent a riding which, some few months earlier, went very strongly the other direction. It was my hope to spend considerable time in my riding, and I assure you that I would not have planned a conference roughly three weeks before the election if I had known of it myself.

On the question of the textbooks, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the hon. member that the policy was not announced in a speech at any political gathering. As a matter of fact, it was suggested to two or three reporters from the Toronto papers who were educational writers, in some room down the hall here and not on any political platform.

Mr. Nixon: And that takes it out of politics?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it does to a degree, Mr. Chairman.

But dealing with the question of textbooks, the hon. member made the observation that this imposes some burden on the boards. He will be interested to know that the amount suggested by the trustees' council for the province was exactly the same amount as the government has agreed to pay the boards; except we are paying them, this year, \$12 initially rather than \$6. While there is no doubt, this first year, that it will impose some financial burden on the boards and may be a continuing burden, in the technical or commercial courses, assuming the life expectancy of a textbook would be three to four years it is quite conceivable that the policy will impose no financial burden on the boards whatsoever.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would permit me, I do not suppose there is any way of calculating the percentage of the cost which would be the local responsibility? It would depend on how they would want to allocate their money.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I think it does. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult. The costs vary across the province, as the hon. member knows. But I remember some figures, even from a Toronto board, which estimated that in the technical or vocational courses their per student cost was roughly \$14 to \$15, whereas in the academic field it was somewhere around \$24.

Assuming that the book is going to last three years this means you have \$18 invested

in the one student, which means that in the technical or vocational courses the boards perhaps have a slight bonus; in the academic courses it may be that they will have to add \$2 or \$3 per student. We do not know. Of course on top of this, there is no question about this, the administrative cost will be absorbed by the board. This will not be substantial but nonetheless it gives them some financial interest which, I think, in the area of trying to create some uniformity in purchasing certainly within board areas, is certainly desirable.

I think the hon. member also mentioned the question of educational television. While this will come up later in the estimates, I want to assure the hon. member that at no time did I, intentionally, and I do not think otherwise, refer to educational television as an expensive gimmick.

Mr. Nixon: I thought the hon. Minister's reaction indicated that he so regarded it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I do not know where the hon. member would get this, because we have made a very careful study of educational television and I have visited two or three other jurisdictions for this prime purpose. I can assure the hon. member that I see the potentials of educational television as fully as he may himself see them. I also see some of the financial problems.

I have also run into some of the inherent weaknesses in educational television, and I can say to the hon. members of this House that when The Department of Education embarks on an educational television programme or system, in conjunction with any other agencies, it will have to be a good one before I personally become involved.

I have run into two or three jurisdictions where they went too rapidly with educational television and where perhaps they did the medium more harm than good.

Mr. Nixon: But you are not going too rapidly, I will agree.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I agree—at least I can see the hon. member would not think we are moving too rapidly, but at the same time I want to assure him that we are making progress. I think I have the names of the personnel of the advisory committee somewhere here in my notes. I think the hon. member would be interested in knowing who they are. Perhaps when we get along to the vote itself on this particular part of the estimates I can tell you a little more about the personnel.

Mr. Stewart, of course, of The Department of Education, the deputy Minister, is the chairman of the committee. From the CBC we have Dr. Rainsberry and Mr. Fotheringham, and from CFTO and CTV, Mr. Cook. We have Dr. Kerr, and I refer to him because I shall mention certain aspects of television that interest me at Ryerson, when we get around to the Ryerson estimates. There are, of course, representatives from the various educational agencies, and Dr. Ivey from the University of Toronto.

So you can see that this is not an advisory committee just to bring us up to date on what is happening in other jurisdictions. This is a committee composed of individuals who are genuinely interested in the development of educational television. I am reasonably optimistic about what results they may come up with.

Mr. Nixon: When was the committee set up?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The committee was set up and held its first meeting on March 12 of this year. I could outline the duties very briefly to you: to advise the Minister on the development of educational television in Ontario schools; to propose specific series of Ontario telecasts to meet the needs of the schools of this province; to advise the Minister on policy problems associated with the development of ETV programmes—and I can assure you there are some problems; and to encourage teacher training in the effective production, presentation and utilization of ETV programmes. While, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. member will feel, as he said, we are not moving too rapidly, I want him to be fully aware of the fact that the Minister and the department, Mr. Chairman, are very definitely concerned with the development of educational TV in the province. But we are also concerned that it be developed in a way that will be appropriate and of some real value to the schools in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have, I hope, touched on most of the items raised by the two hon. members last evening in their general remarks. Perhaps if I have failed to do so, they will bring them up in a more specific way during the consideration of the entire estimates.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may ask one general question. I see it is tidier to deal with it on the specific estimates, but with regard to my suggestion of a continuing committee of

inquiry, the hon. Minister rather skillfully went around that topic without coming to grips with it. I raise it again because in Great Britain, for example, the whole Robbins report at the university level has pointed out that in the past there was no plan at all. I am sure that we had no plan until the advisory committee got into the picture, and there are growing doubts as to what its role should be and whether it is the appropriate body. Certainly the university presidents in the so-called Deutsch report clearly indicated that the first requirement was an analysis of the whole field and what we should be doing in it.

In other words, if the Robbins report is any guide we should be having that kind of job done at the university level. It has been indicated to us clearly that we needed it at the post-secondary level for technical work. There are all these problems throughout the whole university field.

What about the proposition of a continuing committee to co-ordinate all the bits and pieces of research and fill in the gaps?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think I said—and I do not know that I can use the same phraseology again—that the suggestion made by the hon. member is one that cannot be passed over lightly. I think that the advisory committee, such as the Robbins committee, of course was dealing with a specific problem that had not been dealt with before, really, by any governmental agency before that—at least not recently in Great Britain.

We have had committees studying various features of both the elementary and secondary programmes here in the province and I am not sure that the committee of inquiry is really the proper terminology. Perhaps some overall committee on educational planning would be better. As I say, Mr. Chairman, this is an area that certainly will not be overlooked in consideration of my hon. friend's remarks.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. members that my remarks will be very brief this afternoon. I want to address those remarks to one broad field of education which I submit requires continuing attention, debate and action by the people of this province and of the House and of the government itself.

I am speaking, sir, of the field of post-secondary post-high-school education. For the purposes of these remarks, I might describe it as senior education and define senior as including all those of our people

who have reached or are close to the age of 18.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have no desire to curtail the remarks of my hon. friend, but it is a general rule and an understanding that there be one speaker from each party in the House to make preliminary and rather exhaustive remarks over the whole broad field of education and that then the votes be called one by one and hon. members speak according to the vote as it is called. My hon. friend is not speaking, as I understand it, directly to the vote. I ask your ruling on it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I reply to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman? My thought in answer to this was concern. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that on any other item in the estimates we are dealing with particular grants, and particular institutions having again particular responsibilities. The remarks which I wish to make this afternoon, will be very brief, and deal with many, many—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I feel that this should come under vote 504.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Woodbine will speak first.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I was going to defer to the hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. Troy: Thank you, very much. I think my comments will be on the vote in question, 501, because there is a reference in 501 to research, and the only research that I see listed is research in schools construction.

The hon. Minister said he would talk on research later under the Ontario College of Education. I notice the whole vote for that particular institution is \$1.9 million. Consider what has been done in other departments of the province in research: I see in the civil service there is \$50,000 for pay research; in Lands and Forests \$733,000; in northern Ontario development \$760,000 from The Department of Economics and Development; the Ontario Research Foundation \$1 million; again in Economics and Development; something else in another branch \$98,000; in the Department of Tourism and Information \$80,500. It seems to me the amounts in Education are just very minor amounts when we consider that the most important branch of government here, at least the one that

requires the most amount of money, is this Department of Education.

We have heard reference made to the part that the so-called Robarts plan is playing in the educational process in this province. We just have to hark back to the days when that was put into effect and the very strong and trenchant criticism we had from educators and industry and commerce and labour that this particular departure was made without very much research. I have in front of me an article from *The Rotarian* with the heading "I Predict". In the foreword it says:

Forecasting the shape of tomorrow seems a risky business. In fact, tomorrow in its many forms is already in men's minds and on the drawing boards.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) is not here today, but I am sure if he was here he would endorse my remarks and would say that industry in this country, industry in any part of the world, has only developed and increased because of research. We can take the great oil companies—and the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) knows how much the Imperial Oil Company has spent on research. They have got some of the best brains in the nation there. And why? Just so they can make better products so they can sell more of their line. It is the same way with all the other great companies across this land.

We in education have done very little on research. The hon. Minister has spoken about this committee on inquiry. The hon. member for York South has questioned it. Certainly we should have a continuing committee on research in all its forms so that, as it says in this article, we may have on the drawing boards the things needed in education and project what is going to happen, not tomorrow, not next year, but what is going to happen in five and ten years from now.

It seems to me that when a budget reaches \$400 million and more, a small amount to spend on research would be \$10 million. It may not be necessary that the government itself provide the \$10 million. I am sure industry would co-operate with this research branch, I am sure that labour would, I am sure that commerce would. Also, there should be co-ordination in research with the federal government, with other provinces, with the very advanced research they are doing in the United States. These are some of the things that we need to know about.

The effect in the United States, they say, is going to be a 30-hour week in a very short time. Over here I do not know how

long it will take to get that, although all the while they are working at 30 hours in industry, the teacher will still be working his 60-hour week regardless of how far we advance.

Then there are the other questions; the programmed learning, for example. And the hon. Minister mentioned the use of television. We already have research on the construction of schools. Then there is the use of leisure time and adult education. All these things are going to be very serious matters in the future.

I recall when I was at the conference of education, that is the Canadian conference in Montreal, the particular section on which I sat in had to do with manpower training. The great question there was the effect of guidance on the pupils, particularly guidance in their elementary schools. The important thing is that a guidance teacher must know something about the world of work. I will not say this refers to all our guidance teachers, but some of them may have never gotten a little bit of callous on their hands. But they must know something of the world of work.

Another thing is that the number of white collar workers is going to increase. How much emphasis should we give on the business and commerce branch in our secondary schools?

Then also, there is knowing what the dickens we are training for!

I recall at that conference the representative, I think he was a very prominent official of the Council of Labour in British Columbia, pointed out that they were retraining people in British Columbia at that time and one of the trades on which they were retraining was plumbing. Well, plumbers were a dime a dozen, there was a surplus on the market for plumbers. It is the same thing as the hon. member for Woodbine has said about welders, there is a surplus.

What are the jobs of the future? Again, should we be training in specialized skills; or should we just have one training for a basic skill so that the worker can be flexible and maybe as he goes on the next 20, 25, 30 years he will have to be retrained, as I think probably somebody has mentioned, at least a dozen times.

I have a note here. This is a report of the select committee on manpower training, and I read:

The inadequate state of our knowledge in these respects, that is to the projections and the forecasts of the future, what the trends will be, is most unfortunate.

As a committee we have felt the need for more definite information about these matters over and over again. We know that those who have had to make vital decisions with regard to the allocation of our resources in the field of education and training have felt this need much more so than ourselves. We commend them for having the courage to make decisions which they have to make in the absence of adequate information. We wonder, however, how long they can go on doing this before an unwitting but drastic misallocation of resources occurs.

Then there is a separate chapter on research. The heading is:

A NEGLECTED BUT VITAL NEED

The deficient state of our information in various aspects and in other respects must be quickly overcome if we are to have any hope of developing and maintaining sound programmes to prepare our labour force for the challenges of the future.

Then it continues:

FORECASTING CHANGE IN THE NATURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE LABOUR FORCE

A paramount question which every government should be asking itself, and certainly every government in Canada, the federal government as well as the provincial jurisdictions, they should be asking and trying to find an answer to, on a systematic and continuing basis: what are the current and future needs of the economy for trained manpower?

So then, that committee on research should be a continuing one. As I say, in a budget of \$422 million, we certainly should be spending millions on research. Not only people from The Department of Education, not only the professors from the Ontario College of Education—I know that Professor Jackson has made exceptional progress in research and we have others working on research—but also the effort must be from industry, it must be from commerce. This is the recommendation of my hon. friend from Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) who was a very important member of that committee, and I read:

A responsibility for research, this sort of co-operation is also required on the part of various departments within the provincial government which have a legitimate interest in the field of manpower research. Here are three departments involved: Labour, Education and Economics and Development. How they should decide to divide up their responsibilities in this area,

is not of fundamental importance. But what is more essential—

the sentence goes on:

—is the need for them to sit down together at the operating level, agree on what information they should develop and get on with it. But aside from the matter of forecasting, the bulk of the responsibility would seem to lie with The Department of Education.

I could continue reading at length here, but no doubt you have read this report over and over again. I am sure your deputy Ministers, and particularly the new director you have, are aware of all this. Again it was something which, after the first conference on education in 1958, we presented to The Department of Education, to the then Minister, our recommendations on the trades training programme, on the fact that you should have a director. Three years after the recommendations were put to The Department of Education it comes into effect, at least is projected; and then only recently, only a few months ago, we have the director.

But, sir, there will be others who will be speaking on various topics under the various headings; and I strongly urge the hon. Minister to recommend strongly to the Cabinet, to the Executive Council and to the Treasury board, that millions be put into research. I would say possibly an amount of \$10 million, with the co-operation of industry.

May I conclude these remarks on this particular subject saying, as Dr. Wilder T. Penfield said not long ago, that there is no limit to the uses to which men may put their talents. We have research by all nations, even by our own country, in how to get things into space, in guessing what there is beyond; but what Dr. Penfield also said at one time is:

"We are looking the way to the moon, but we still do not know very much about the human mind."

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in replying to that, actually I intended to deal with research at some length under the vote for OCE because this is where, at least to a degree, the research of The Department of Education is centred. The budget for the department of educational research at the Ontario College of Education, which serves as the main research branch of the department, is by itself in excess of \$450,000 for the current fiscal year. To this sum—and I am taking research in the very broad aspect, and I think you must in the field of education—must be added, within the college, a sub-

stantial portion of the funds provided for graduate studies in education.

Research is done by staff, and by candidates for the Master of Education and Doctor of Education degrees, but a fraction of the budget for the regular teacher-education programme must be added to cover the cost of experiments and studies in the University of Toronto Schools and in the teachers courses. These amounts are part of the budget for the Ontario College of Education, which is submitted to the government of the University of Toronto, and the total budget for the Ontario College of Education is paid by The Department of Education.

During the past current year the department made grants in excess of \$70 million to the universities. The amount for the last five years totals \$200 million. These funds are used, not only for teaching purposes, but for research and the scholarly production of knowledge. Certainly substantial sums should be credited towards educational research directly, or in related studies and fields such as psychology, social work and economics. While these activities are not itemized in any of the specific reports of my department, an indication of their scope may be secured in—and I am sure the hon. member reads this regularly—the survey of educational research for the province, published from time to time for the Ontario Educational Research Council in the *Ontario Journal of Educational Research*. I am sure the hon. member is familiar with this. Incidentally, the publication of the journal is subsidized to a considerable extent by The Department of Education.

Support is also given directly to students, through the miscellaneous grants, bursaries and scholarships, for study and for research. The Ontario graduate fellowship programme is an outstanding example of this, Mr. Chairman.

In addition to our participation, directly and indirectly, in the activities of the Ontario Educational Research Council and the Metropolitan Toronto Educational Research Council, some portions of the general legislative grants paid to the local school boards must be credited towards research. These grants have enabled teachers and officials to engage in research activities which are substantial in number, variety and scope.

Just over a year ago, the Ontario Curriculum Institute was founded, to work primarily in the area of educational research. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, there is no better example of research being done in education than is presently being done by the Ontario Curriculum Institute.

This body was founded through the co-operative efforts of the Ontario School Trustees' Council, the teachers' federation, the universities' supervising bodies and, of course, The Department of Education. As you are well aware, we make grants to this curriculum institute. We have also contributed for some years directly to the support of the Ontario Mathematics Commission, to the research activities of the Canadian Education Association and to the Canadian Council for Research on Education.

Within the department—and this does not show in the estimates, Mr. Chairman, but it is there and I am sure the hon. member, having some real knowledge of the educational process must accept this—several branches are engaged in genuine research activities. Among these are the guidance branch; the auxiliary education branch, directly and through the supervision of the registrars branch, whose studies of the examination policies and practices are important parts of educational research; and the teacher education branch, indirectly through research activities with the teachers' colleges. All these make some contribution in the examination of present practices and the implementation of new discoveries based on the research techniques and methods.

Officials of the elementary branch and the secondary branch not only encourage research, they conduct studies of their own. Research in special areas is conducted at the Ontario School for the Blind, and the Ontario School for the Deaf. Many of the studies of the statistical services branch are in the areas of pure and applied research in education. The curriculum and textbooks branch, Mr. Chairman, is closely related to research, as you can guess. It has been expanded in recent years and has increasingly devoted its activity to the application of research findings in the development of new courses of study for the reorganized programme in the secondary schools and for Grades 1 to 6 of the elementary schools.

Large numbers of outstanding teachers and inspectors, supervisors, teachers' college staff, and university representatives have studied, or are studying, and experimenting with new approaches in mathematics and the role of television—to which I have referred—language laboratories, and programmed instructions, in the school programme. The work done in the curriculum branch in this development, with the co-operation of authors and publishers of new textbooks, based on the findings of research, has provided Ontario with unexcelled teaching aids in this area. Officials of the department are constantly being sent to

investigate new policies and practices in other jurisdictions, in the United Kingdom, Europe, United States, and many parts of the Commonwealth. The department sponsors other investigations and conferences, of which the relatively recent conference on school design and construction—which gives rise, really, to this item in the estimates, I think—is a very good example.

The figure for research would not be exaggerated, sir, if it were placed in excess of \$1 million annually perhaps during this past year or two. It is my intention to continue to expand our support for research. It is my firm belief that only through research study and experimentation can valid solutions be reached for the many problems which now exist, and for others which will undoubtedly arise in the rapidly changing world, my hon. friend mentions, of today and tomorrow.

I would agree, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very critical area, one to which we have to give great attention. At the same time—I do not recall specifically the phraseology in the manpower training report—but if memory serves me correctly, it indicates that there must be some form of manpower assessment which looks forward five to ten years. You indicate that this is, to a degree, perhaps a high degree, the responsibility of The Department of Education. I would suggest that really our basic responsibility is to instruct in those areas where we think we will be of best help to the students of the future.

I think the question of trying to establish job determination or the manpower requirements in the future is certainly of interest to the department and related to its responsibilities, nonetheless I think they should be determined by such a body as the automation foundation or perhaps the federal and provincial Departments of Labour. I think we are all very vitally concerned, but one of the very basic functions of this department, I suggest to you, is the actual instruction of the young people so that they can fulfil the manpower requirements whatever they may be.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my hon. friend that perhaps one of the very basic things we must retain is a very high degree of flexibility in the programme that our children are undertaking in our school system. I think it is quite obvious that no one, no matter what studies are made, has the type of crystal ball that will indicate what the job opportunities will be in ten or 15 years time. If they have, certainly I do not possess one. I think that our school programme must be such that we will give our students sufficient education that if there is a change in manpower requirements they have certain basic attitudes or

skills so that they can adapt themselves to these changes.

I have read very carefully the recommendations of the manpower training committee report. I have something more to say on this, maybe at greater length a little later on. I assure the hon. member that we are concerned about research, but research cannot be and should not be centred in just one specific area within one department. This relates to what is going on at the universities and throughout our school system. It is not research that you can see developed with a separate department as we see in industry. This is a very delicate and specialized field and I assure the hon. member that we are very concerned and we shall do our very best to see that proper research facilities and studies are conducted throughout our school programme.

Mr. Troy: May I ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, is there a central council or central group to which all of these research organizations report? For example, you mentioned The Department of Labour in regard to its most important function in manpower training, but is the representative of The Department of Labour or are representatives of labour groups on your research committee? Are there representatives of industry and, also, do you have frequent meetings with the research departments in the federal government? I know there is no department of education but the federal government does a great amount of research. Is there harmony and co-operation with all of these other groups?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps you might specifically refer in this area to the Ontario Educational Research Council through which is channelled a great deal of this research. As far as the relationship of this department to others is concerned, I think perhaps our association here with The Department of Labour, The Department of Economics and Development and the automation foundation will be of some help to us although I am still very concerned about automation and its future. I think it should give us all very great concern.

Our relationship with the federal Department of Labour has been most acceptable. We have worked very closely together to develop the programmes not only in the secondary schools but in our planned vocational centres, at the institutes of technology and, of course, in the programme four and five areas. We have a happy relationship with that department as far as these aspects are

concerned and I am sure, of course, that this will continue. The federal Department of Labour is very interested in trying to do some of the type of forecasting mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. Troy: I suppose the council is also concerned with adult education and particularly the use of leisure time. Another factor, too, which must be considered, is that the life span is increasing so that people, long after they have reached the age of retirement, must have something that can interest them. I presume those things are also considered.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, these are being considered. I think if my memory serves me correctly again, I made some reference to this in my observations on the youth branch. I am not sure of this but at some point or other during my main speech on the estimates, I indicated the problem facing this society because of the increased leisure time as one that should give us great concern. Certainly this is being studied by several agencies and we in the department are quite concerned about it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. member for Nipissing has raised this rather interesting point may I ask the hon. Minister to take a couple of examples? How much money will the department be giving this year to (a) the Ontario Curriculum Institute, and (b) Metro Educational Television Association, or whatever the correct name is?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just trying to get the specific amounts. As far as the curriculum institute is concerned, Mr. Chairman, it will be receiving a \$50,000 grant, the same as last year. As I understand it, the trustees group will be contributing a like amount. I have been chatting with the new director, Dr. Morgan, and he is hopeful of interesting—which I think would be very helpful—business and industry in financially assisting the curriculum institute.

As far as the grant to META, there will be some assistance, which has not been determined, through the Minister's advisory committee on educational television. I shall be quite frank and tell you that we have suggested to META—we have a representative of META on the Minister's advisory committee—that we are attempting to develop a programme of provincial scope and that the support for META could come to an end when we have solved this type of programme. But META will receive some

amount through the recommendation of the advisory committee on educational television.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I discovered today from an answer to a question tabled in the House that a barefoot boy by the name of E. P. Taylor in the fiscal year just concluded got almost \$21,000 from the Ontario government for breeding horses.

I am a great believer in the principle of giving welfare assistance to those who need it but in view of the fact that Mr. Taylor has now moved out of the country, I would suggest that we let him struggle along as best he can on his own resources. If we did so, we could increase the grant to the curriculum institute by 40 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the only observation I have to make is that Mr. Taylor received no grant under the estimates of my department.

Mr. Bryden: But under the estimates of your government he has received \$40,000 in two years.

Mr. Troy: Just one final question on the curriculum institutes—pardon me.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I just have a very brief question for the hon. Minister. What relationship precisely does the curriculum institute have with the research monies designated under OCE?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no relationship between the monies voted under OCE for the department headed by Dr. Jackson and the curriculum institute.

Mr. Troy: In the curriculum institute, are there representatives of industry and labour on that committee, or just members of teaching groups and trustees?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am just going from memory again. We do not have any direct control over the curriculum institute. This is one of the benefits of the curriculum institute, I think. We are participating and we help finance it but we are very anxious that it operates quite independently of the department. I think there are 30 members on the board and there are six appointed by the five participating groups. As I understand it, there are no set rules as to who these six individuals may be.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter I would like to raise. There

have been and there will no doubt continue to be discussions of large and important principles. There is one rather small detail, but important in its own way, that I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister. I am not singling him out; this problem arises in a few other estimates as well.

Item 12, under vote 501, asks for \$1,000 for what is described as "unforeseen and unprovided." As I understand the new system here—and I think it is a good system—budgeting is done on the basis of programmes. The Treasury board will authorize a budget on the basis of a programme submitted by a department and I would like to know how one draws up a programme for something that is unforeseen and unprovided.

Mr. Chairman, this item appears in some of the estimates of some other departments, but not all of them. I would suggest to the Treasury board that it should strike these items out of all estimates. If matters come up that were not anticipated at the beginning of the year, there are, as we know, proper procedures for having them approved by the Treasury board if they are proper. I think in order that we may fully establish what is a good system of budgeting by programme, we should drop this old-fashioned item of unforeseen and unprovided. I will admit, however, that \$1,000 in \$400 million is not a significant sum. It is the principle of the thing that I am concerned about.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that mad money for the secretary?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we use this too regularly as a matter of fact. I do understand, if I recall correctly, that on one occasion this was used for, I think, a \$200 fee for legal opinion. We have no legal counsel directly within the department and this was to do, I think, with certain aspects of the separate school system. This was the item that we used to pay the \$200 fee.

Vote 501 agreed to.

On vote 502:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would just like to compliment the hon. Minister on his presentation. I think it has been the best I have heard in this House in the five years I have been here.

Mr. Troy: That is also including the former Minister.

Mr. Newman: He certainly is most familiar with his subject and has given excellent answers to every question asked of him.

Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the hon. Minister? Will he consider the teaching of house buying on the elementary level, primarily to the senior grades, because quite a few of these students now do not carry on; or if they do carry on they may get into one or two years of the secondary school level then their education stops at that point? Likewise, they may be 15, 16 and even 17 years of age; generally at the age of 16 and 17, rather than keep them in an elementary school, they are sent to the junior vocational schools.

Another thing I would like the hon. Minister to consider is instalment buying. Were the youngster made aware of the dangers of instalment buying earlier in his life he would not be confronted with the dangers with which we find him faced as he goes on through life. Recently we had presented to the House the various type of gimmicks, rackets, sharp practices and so forth which are employed by certain unscrupulous operators. Were the student made aware of some of these dangerous practices, he would not be so easily led up the garden path.

The third comment I would make concerns guidance. I think that guidance is more important in the elementary level than it is in the secondary level. It is here where we need the more competent guidance teacher because the youngster, when he leaves the elementary level, has only one year and sometimes only two years in which to make up his mind as to what course he is to follow for the balance of his life. If he does not select the proper course of education, he finds himself confronted with the need to be retrained; and not two or three times—I understand the latest figures are 11 or 12 times, in the course of his 40 years of employment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in commenting on these three aspects: This question of house buying is a specific subject. I do not know that it really had occurred to me, or the department. Certainly we will consider that. As you know, under the reorganized programme there is, of course, economics.

I was in a school, I believe it was either in Fort William or Port Arthur, some two or three weeks ago, and in one of the occupational courses—and this is perhaps an appropriate area where this type of course of instruction should be given—the gentleman in charge of the class was giving a talk on credit buying. He said that he not only

found it an interesting course to give to the students but that the students came to school the day after class with many problems presented by their parents as to the difficulties involving credit buying. Certainly this is an area which will be part of the occupational courses at Grade 9 and 10 level.

I could not agree with the hon. member more as far as guidance is concerned. This is an area which still needs, as I said in my opening statement, considerable work. It is an area which has developed very rapidly. Certainly it must apply to the elementary as well as the secondary level because I think the day is rapidly approaching when the somewhat artificial division between elementary and secondary may conceivably disappear and we will treat education as a continuous process, say from Grade 1 to 12 or 13, as the case may be.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue this one step further? I do not mean to institute a programme in the school on these various topics I have mentioned; but possibly in the guidance programme the department could come out with certain specific topics which should be covered during the course of a year, solely for information for the youngster. Because at that age he probably is not fully cognizant of the dangers with which he is going to be confronted with later on in life. And where topics such as house buying, unionism, maybe instalment buying, are simply introduced, then when he gets into the secondary level he is a little more aware of them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two areas on which I would like to address some questions to the hon. Minister.

Would the hon. Minister make general reports with regard to the revisions in the kindergarten to Grade 6? Is this being done under the aegis of the curriculum institute, or under whose direction is it being done? And specifically, at what stage are these studies? I mean, they have been going on for two years now and I am just curious to know exactly what is happening. I notice in the annual report that it states they are going to be accelerated with the completion of the courses for reorganization in secondary schools. Has the hon. Minister got personnel there? And when they are freed from secondary, will he switch them over?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to report that the Treasury board as recently as this morning, just as recently as that, has approved the allocation of five

permanent personnel for a year or a year-and-a-half to expedite the programme. It is being done very definitely, within the curriculum and textbooks branch of the department. I think there has to be a very clear understanding that the curriculum institute operates independently. We are interested in their recommendations; but the final responsibility must lie with, I believe, The Department of Education, for the actual implementation of their recommendations. We must take the responsibility for the courses in our schools.

As far as Grades 1 to 6 are concerned, they have been delayed, to a degree, but not to a major degree, by reorganization in the secondary school; but I would report to you that studies have been concluded of developments in curriculum in a number of forward-looking jurisdictions in the U.S.

An official of the curriculum branch visited the state departments of education in Minnesota, Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, and the Chicago Board of Education. He has held discussions recently with officials in all of these areas, and leading educators in several American universities have also been consulted. We are going, perhaps, you may feel, somewhat far afield; but we feel that we should make every effort to contact those individuals who may be able to make a contribution to this revision.

Meetings have been held with the curriculum revision committee of the Ontario Teachers' Federation. The latter group has conducted a survey of teacher opinion on many matters relating to curriculum in Grades 1 to 6. This information has been analyzed and the results have been given to the department. It is proposed to continue and extend the help which may be secured through this avenue. We think this is a very helpful way of trying to determine the type of curriculum in the elementary area.

Meetings have been held with the inspectors, teacher staff, and college members at the fall conference of these groups at the ten teachers' colleges, and these groups have indicated the areas where they believe helpful changes could be made.

Three sets of new primary reading series for Grades 1 to 3 inclusive will be completed this year. New spelling series have been developed and are in use in Grades 2 to 6 inclusive presently. New textbooks in English have been introduced in some grades and they will be extended throughout all grades. Texts incorporating some of the findings of the new approach to mathematics, as we call it, have been approved for Grades 3 to 4

and others for Grades 5 and 6 are now available.

The teaching of French to English-speaking children is under study by a curriculum committee made up of representatives of the university professors, the classroom teachers, supervisors and inspectors, teachers' college staff member, and officials of the department. The committee is examining the whole programme and will make recommendations for an integrated course throughout the elementary and the secondary schools. It will investigate the problem of the supply of teachers, which is not really related perhaps to curriculum, and especially the training of teachers for oral classes in the elementary schools.

Provision is being made, and I have just learned now, that the extra staff we were looking for has been approved by the Treasury board this morning, to complete this revision. But the responsibility for it, Mr. Chairman, lies within the curriculum and textbook branch of the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the question in my mind grows even larger. The government is spending \$50,000 for the Ontario Curriculum Institute, along with monies coming in from other sources, and now the hon. Minister has explained to us that within this branch of the department you have a committee which is proceeding with the revision of the curriculum from kindergarten to Grade 6. In fact, you have just got the six personnel for a year-and-a-half, which is another few tens of thousands of dollars. It is the relationship between the two of them.

I agree that the curriculum institute is an independent body which makes recommendations this government will have to implement in its wisdom. But it would appear that you are now coming into the picture in what in effect is a parallel study with the Ontario Curriculum Institute.

Let us take a hypothetical case. Suppose the curriculum institute comes up with a recommendation with regard to Grades 1 to 6 about a year from now, and meanwhile you have this other body within your department, doing a study on curriculum and it comes up with a different recommendation. Why do you have two bodies doing that basic job?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Chairman, it is a very excellent question. I think that the answer is not easy to give or explain, except that the prime purpose of the curriculum institute is to be independent and objective. The department officials have certain views—

I am just taking one area as an example—in reading or the instruction of reading in the elementary schools. There is a certain school of thought in the province which would indicate that the view taken by the department is not correct. In order to be completely objective, and realizing the great importance of this particular area at the elementary level, we have asked the curriculum institute to do an objective and independent study and to assess what the department is doing in relation to what other groups are suggesting and what classroom teachers are suggesting.

I think there is very definitely a spot for both types of study. It would be my thought that the curriculum institute will concentrate on one, two or three specific areas during the course of its year, that it will take perhaps a wider or broader approach, that it may be sort of holding out carrots or goals that the department should aim for in a broad sense, and that it, I hope, will fulfil a very necessary role. The fact that it is separate and independent from the department, I think is what will make it effective.

I do not think there need necessarily be an overlapping. I feel quite confident there will not be. I realize the possibility of it, but the attitude to date of the people on the curriculum institute is that they do not want to overlap what we are doing. At the same time they want to look at some areas in depth because they think it will be helpful to the curriculum and textbook branch of the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my other question has to do with letters of permission and letters of standing. As I understand it, a letter of standing—is that the correct term?—is in effect a temporary certificate given to somebody who has training in another jurisdiction and presumably the training is roughly the equivalent of ours. Is that correct? Well, I am a bit puzzled. In a system the size of ours, we have only 942 people who are persons with no professional training at all, 546 holders of expired third-class certificates—that sounds like a pretty dead professional place, an expired third-class certificate; I do not know how low down on the totem pole you can get—

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are not the top professionals.

Mr. MacDonald: Persons who failed the teachers' college total 91; teachers holding high school certificates, 17; then, teachers holding certificates from other provinces—holders not eligible for letters of standing.

This may be a small point, but what is the distinction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is a very involved situation but these are people who do not have the equivalent qualifications. It is an area that gives me some concern on occasion, because usually these people are the ones who end up in the Minister's office wondering why their qualifications are not equivalent.

Quite frankly, we are extending our assessment of outside jurisdictions. I have run into a situation, for instance, in Windsor and as a matter of principle I had to accept it. There is a very excellent course at Wayne University in geography, if memory serves me correctly. Yet because of the fact that it is so difficult to evaluate the courses at all the surrounding universities, a student taking a course there, which might be a very acceptable course, at the present time does not receive credit here in Ontario. These are areas I feel we must assess, but I think you appreciate the great difficulty in trying to evaluate courses at all the institutions of higher learning in other jurisdictions. This is not an easy task.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us what percentage of the students in the primary system get their entrance, that is accomplish Grade 8 successfully, in less than the eight years? Just roughly—half of them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is difficult to determine. It cannot be determined from the report. We would have to get you very accurate figures but we estimate it would be somewhere between 35 and perhaps 40 per cent. These are quite often the same students who go on to the 12-year system, at least the 13 in 12. It would be very close to the same percentage, roughly 35 to 40 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: In fact there would be very little opportunity to accelerate a year after Grade 8?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it would be almost impossible, certainly under the reorganized programme, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be very difficult to accelerate after the Grade 8 level, the way the courses are constructed at the moment.

Mr. Nixon: So approximately, let us say 40 per cent of the students do accelerate a year in some way or other, during the public school system. I would like the hon. Minister to comment on whether or not the methods

of doing this in the various educational jurisdictions are uniform or whether the responsibility is left entirely to the local boards.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be inaccurate to say that it was uniform. I think that obviously certain ideas and philosophies carry over from one board area to another, but the actual responsibility for the promotion of students lies very definitely within the local board area, and usually then, of course, on the recommendation of the individual teacher and the principal.

Mr. Nixon: It is because of this fact, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the possibility for an average student, or an above-average student, to accomplish a little faster academic progress is not available in all jurisdictions. There are many school boards who have the philosophy "one-year-one-grade" and that is it. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on whether he feels there should be this kind of freedom of choice in every area, or whether or not the student has the right to accelerate if in fact it has been indicated he can do so?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this matter is subject to review, if the board refuses, by the inspector. I think it is a situation that perhaps over a period of time may be resolved in the development of some overall policy for the acceleration of students. Actually, this is developed to a degree. There has been, I understand, some reference—if there has not there will be—to the Grade 13 committee on this whole question of telescoping or perhaps altering the programme for Grades 1 to 8 as it relates to the secondary level. Of course, into this comes the philosophy that although many students might be able to do it in the 12 years, you are then perhaps graduating some students theoretically from school at 16½ or 17 years of age, which may be too young emotionally or socially to attend university. This is also being considered by the Grade 13 committee.

Mr. Nixon: But the fact of the matter is that a large number of students do this now. It might be a good subject for research to examine the various means whereby acceleration is possible and come to some conclusion as to which way is best and then implement it in the province of Ontario.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, if the teaching of French in the public schools, which is a matter of choice by the individual boards, must be paid for entirely at a local level.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure exactly what the hon. member means. If he means are there any special grants, there are no special grants but they are given the same type of grant per student that would be given for any other type of course. They are not treated any differently; there is no special grant for it.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister said, either in his remarks yesterday or in his report, that there is a shortage of teachers qualified to do this. Then is it just on a strict salary competition basis that the communities get this service?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I see what the hon. member is asking. Yes, this is a case, Mr. Chairman, of the boards endeavouring to obtain the appropriate teacher for the instruction of oral French. There is no additional grant given to any board. The boards must compete for this individual, and of course, as I say, there is a shortage of this type of individual. This is still one of the stumbling blocks, although I said in my estimates the number now I think is close to 104,000 presently taking oral French at the elementary level.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South has touched on letters of standing and letters of permission. How would it be that a teacher would have a letter giving permission to teach in our elementary schools for 19 years and still not have any kind of a certificate?

Mr. MacDonald: It is like a permanent casual.

Mr. Troy: The tragic part about it, too, is that this particular teacher, according to the inspectors, is a much better teacher than those who have Grade A certificates. Would there be something in the department which would allow, would compel, that type of teacher to get her certificate long ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, these are quite often the situations which find their way to the Minister's office as well. Quite often these cases occur where a married woman, say, has gone back to the profession. She does not want to leave her family; she may be in some more remote community and is not able to upgrade herself to obtain the appropriate certificates. Then I think it is true in some cases—they are not many, but in some cases—the teachers probably are as competent as those with their certificates and this is the way the situation develops.

It is theoretically possible, of course, for the department to force some of these people; yet at the same time many of them are doing a quite adequate job. As the hon. member has said, the inspector suggested this one teacher is doing better than those who had their qualifications; but there are these rules and regulations we must observe and this is what complicates matters. This is how the situation develops. It is really very simple, and one I run into fairly regularly.

Mr. Troy: This particular teacher to whom I refer, sir, is married to the profession of teaching; that is her marital status. The tragic part about it is that she is bilingual, an exceptionally good teacher, and it is very unfortunate that she still has to have that letter of permission.

Again, too, I have seen people come from other countries into our province and teach. At least they had PhDs, but just because they had a doctor of philosophy degree does not mean that they are good teachers; in fact they did not last any time.

I noticed in the press not very long ago that there is a special course for teachers in conversational French this summer, I think, at Waterloo or Kitchener. Is that under the department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is the same summer course as last year, Mr. Chairman, and it is being held in Ottawa.

Mr. Troy: A crash programme!

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a crash programme, an experimental type of programme—this is another area I did not touch on—being run by the curriculum institute; and I believe they are doing this in London.

Mr. Troy: Well, if a certain institute or committee is considering Grades 1 to 6, how then would it be possible to integrate that very fine suggestion of the hon. member for Brant that we shorten the school years to 12 years, just as is done in the province where I was born, Quebec? And in the province of Saskatchewan they can proceed to their senior matriculation in 12 years. Surely Ontario can. What is the strong objection to compressing the pre-university education into 12 years; what is the objection?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is related to the study being made by the Grade 13 committee. And there have been references made to this at the committee gatherings already, although I think that in fairness the hon. member should know that comparative studies made—

and they of course are not complete and may not be entirely accurate—would indicate that a Grade 13 graduate in this province does have some slightly greater knowledge than a comparable graduate from Grade 12 in a lot of other jurisdictions. I think it is only fair that we should tell him.

Mr. Troy: That is a matter of opinion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Troy: And guidance; a final question about guidance in the elementary schools. It seems to me that the most important people to be guided are not the youngsters themselves but the parents. I think they should be brought into the picture, to discuss the future career of their offspring with the guidance teacher.

Hon. Mr. Davis Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for all areas, but I can speak for those I know rather well. Many of the parents of the Grade 8 students, or sometimes the Grade 7 students, are invited to the elementary schools to discuss with the principal and the room teacher the future of the student when he proceeds on to Grade 9. This is not general because in many areas they still have not got people who are competent enough to handle this situation; but it is developing and it is one with which I certainly agree. I agree with the hon. member that the ultimate responsibility for selection of the course must lie with the student and his parents.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the hon. Minister in connection with the curriculum institute and the association for better basic education. Apparently a brief entitled: "The elementary educational system in Ontario schools, its shortcomings, adverse effects on pupils, and suggestions for corrective measures", was presented to the Minister on November 5, 1962. Apparently at that time the Minister promised investigation. Then a second meeting of a committee of the association with the Minister, his director of education, two other staff members, and the director of the newly formed institute for curriculum research, took place about March of 1963.

From what I understand, the committee had asked that tests for phonic knowledge be presented at all educational levels, that experimental classes taught by a modern phonetic system—not augmented Roman—be set up and results compared with those of equivalent classes using the current mixed method, that is the sight plus the phonic.

The committee was advised, I understand, that the test results and experiments they sought demanded scientifically controlled and conducted experimentation, and that a great deal of research and analysis was necessary by experts before results would be meaningful.

I have been told that the hon. Minister suggested, at the time of the second meeting, that since the curriculum institute would be studying the reading programme—I guess that is what is going on now—and with the institute's team consisting solely of educators, perhaps one of the members of the institute's committee might be a parent appointed by himself or his department. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if any of the requests of the Association for Better Basic Education have been or are being carried out by the curriculum institute. Has any member of the Association for Better Basic Education been appointed to the curriculum institute?

I wonder: has the hon. Minister any other comments in connection with this question of the teaching of phonics in the elementary schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I actually touched on this a few minutes ago. I informed the hon. member for York South, when we were discussing the role of the curriculum institute as compared with, or in relation to, the role of the curriculum and textbook branch, that this was one area where we had specifically asked the curriculum institute to undertake a study.

The suggestion made by the hon. member is quite accurate. I do not recall any meeting with the head of the curriculum institute and members of the department in March of 1963. Actually the head of the curriculum institute, Dr. Morgan, was appointed, I think, in December or March 1963 or January, 1964. The terms of reference of the study being undertaken follow very closely to the suggestions contained in the question of the hon. member.

I have no further comment to make on phonics as it is being used at this stage. This is why the committee has been asked to study the matter and the initial or organizing committee set up. Consideration, I understand, is being given to either having somebody from this association on a continuing committee, or certainly to allow and ask the committee on this particular problem, to make a presentation of their particular interest to the committee on the study of phonics, the use of phonics in the reading programme.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow that up with just a very brief question. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us when or if the Association for Better Basic Education has been advised as to whether or not they will be allowed a representative on the curriculum institute? This, I understand, is one of the suggestions that came from the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member perhaps was not here when I outlined the setup and the functions of the curriculum institute to the hon. member for York South.

They are an independent group. We have asked them to do this study for us and they have agreed. We are not in a position to dictate to them as to who should be on the committee. I cannot tell the hon. member, but I shall certainly ask the departmental officials, or I shall personally ask the director, to inform, if they do not already know, the people in this group.

I know some of them. They have been to my office on one or two occasions. The first time they were there they brought in a report from the San Francisco Board of Education on this particular subject. I was interested in it because I had just been to the same area and I discussed this problem with one of the authors of this very report.

I have sympathy with these people because their children, many of them, have difficulty in reading; yet I think you would be interested to know that our statistics reveal that there are as many young people learning to read properly today as there were some years ago; this is the belief of the departmental officials. But certainly we are concerned enough to have this study undertaken by the curriculum institute and I shall certainly ask the director to keep this group well informed as to the progress of this particular study.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister if the department tape records courses in various subjects. For example, a youngster may be ill in a community and will miss, let us say, two months at school. I know he could probably go into a correspondence course, but rather than go into that he might prefer to get some other type of help.

If The Department of Education would have various subjects in the science course tape recorded, all they would have to do is send the tape to the youngster and then he could play it at his own home and educate himself in that fashion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the department itself does not instruct by way of tape. In the use of tape not only is there the recording, of course, but the student must have a machine to play back the tape. As to whether some of the local boards use this for students who have been ill or are incapacitated and cannot attend regular classes, I do not know. We do, through the auxiliary education branch, provide certain special services, but we do not generally distribute tapes with instruction for the students. This is done, as you know, through the correspondence course.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question with regard to central schools. There is quite a discussion in certain parts of the province with regard to central schools. I think the hon. Minister made some comments at the opening of his estimates. Could he tell me how many municipalities, rural municipalities, have adopted central schools up till now in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are over 700 central schools now in the province. This would not necessarily indicate the exact number of municipalities because some of the municipalities might have one, two or some may even have three central schools. But assuming that the average would be, say, one or one and a half, there would now be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 550 municipalities with central schools in this province. The great bulk of our students are presently attending graded schools throughout the entire province.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the teaching of religion in the elementary schools received a lot of comment over the past year or two and in looking up some of the background on this and reading the debates in some of the first issues of *Hansard* that were taken in this House, it was interesting to note that this was introduced, I believe, in the year 1944, so that we cannot regard the teaching of religion in our schools as having a strong and great historical background. There is a strong feeling among those who are opposed to this that the time has come to reassess this part of the curriculum very carefully to see what its value is and see how it is regarded by the community in the province at this time. I would ask the hon. Minister for his comments in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is quite right as to the date of the introduction of religious education in the

schools. It was in 1944. I think the hon. member is also correct in saying that there is a body of opinion in the province that feels that—I do not know whether you would say that they were actually opposed, you might say they feel it is not necessary. I have had representations from the North York board, through the chairman, Mr. Stanbury, and I think two or three days ago received a petition, or at least a resolution, from the Scarborough board related to the subject. You should also know that there are certain groups who still feel there is merit in having religious education in the schools and I can assure the hon. member that this matter is receiving my very careful attention at this time.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, following this subject; this of course refers to public schools. The hon. Minister will not make any commitment; but let us say he is not going to have any religion in schools: we in our separate schools can continue with something that we think is a vital part of a youngster's education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have received no representation about this at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: I understand that in the public accounts of 1962-1963, there was a considerable unexpended portion dealing with inspectors in both votes 502 and 503. The basis for it apparently was that the pay is not sufficiently high to attract inspectors, and that the people who are most likely to become inspectors, namely, principals, did not have a sufficient financial inducement to make the changeover. I am curious as to whether in fact there were unexpended portions, and whether these reasons for them are valid.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would say that this is the prime reason for the unexpended appropriation for inspectors. I am just going from memory—this may also apply actually to the secondary—I would be less than frank if I did not acknowledge that we have a problem in obtaining staff through the province as far as inspectors and senior personnel are concerned by the very competitive nature and the very high salaries presently being offered by the boards. The assessment that my hon. friend has made is to a very high degree accurate.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister: Are there any specific plans that he might have in mind to alter this situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think we are all concerned, Mr. Chairman, and these matters are all being explored.

Mr. S. Lewis: I shall move to one other small field, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister has kindly opened up some of the areas of curriculum at the elementary school level relating to elementary education. I have one or two minor comments—not in as facetious a way as might first appear—to make about one particular part of the elementary school curriculum.

I gather that there is considerable sentiment in this country at the moment that *Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine should not have special exemptions or special inducements for Canadian editions. I would heartily concur in such a feeling. I would particularly concur in the suggestion that The Ontario Department of Education not act as a promotion agency, as a public relations outlet for one of these publications.

I hold in my hand the *Reader's Digest* reading skill-builder which I understand is actually used in—maybe not many—certain schools, certainly in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

This came to me from one of those schools. It is a very ingenious little book, having the actual format of *Reader's Digest*. It is a superb inducement to young people, having memorized the contents therein, to rush out to their newsstand years hence and buy *Reader's Digest*.

Now, apart from personally thinking that *Reader's Digest* is one of the more pernicious magazines available for public consumption, I would like the hon. members to know the contents and quality of the material being disseminated through the educational system in this fashion. There are several cute little parables and stories and instructive moral homilies in this book, some of them dealing with the saving of money and learning from a moneybags, others of them discussing fox shooting and the value of shooting foxes as they move in and out of ends of a hollow log—

Mr. MacDonald: A Victorian virtue, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: A very Victorian virtue and perhaps consonant with certain Victorian educational principles. But the story that appealed to me most was the little excerpt from "Goofy Gobblers", which was a friendly little piece, three-quarters of the way through the book. This little excerpt is entitled: "Some Learn, Some Don't", and I would like

to read it for the edification of the hon. members of the House.

One of my friends is really smart. His baby turkeys learned to eat and drink but he had to trick them into it. He put bright marbles into their food. The crazy things pecked at the marbles. They were not trying to eat. Their beaks slipped off into the food. They couldn't help getting some of the food into their beaks. In that way his baby turkeys learned to eat.

Ah ha; instructive.

But this farmer had a hard time getting them to take a drink. He put water in pan after pan but the little turkeys did not drink. They began to get sick for lack of water. So the farmer took each one by the head and put its beak down into the water, then it had to drink.

And again, no doubt, my agricultural friends in the House will agree that is an appropriate approach.

Another friend was not so smart. While he was feeding his baby turkeys the breakfast bell rang. He put the empty pail down in the yard. Off he went into the house. Half an hour later he found the pail almost full of dead turkeys. They had jumped in to see what they could see, then they had not known enough to jump out. So big turkeys or little turkeys, I think they are all goofy, yet I keep on raising them. I want to see what crazy things they will do next.

Apart from any facetious undercurrent, I might say to the hon. Minister that this kind of incorrigible claptrap has no place in an educational system, either as an ancillary text or as a workbook or as an educational stunt, and certainly not as any substantive educational content. I find it difficult to believe that anywhere we could be promoting *Reader's Digest* in this fashion. It may not be a specific policy of the department, but I feel it should be acquainted with the nature of the material.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would assume the hon. member, knowing the regulations of the department to a degree, fully realizes that this is not being promoted by The Department of Education, that this comes under the ancillary books or periodicals that a board may provide. Knowing the great interest that the hon. member must have in the subject to bring this matter to my attention, I presume that he has already brought this to the attention of the local board, whose responsibility it is.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, a question. In *The Canadian School Journal* some time ago there was a problem that was discussed by the executive director of the Ontario School Trustees' Council in regard to divided allegiance of the principal—his allegiance to the school board and his allegiance to the teachers' federation. Has the hon. Minister any comments in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have no comment on this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Troy: Has the hon. Minister had representations from the trustees' association that there be a change in the law?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The trustees' council has for some years made representations perhaps to suggest that the principal should not be a member of the OTF and not be construed as being part of the teachers' federation organization. There has been no decision or action taken on the representations. I have no comment on this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 502 agreed to.

On vote 503:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on vote 503, may I suggest to the hon. Minister that he establish some policy concerning summer schools? That is where a student in a secondary school fails one or two subjects and at the end of the school year attempts to pick up those subjects by the attendance at some summer school, either in his community or in some other community.

Quite often after the six-week or eight-week programme, the student returns to his community and finds that the principals of the schools frown on or look with a jaundiced eye at the type of education that he received at that summer school. They frown upon it; they claim it is not up to standard.

I think the department should set certain standards for these summer schools so that when the students does attend them, he has to pass certain types of set exams and that they be recognized in all schools in the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that has been left to the discretion, as the hon. member knows, of the local board area—the question of summer school, what the tests will be, and so on. The suggestion of the hon. member that we evolve some form of overall policy certainly is worthy of consideration, but to date this has been a matter, Mr. Chairman, determined by the local boards themselves. Some local boards, as the

hon. member is well aware, do not have summer schools of any type and this is perhaps a matter that could be and perhaps should be considered by the department.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, my own school board does not have a summer programme—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand that.

Mr. Newman: —but a lot of students from the Windsor area do attend a programme in the Chatham district. They complete the programme there and then when they attempt to have credit for the completion of that programme for that subject in the local area, there is always some comment: "Well, you just spent eight weeks at the Chatham area. You did not learn as much as you could have in the programme back in the local area." Or they also frown upon the idea that the youngster goes there while he loafed all year in the school, and that is the reason for his failing. There are other things that have to be taken into consideration. I do not think a youngster should have to sacrifice a whole year of school simply because of one or two subjects which can be made up by attendance at a summer school in some area.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Mr. Chairman, if I might add that—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! The member for Scarborough North.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Since we are on this subject, Mr. Chairman, I will be fair to the hon. member for Kent West.

Mr. McKeough: I certainly was not aware that there had been any criticism by the Windsor board or others of the programme which has been run by the Chatham Board of Education for the last two years, and I believe very successfully. I can only suggest that if the Windsor people feel this way, the best thing they could do would be to organize their own programme, instead of looking to Chatham for assistance and crying about it down here.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I could answer the hon. member, we do not complain. I would like to compliment Chatham on conducting a programme like this. I think this is forward thinking. I wish my own board would do exactly the same thing.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on vote 503, the secondary education branch, I would first like to quote from the

hon. Minister's remarks of yesterday. He said:

A nation that forgets its past is likely to have a short future.

And then he quotes Mr. J. Bascom St. John as saying:

Let us not make the fatal mistake of letting history "go out of style".

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we can approach this, as the hon. member for Brant I think has already suggested when he spoke on the teaching of history, in the secondary school field on a non-political basis. It is something that affects all of us as Canadians. I have talked over the years with many teachers in our schools and I find that many of them feel that Canadian history is dull and uninteresting. I certainly would strongly disagree with this; I think that Canada has an exciting and challenging history and I think that the people of our nation, and especially the young people, must be taught to know the difficulties that have faced the people who have come before them: starting right back from Champlain and the founding of Port Royal, the United Empire Loyalists, Lord Selkirk's settlement at the Red River, and moving all through our history to the Rebellion of 1837, struggles to achieve responsible Cabinet government, and then the vision and the establishment of Confederation. We have to go all through it right up to the development of Canada into the nation that it is today.

I think, Mr. Chairman, many of the problems facing us today, facing our Confederation here, these serious and complex problems, could be solved, sir, or at least better understood by our people if they realize that they are not new problems—as has been said many times before. They are not new problems. They have faced people in this country all through the years, through our history, and they go right back to the founding of Quebec and its conquest.

I think these problems can only be solved by Canadians knowing their roots and by our young people realizing how our forefathers faced these problems. I think this will only come from an intense study of our history. Without the knowledge, without the vision, the courage, the faith, the hardiness, the resourcefulness in all these things that our forefathers had, without the leadership which they showed as to how this nation could be founded and brought into the position which it holds today—without our young people realizing all these things, I think that we will perhaps flounder in the ignorance of our own history.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I think that, getting right down to our problem today it is that we really do not have an adequate Canadian history course in our secondary schools. The fact is that there is no course of study, in any year in secondary school, which is devoted completely and exclusively to Canadian history. Canadian history is taught on a compulsory basis in two grades—Grade 10 and Grade 12, I believe.

In Grade 10, Canadian, British and American history is taught—roughly about one-third for each of these—plus a section on government or civics. How can we have an adequate appreciation of the history of Canada when we have to study the complete history of three nations in about four periods per week?

Going on to Grade 12, here the course concerns world history, and Canadian history is only barely touched upon. It is a fraction of a part of the history course which covers the major history of the world since 1500.

Mr. Chairman, if you take the textbook used in many of our schools—I think it is called, *The Modern Age*—we find that this textbook has in it 600 pages. Of these 600 pages ten pages are devoted to the history of Canada. And if you look through the text, Sir John A. Macdonald's name—if I dare mention his name again—is only mentioned twice. I apologize to my hon. friends to the far right—

Mr. S. Lewis: Why should it be mentioned more than that?

Mr. Wells: I have not checked to see if George Brown's name is mentioned at all but I dare say it is not. Really the Grade 12 course, Mr. Chairman, is only a broad survey of world history and not really Canadian history.

I might say this: in Grade 13 an excellent course in Canadian history is offered: about 50 per cent of the subject matter deals with Canadian history and deals with it in a very fine manner; but of course, as we all know, it is an optional course in Grade 13, and very few of our students either choose it as an option or else arrive at the Grade 13 level where they even have the chance to choose it.

In rising on this vote I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that his department and, perhaps through this discussion in this Legislature, the Ontario Curriculum Institute, will tackle this very important problem. It is an important and pressing problem, which should be tackled particularly

in view of what I said earlier. We must realize our history to realize and face the problems we face in this country today. I hope that these groups will tackle this problem and that they will study it so that we can arrive at some solution.

I would just like to add a couple of suggestions which perhaps could be adopted. I would like to see us perhaps go back to where we would have a complete Canadian history course in Grade 10; one that would be devoted completely to Canadian history and the government of Canada. The Grade 11 course in world history could be—it now ends at the year 1500—advanced to the year 1763. Then, in the Grade 12 course, we could have a much greater emphasis on Canadian history, as it relates to the modern world, particularly since 1867. Here we could have a real study by our young people of all these problems: provincial rights, national schemes of social welfare, how the Canadian constitution can be amended, all these things which are so vital for their knowledge of the problems we face today.

Then, in closing, Mr. Chairman, there is just one other suggestion I would make. In the English courses of study there should perhaps be more emphasis on compulsory reading of biographies of great Canadians. There are available many fine biographies of Canadians of the past. Why should these not be made compulsory reading in our English courses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to comment on that for a moment. I think perhaps I have indicated to the House in my opening remarks that we share this concern about history and I think that much can be done in the schools of this province; but I think it is only fair to observe as well that this attitude, or lack of interest in history and other developments within this province, does not confine itself to the school system. This is something which has spread throughout, I believe, our entire society. It is a reflection of the attitude of the many parents in this province and I think it is something which we maybe should consider, if we can, in a more general way than confining our interest to the school system alone.

Obviously we can do much to engender this interest through schools but I would suggest, and this is not the appropriate time nor the place, but some discussion might be entered into to determine how we could better interest not only the school children of this province in Canadian history, but the entire population. The problem certainly extends beyond the school system itself.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, last summer the Ontario high school principals met in their annual conference at McMaster University. One subject among those discussed was the question of standardized examinations. I read, from the Canadian Press dispatch from Hamilton:

The standard exams which would be optional for schools that wanted them would provide a basis of comparison for schools at lower levels.

As we all know, at the moment, only Grade 13 students write their final set of examinations on a province-wide basis. The principals' resolution—the article goes on to say—implied that lower grade examinations would not be used for credit as Grade 13 are at present. The exams would, the resolution said, afford all schools an opportunity, if they wish it, to compare achievement in their schools with the normal across the province. That is the first thing.

Another subject discussed was the archaic laws of the province of Ontario which do not permit retired teachers to teach, as they do in other provinces. For example, a retired teacher from Ontario can go to the province of British Columbia or Quebec—I knew a principal, Mr. Chairman, who was retired from a high school in northern Ontario, and then taught for years in the province of Quebec without affecting his superannuation. In this province, there is a certain limit.

The principal pointed out that a great number of highly qualified teachers are lost to the high schools, particularly when we have a shortage of teachers. As Colonel King—I believe he is a high school principal—pointed out, there was a shortage of qualified teachers and it was not improving. Only 866 students entered the Ontario College of Education last year for teacher training and the province actually needed 2,500. Then this principal pointed out, again in regard to superannuated teachers, that if they teach more than 19.5 days they have their pension affected.

It brings up the point that they can go to B.C. if they want to, they can leave this beautiful province of Ontario, the richest in the land, and they can go to the province of Quebec and they can teach there as long as they can totter to school. They still draw their full superannuation. Why not in Ontario? Because you are losing the benefit of many teachers who could contribute much to the system, particularly when you have to resort to getting people into our schools on letters of permission and letters of standing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the second subject first. As the hon. member knows, this is the stipulation under The Superannuation Act. This is the agreement that was reached and it is one that may, I think, restrict us to a degree from the use of some of these teachers. It is debatable just how many of them are involved. There are a number who go into the private schools in this province, as well as going to other provinces. It is one of those areas that I would not want to be put in the position of saying that we should alter because of the shortage that exists at the moment, if in the long run and with the general benefits under the Act it is indicated that this is perhaps the best overall policy. I fully appreciate that you can find certain exceptions with validity to every rule, and yet, nonetheless, rules must I think, be maintained and this is one of them.

I would like to reply to the first question, mentioned by the hon. member, with reference to some other type of external examination, or some external examination at the other grade levels. As you know this year we are having Grade 12 examinations in the technical subjects, and Latin and I believe geography as well for the Grade 12 students. This is being done for several reasons, one of which is the preparation for the type of examination that they will experience at the Grade 13 level. So to a degree we are implementing the suggestion made by the headmasters at their meeting last summer. It does not go as far as they would suggest, Mr. Chairman, but certainly I think it indicates that we are interested in doing this type of thing.

Mr. Troy: Last fall, or sometime within the last few months, there was a meeting in Sudbury of male and female high school people and they had a strong resolution. I do not know if they sent it on to the department in regard to the possibility of French high schools. We have of course French Grades 9 and 10, but under The Department of Education we have French high schools across this province that are supported in Grades 11, 12 and 13 entirely by the parents themselves with no grants from The Department of Education. Have you any comments to make with regard to high schools under The Department of Education in which the instruction would be in French?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not recall this coming to the department. I do not recall it coming to myself, this recommendation from the students, although I do believe I saw something about it in the press.

More recently the association visited us here at Queen's Park—I guess about two or three weeks ago—with the thought of discussing this whole matter.

As you know, we do now instruct in French in two or three of the courses. Pupils write their examinations in two courses in French and Latin, I believe. The department is presently looking at the possibility of translating literally the existing history book. Whether this is possible or not, only time will tell. But we are considering this at the present time.

Mr. Troy: Finally, what is the hon. Minister's opinion in regard to driver instruction in our high schools? I know many of the principals frown on it. I certainly know the safety league endorses it, but what is your opinion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the department pays grants on driver education if it is outside the school hours. You might construe this as being in the same area perhaps as—not the physical fitness programme—but perhaps practising football or hockey. Quite frankly, we feel the school today, in both the academic and the technical streams, is full. We are interested in students learning to drive properly, but we feel it is an area that can be accomplished after the regular school hours. This has worked quite well in many schools.

Mr. Troy: The only difference, sir, between the teacher of the driver education and the coach of the team is that the teacher of driver examinations get a special salary. For the coach there is nothing special. He can be there for four hours and gets nothing extra.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the hon. Minister, what is the number of the personnel in the department of physical and health education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: A total, Mr. Chairman, of 20—the director, nine special services inspectors—four secondary and five elementary—six stenographers, and four camp maintenance workers. In addition, 70 are employed on the instructional staff in July and August to conduct the leadership programmes.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, that is 20 in the department itself, not counting clerical staff in all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this is right within the physical and health education—

Mr. Newman: Yes, but I do not care about clerical staff. I am only interested in the number that is actually involved in physical and health education and inspecting.

Hon. Mr. Davis: During the regular year there would be ten, plus the people who are employed on the instructional staff at the two camps during the summer months. These would number 70.

Mr. Newman: Is that a substantially improved number over last year and the year before?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just going by memory, Mr. Chairman, but I believe we have added one "phys-ed" inspector each year, for the last two years. I can get this accurately for the hon. member, but I think this is correct. We added one "phys-ed" inspector last year and we have added another this year.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, has the curriculum P-5, Primary Division, been adopted as a required course of study?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it has been adopted as a required course of study but it is a reference publication. As the hon. member knows, it is used extensively by many of the "phys-ed" people throughout the province. They regard it rather highly.

Mr. Newman: Have the courses of study for both the intermediate and the senior divisions been revised in physical education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is referring to some specific revision, I would suggest the answer would be no. There has been, I hope, a slight change in philosophy as far as physical education is concerned, the change being toward greater participation by the student body in the sporting activities rather than the concentration in certain areas on a specialized few. As the hon. member knows, under the physical fitness programme that we are administering here in the province there is also the philosophy of attempting to create leadership ability and to develop this type of talent in the young person. The course of study that perhaps the hon. member might be referring to directly is the health course, which is under revision. The physical education part of it is pretty much as it has been, except that I understand there is the greater desire to engage more of the students in the physical education activities of the school programme, which I think is very necessary.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it has always been the desire of physical education people to involve a larger percentage of the students.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, this may be very true, Mr. Chairman. I know many of them have attempted to do this. I was there not too many years ago; I have been very interested in physical education, and there is still a tendency to develop a very excellent football team or hockey team or basketball team, which is also very natural, and when this happens certain other physical fitness activities must necessarily suffer.

Mr. Troy: They all add to the morale of the school, though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, this is important too, I agree; but there is a happy medium.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, there are very few schools which do not stress after-school programmes in addition to the team effort. Has the maximum time allotment for Grades 7 to 13 been set at 120 minutes per week?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, did the hon. member say Grade 7?

Mr. Newman: Grades 7 to 13.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Grades 7 to 13, that is four periods; yes, this would be roughly 120 minutes per week.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, has physical education been restored as a compulsory subject in Grade 13?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it has not been, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Newman: Then, the last question; these are all questions from the physical fitness report of three years ago, and I have another 30 after these. What is the department doing to overcome the serious problem of unqualified physical education teachers in the elementary schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the problem of unqualified "phys-ed" teachers in the elementary schools is related to a degree to the personnel, the salaries being offered, and the fact that in the many areas of the province there are still small schools. We have provided for, under the physical fitness programme, for scholarships for the "phys-ed" courses at the universities. Whether these will appreciably assist at the elementary level is debatable. It is one of those areas which, I think, only a period of time and an excess of personnel will solve.

It is difficult to single out any one particular part of the school programme and say that an instructor in this area is worth "X" dollars more than say in the English field, or music, or some other field; and it is difficult to get a number of qualified people in the elementary school section. While we are debating the secondary school field, I am quite happy to present this information for the elementary field to the hon. member.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the balance of the questions I will ask under the more appropriate vote; that is vote 511, Ontario fitness programme.

Mr. Troy: Since there is only one section where it says physical and health education, there are a couple of questions I want to ask the hon. Minister.

Last fall, when the funeral of the late President of the United States was being held, a couple of students up in Elliot Lake stayed home with their parents' permission, and then were suspended from school by the board. Not very long ago, sir, in the province of Quebec, in fact in Quebec City, right in the midst of the school year, there was a hockey tournament for youngsters—I do not know just what age, maybe 12 and 13. According to the press 17 teams went down there for this hockey tournament, including a number of schools in this area. I noticed Sault Ste. Marie was represented and I believe in the final game a Toronto team won; they were all school youngsters. I understand also that in order to win in the inordinate desire to get a victory, they used only nine of their best players. And just imagine, too—they had been playing all week—imagine also that youngsters of that age, in order to keep physically fit for the game, had to receive oxygen during the game. And only nine students—this is hearsay evidence, of course, it is from the representative from Sault Ste. Marie who was down there at the time.

What comments does the hon. Minister have to make about all these youngsters, right in the midst of the school year, competing in hockey tournaments who at the end of the week are in such a condition that they had to have oxygen to play? I remember some years ago, because of certain pressures we put on the National Hockey League, Clarence Campbell, the president, directed the National Hockey League clubs that they could not have anything to do with high school students during the school year. But here we have youngsters of that age taken down just as an attraction at the Quebec

carnival. Has the hon. Minister any comments to make about that type of policy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure really what the hon. member wants me to comment on. I am not sure that this really comes under the direct control of The Department of Education. I assume part of the question was to do with the two students of the Elliot Lake high school at the time of President Kennedy's funeral; this is a matter very definitely for the local board, one which I understand was determined at that level.

These hockey tournaments: I am not sure whether the hon. member is referring to the ones which the young people were participating in at Easter or is this—

Mr. Troy: No, no, this was not Easter time; it was right in the midst of the school year. It was some time in February. It was during the Quebec carnival. It was not just a weekend, it was all week. They left on Saturday or Sunday and returned the following Saturday or Sunday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, there are two aspects to the problem. Can I have any comment as to whether they were away from school as school teams? This I did not gather from the hon. member's question.

Mr. Troy: I presume, under the truancy law, and because of their age, they would be school youngsters. I do not think they are in university or Grades 12 or 13.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. But I did not gather from the hon. member's question whether these were teams under the direction of the local schools, or whether they were associated with service clubs or minor hockey clubs within the municipality. They were not sponsored directly by the school?

Mr. Troy: Oh, no, no. No school would do that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this is a matter which must be determined by the local school authority, if they feel some truancy has been committed. If they feel that, to a degree, this has been reflected in their school work this is a matter they must consider. I am very happy to hear that they were not school teams, that they were local teams; and as far as some comment on whether or not I feel they perhaps were extended beyond their physical limits is concerned I think this is going beyond the area in which I have

too great knowledge, and where I should pass any comment.

I am concerned; I think we all are, about any young person in athletics being extended beyond his capabilities physically. I think it is one about which we should be concerned, but I believe, and I hope this to be the case, that this does not happen very often. It has not happened, certainly to my knowledge, to many of the school leagues around Toronto. I think perhaps the hon. member is expecting us to go beyond our duties as Ministers and comment on the approach that municipal teams or managers take to their players.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has said that certain tests are marked by computers so that the results can be sent back very rapidly to the schools concerned. Are some of these tests administered to the Grade 13 students partway through the year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. This has been done at the Grade 12 level. These are the papers which were given last year and, as I recall, two years ago, to the Grade 12 level. Some of them were part of the Atkinson study—I am just going by memory again—but they have not been given at the Grade 13 level.

Mr. Nixon: There has been much comment about the possibility of introducing some sort of test part way through the Grade 13 year whereby university registrars might have some advance idea of the general ability of the applicant. It might well be that a test of this nature, which could be marked quickly and would require no special preparation by the students concerned, might be implemented so that the universities in selecting from the applicants from Grade 13 would have more to go on than just the results of the Grade 13 examinations.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this might be a possibility. It may be an area being discussed at the Grade 13 committee. I think the universities would be better served—and I will check on this, they may even be at this present time—by a fairly comprehensive report of the Grade 12 examinations.

Mr. Nixon: Are these results available to the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: They certainly are available to them.

Mr. Nixon: Are the universities using them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure of this. I will check because certainly they are available to them if they desire.

Mr. Nixon: I would also like to ask the hon. Minister for comments on uniformity in the secondary system. He has already said that flexibility is very desirable and with this I am in complete agreement. Nevertheless, within a section of the course, let us say, science in Grade 9 or whatever it may be, surely there is some advantage in the content being uniform throughout the province.

Would he refer also to the advantage of uniformity of presentation? I think particularly of the freedom that the individual boards have in presenting, let us say, physics taught in either Grade 11 or 12 and in the other year, chemistry. This works a hardship on students who move from one area to another. They may find when they leave an area half way through the physics course, that at the other school chemistry is being given. I do not know whether this is still such a problem as it was, but I would like the hon. Minister to comment on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think this goes back a number of years. Perhaps the hon. member will be more familiar with the background than myself but it occurred, as a rule, in the smaller schools and sometimes depended on the staff available. At the present time there is a very high degree of uniformity as to what grade level of physics, chemistry and the other subject areas might be taught. Some of the smaller schools still may vary from the larger schools here in the province. Quite often in these cases it is the question of staff that may bring this about. I think we would agree that it would be desirable to have this uniform across the province and it is certainly headed now in that general direction. There are not too many schools left that are varying from what might be the established norm.

Mr. Nixon: The time might come when the hon. Minister would give an edict on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is possible that we might suggest this.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister carrying on studies with other provinces so that mobility of student population from one area to another would be more readily accomplished by standardization in certain programmes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is being discussed. It was on the agenda at the Ministers' conference at the CEA last session. It will be on again. There are some difficulties, although in some areas I am sure the

hon. member would have difficulty in understanding why there should be problems. As far as we are concerned here in Ontario, we are very anxious to establish at least some degree of uniformity with our sister provinces. I can assure the hon. member that we are not standing in the way of any such development.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I notice this Canadian Press despatch of September 6, 1963. It is a statement by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) but it was read, it says, by "Provincial Secretary Allan." I do not know who "Provincial Secretary Allan" is, but I presume it meant the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). In the statement, the hon. Prime Minister urges greater use of school buildings in Ontario. Has the department by correspondence and other ways, urged the school boards to throw open their facilities to the community endeavours? I know that the Gladstone Athletic Club here in Toronto sought to make use of a running track in some of the Toronto schools and it was told it could have it at \$50 a night. I do not think any amateur club in Ontario would be able to pay \$50 a night for the use of a facility like that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the speech that my hon. friend is referring to may have related—and I am not sure of this, perhaps to a degree at least—to the use of secondary schools. I regret the hon. member was not there—perhaps he was not invited—I made a speech in his community about a year-and-a-half ago. In fact, one of my first trips outside to visit some of the schools was to North Bay. I can recall at that dinner urging that the facilities, both recreational and educational, in our secondary school plants be put at the disposal of the other community organizations within the municipality. I have re-echoed this view on several occasions.

I think, sir, we must accept the fact that there would have to be minimum charges for janitorial services and so on, but certainly I believe quite strongly that the physical plant facilities should be made available to recognized recreational or educational organizations within the community. I quite agree, Mr. Chairman, that this is something that should be done and is done in very many areas.

Mr. Troy: That visit of the hon. Minister was not an official visit. It might have been to visit a certain organization in my community with which I was not affiliated.

The township of West Ferris is concerned—naturally, like all municipalities—with the expense of education. The reeve of the township has been quoted as suggesting that the school boards have staggered classes, so many in the morning and so many in the afternoon. He carried his project forward to the northern Ontario municipalities and they recommended, at least they endorsed it, and they are going on to the Ontario mayors.

Is there any necessity for special legislation to cope with that situation? Cannot school boards if they wish have staggered classes now? I know that there probably are certain factors that are against it. It may not be as effective as they think it will be but there is nothing in the legislation, is there, against it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member knows, during the period when school facilities were in short supply, many boards were operating under staggered classroom situations. Of course, I think the experience at that time illustrates that it was not desirable educationally. Sometimes this is forced upon a board due to the lack of facilities, but to be quite frank about it, in the department we do not encourage this because we do not think it is in the best interest of the students. It certainly imposes additional burdens on the staff and our experience is that many of the parents also object to it. We are anxious to find any way to effect economies in the school system, but I suggest there may be other areas that could be explored before this one.

Mr. Troy: But the hon. Minister does not refuse if a municipality wants to go ahead in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Other municipalities have been able to do it, yes.

Mr. Troy: Apparently the reeve of this township wanted to make it a general move all across the province and he wanted the mayor to support him, that is why I brought it up.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague brought up the question of the greater use of school facilities. Does the department compensate the local boards of education for the additional expense as a result of this greater use of school facilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, we do not compensate. If the Windsor Greater Basketball League, for example, wishes to make an arrangement with the Windsor board

of education for the use of its gymnasium during the winter season for the local basketball league and if the board so desires, then it is up to the board to arrange for whatever cost is necessary to look after, say, the lights or janitorial services, heat and so on. We do not provide extra grants for this type of activity.

There are certain programmes that are administered through the community programmes branch of the department where certain sums may be available to the school boards, but this is very negligible and in most instances the arrangement is made between the board and the organization wishing to use the school.

Mr. Newman: Is the hon. Minister aware that one of the recommendations of the Ontario Fitness Council was that grants be made to compensate boards for such additional expenditures?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I fully appreciate this was one of the recommendations, Mr. Chairman, and there are many recommendations with which I agree in that report as a matter of principle. Some, quite frankly, are very difficult, practically speaking, to bring about. This is one recommendation, as far as the monetary side of it is concerned, with which I perhaps do not agree. I agree with the general principle of using the facilities but I question whether it is up to The Department of Education to compensate the boards. I think this is an area, surely, where the local people can become involved, and this would help the development of a physical fitness programme within the municipality. I think that, somewhere along the line, the local groups must become interested and I think this means financial involvement.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether my question is on this vote or whether it would be on the next one. I am talking about vocational guidance counsellors. I am thinking of them in terms of secondary schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think that this would be vocational guidance in the secondary schools.

Mr. Thompson: I am thinking of all schools as well as secondary schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We touched on the elementary school guidance problem earlier. I think if the hon. member wishes to ask a question on guidance in secondary school

this would be the appropriate place to do so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: Fine. Relating to the remarks of the hon. member for York South—I do not want to intrude in his area because we are overlapping—but I am referring specifically to this report of the select committee on manpower training. I would just like to say that, having been a member of this committee, I thought it was a most worthwhile experience for me. I have, on a number of occasions, congratulated the chairman of the committee. But the real test of this committee, in its recommendations, will be whether they are put into practice.

If I may, I will just quote some of the suggestions made in this committee with respect to vocational guidance counselling in all the schools. I am referring to page 79 of the report, and it says:

The need for adequate counselling begins in the public school and does not terminate until an individual finally retires from active participation in the labour force.

Going further on, it says:

Adequate facilities must also be made available at the high school and post-high school levels in connection with guidance. There is a particular vital need at the point of transition between school and employment. All too often the student is left completely to his own resources once he leaves school. The schools no longer assume any responsibility for him and the National Employment Service has only begun to establish a youth counselling service.

At this most critical juncture in their careers, many youths are today without competent advice or counsel. Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that so many of them cast about aimlessly for long periods of time.

It suggests in view of these considerations:

It is inconceivable to permit those who have not undergone specialized training to engage in vocational counselling. The work involved is too vital to be entrusted to partially trained amateurs. In the future, therefore, we—

and I refer, by “we”, to the select committee:

—we would recommend that nothing less than university graduates with two years of additional specialized training in career guidance be employed for this purpose.

And I would ask the hon. Minister's comment if I could continue my approach on this. Perhaps he might make a note that that is one of my questions.

The suggestion in the report is that we do have only partially trained vocational guidance people, and the experts who came before us are recommending that we should strive toward university graduates with two years of additional specialized training in career guidance employed for this purpose.

We would also suggest that during the course of this training they be compelled to spend considerable time with the National Employment Service. Beyond this, it is to be expected that anyone who makes a career of vocational guidance will make a determined effort to keep up with the latest developments applicable to his work.

And the recommendations with regard to vocational guidance are as follows:

1. Vocational guidance must be accepted as a vital and integral part of our overall education and training system.

2. Expert counselling must begin in the grade school and be continued to be available to all students and workers until they finally retire from the labour force.

I will not go through all the recommendations because I am quite sure that the hon. Minister has read this.

I think one point, it seems to me, is important. The hon. Minister may suggest that it is very difficult to get vocational guidance teachers placed throughout the whole of Ontario at this time. The suggestion is made in this manpower study that there should be a close liaison with the National Employment Service, that if necessary you should have a group of vocational guidance counsellors—a competent team, it suggests—who are in touch with the National Employment and who also would go out on a circuit to various schools.

I notice the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) is there, and I am just thinking of the whole area of responsibility of training. We go back again to our friend, the hon. member for Nipissing, who suggested that it was very important, about a manpower study and so on, that there is some purpose the people and the students can see.

As well as that I cannot help feeling that if you have vocational guidance counsellors who are not adequately prepared, if they are not in close touch with the National Employment Service and getting data from all areas—The Department of Labour, industry, unions, and so on—then really these people are travelling

blind and perhaps may be doing harm instead of good.

Realizing the importance of this, as I am sure the hon. Minister does, I wonder if he could tell us: Are all the secondary schools covered with respect to vocational guidance counsellors? If not, what kind of approach is taken? Second, how do they fit in with the National Employment Service? And third, since I do not think the hon. Minister has a manpower study, how at this time does the hon. Minister get statistics, and what kind of statistics does he get with the portraying of future opportunities for students?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I fully understand the hon. member's question. It may be that he is expecting too much of the school programme. We were discussing guidance actually earlier this afternoon, when I made some observations about it at the elementary level.

I suggested then that this is one of the very important areas because of the reorganized programme and because of the great change in the technological nature of our community. At the same time I suggested that, guidance not being an exact science, there was a great responsibility still with the parents.

Guidance counselling, or vocational guidance, at the secondary level naturally requires a university degree, and in many instances the counsellors have either their year at OCE or they have summer courses. Last year we had a total of 732 taking the special course in guidance.

We still need qualified individuals. Whether these people need an additional two years beyond the regular programme or not I think it is debatable, because it is not an exact science. It is not like mathematics or some other areas; it requires a great understanding of the students; it requires a relationship, perhaps in this area, which does not exist in many other areas of education.

At the same time I doubt whether many guidance counsellors or vocational advisors can specifically state to a student that this is the profession, or this is the vocation, he should approach. I think they have to look at this in a more general way, and try to determine whether the student is better suited to the general field of academic study, or to the general field of commercial study, or to the general field of vocational study.

I think that to suggest that any guidance counsellor is going to say to an individual, "You will be a tool and diemaker," or "You will be a doctor," is asking a great deal, and

perhaps doing the student a great disservice. But I think a guidance counsellor can very definitely help in directing the students into, say, the academic stream, where he may decide even to become a lawyer. Or you can direct him into the vocational stream where he may become not a tool and diemaker but a tool designer.

I think this is the area where perhaps guidance is most appropriately used. I think the reference to guidance counselling in the manpower training report, as I recall, perhaps suggests more than one can expect to accomplish at the secondary level. Perhaps to a degree it refers to some form of counselling or guidance that might be available to the adult population under the retraining programmes.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I would say that in the manpower study one of the real concerns was direction for young people. I appreciate thoroughly that it would not only be perhaps a fallacy to tell a young person that he should be a tool and diemaker, other than a plumber or something, but also it would be a little foreign to our approach with respect to freedom to mould them so thoroughly. On the other hand there was concern in this manpower study that in this whole area there was a number of students who had not been counselled—I am not going to any length on this thing—and who had drifted without any sense of direction.

The question was: If you are going to have a vocational guidance counsellor, surely one of the things apart from all the personality studies and tests that you give—and I do not know if IQ tests are exceptional today or not—but apart from the variety of aptitude tests you give surely one of the important aspects is that he also is factual. Again it was hard to know how factual he can be. But if he has a number of close contacts with the people who make job opportunities with industry, if he knows of research taking place with the National Employment Service, and perhaps if he has been down to the National Employment Service and worked there for a period, then this is the point I am making, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is not sufficient information available, perhaps there never will be sufficient of anything. There is, however, a large bulk of information available to the guidance counsellors as to the specific areas where the demand exists at the moment. As I have stated, this comes through NES, with which we have very close relationship. The NES takes, I think, in

many areas quite an active interest in the vocational programme at the secondary level.

But guidance gets back really to the basic problem of determining which general area the students should be encouraged to pursue. I think this is the basic decision that has to be made and the other skills will develop from that point. But we have a good number of guidance people—the 1962 course had 590 and the 1961 course had 349—so I think this indicates to you the increasing interest in guidance in the secondary school programme.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, one of the arguments that has been raised in connection with The Department of Labour looking after the apprenticeship division, and which I do not agree with, is the fact that The Department of Education does not have a close contact with working conditions, with unions and with management. In trying to dig down and see whether there is validity in this, you come back to the point that, well, teachers are academic and they have their school and when you go in through the portals of the school that is another community.

I would suggest from what I am saying that the vocational guidance teacher has not got his tentacles out throughout the community to derive knowledge. And then could I ask you, sir, in view of this—

Hon. Mr. Davis: And the vocational instructors within the schools have a knowledge, too. They are not straight academic people.

Mr. Thompson: Fine. In view of this I would say that this seems to me to be the principal argument on the part of a number of Department of Labour people for making a foster child, an orphan child, of apprenticeship. When I think of the role to give prestige to vocational courses, to technical work, I ask you, sir, because of this and the fact that you tell me that it is not really a valid argument that The Department of Education is in touch with industry and with others, in your terms could you explain to us, why is the apprenticeship branch placed under The Department of Labour instead of under The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer to that is obvious. Certainly, historically this has been perhaps the appropriate place for it. But times and conditions change and the hon. Minister of Labour and I have been discussing this matter. We are making provision, as you know, for a certain

amount of apprenticeship instruction throughout the secondary school programme. This is an area which will be jointly explored by The Department of Labour and The Department of Education. There are arguments that are valid in both directions and these arguments, of course, alter with times and with the circumstances.

Vote 503 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to go to the order paper and second readings. Then when we have completed what has to be done there we will return to the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Eighth report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans	2615
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	2615
Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2616
Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2623
Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2623
Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	2624
Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, 1955, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	2624
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	2624
Public Service Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	2624
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	2624
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	2624
Mothers' Allowances Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cocile, second reading	2624
Ontario Housing Corporation, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, second reading	2624
Sheridan Park Corporation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Randall, second reading	2625
Legislative Assembly Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	2625
Hotel Fire Safety Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2625
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	2625
Recess, 6 o'clock	2656

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today as guests, in the Speaker's gallery, members of the Canadian Bible Society, who prior to the opening of the House today made a presentation to the Legislature through the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) a copy of the Bible for the use of the hon. members and the public servants connected with this House.

We also have as guests, in the east gallery, students from St. Clement's School for Girls, Toronto; in the west gallery, students from Deer Park Public School and St. Peter's Separate School, both of Toronto; and in the east and west galleries, students from Grandview Public School and Holy Family Separate School, New Hamburg.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's eighth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, several of these amendments are in the form, really, of administrative improvements.

However, the first section does refer to the change of status of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. There are two other sections designed to abolish disability pensions, due to the entitlement now to service pensions. Two of these sections fall in line with the amendments to The Pensions Benefits Act. It also provides that where pensions were paid during the month, they will be paid monthly in advance, to simplify the administrative procedures.

The bill also contains a provision whereby on the death of a beneficiary, the payment will carry on to the end of the month. This month-end rule will assist in the efficient administration of the Act.

The balance of it is pretty well administrative and I will have a much fuller explanation on second reading.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to take the opportunity to inform the House as to a further step that is being taken to assist in alleviating the water shortage, which has been handicapping the farmers of southwestern Ontario.

Hon. members of the House will recall that a few days ago it was announced by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) that increased government help would be available for the construction of farm ponds and toward the building of reservoirs. This programme is being undertaken jointly by The Department of Agriculture and The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

A further step in combating the water shortage in this section of the province has been taken by the transfer of an agricultural engineer whose specific responsibilities will be in dealing with farm water problems. He will be located in London. Mr. Vernon Spencer, a graduate of the Ontario Agricultural College and the University of Toronto in engineering, will have specific responsibility within The Department of Agriculture

in relation to water problems. He will also co-operate with other engineering specialists within The Department of Agriculture.

In addition, there will be utmost co-operation with the research on water resources being conducted through the Ontario Water Resources Commission and the agricultural college, and with The Department of Energy and Resources Management in carrying out the joint programmes of both departments endeavouring to develop means of alleviating conditions throughout this section of the province.

I can assure the House that this government is fully cognizant of the gravity of the situation and that every possible step will be taken to provide for the future needs of agriculture, as far as an adequate water supply is concerned.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, in reference to that statement, may I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister cares to answer.

Mr. Troy: In a recent issue of the North Bay *Nugget*, Mr. Speaker, I notice that there is a story about, not the same scarcity of water as in southwestern Ontario, but a very severe shortage in Nipissing. Has the hon. Minister given any thought to having one of his engineers located in northern Ontario too, because the water shortage there is acute according not only to the paper, but also a statement of The Department of Lands and Forests?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder would the member ask his question.

Mr. Troy: I am just finishing the question, sir.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I must confess I did not see this article in the paper that the hon. member has mentioned, but I would like to say that the policy announced by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, applies to the whole province of Ontario, insofar as assistance is concerned. Our extension engineers, operating in The Department of Agriculture, will be available to assist all farmers across the province in every locality. The idea of centring one specialist in this particular area is to co-ordinate the whole programme and to assist the other engineers in the specific areas.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE POLICE ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Did the member wish to speak to the bill?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. Since we are dealing with the principle of this bill, I thought perhaps the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), or some of his hon. colleagues in the House, would have something to say.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer briefly to one aspect of this bill, because I think we have a remaining problem after all the travail in considering this in the House. Our task was to achieve a balance between the first, the pre-eminent consideration, namely, protecting the individual rights, and secondly, strengthening the investigating powers of the police commission so that it might be in a better position to cope with the threat of organized crime.

I do not need to review in any detail the fact that by unanimous consent we recognized that we had ignored the rights of individuals and therefore there was an almost unprecedented political storm in this province as a result of which we have had a complete revision of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, the Act now in almost every conceivable way is framed in a fashion that is going to protect the rights of the individual. Indeed I would go one step further and say that in one or two areas—one particularly that I want to refer to here by way of reviewing a rather lengthy discussion that we had at the committee level—I think we have leaned over too far the other way, with the result that we are going to cripple unnecessarily the very needed power for tracking down information as to the existence and the operation of organized crime in this province.

I am referring to a portion of the new section 17, as in the reprinted bill, to be found in subsection 4. The nub of the issue here, to put it in layman's language, Mr. Speaker, is that under subsection 4 of section 17, it is going to be the right of the witness by request or by consent, to decide whether or not an investigation of the police commission is going to be *in camera* or whether it will be open. If it is going to be *in camera* it must be on his request or with his consent.

I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that in all of the existing investigating bodies on the North American continent where we are attempting to cope with the same threat of organized crime that we have seen emerge in the province of Ontario, the right to an *in-camera* session is the basic right of these bodies. They have done it with accompanying legislation or a civil rights statute that has certainly protected the rights of individuals involved to the point that on no occasion have I ever been aware of any outcry as to the violation of individual rights in their activities.

But here we are leaving with the individual who is brought before the commission the decision as to whether or not it is going to be *in camera*. Now let me go back, just so that there can be absolutely no misrepresentation of what I want to say, Mr. Speaker. I agree that the first consideration is that we have to protect the rights of the individual. But I submit that in his bill we have now done so.

Whether it is an open session or whether it is a closed session, the individual is going to have right to counsel. He is going to have, through his counsel, as is spelled out in the subsections, the remedies by way of habeas corpus, certiorari, prohibition, mandamus and other extraordinary remedies.

He is going to have every protection for a witness available under The Evidence Act. He is going to have all the rights of a witness in the civil court. Indeed, as a result of our discussions in the committee we put this point, subsection 4, in there so that he has all the rights of the civil court in addition to what has been spelled out in detail in advance.

Therefore I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have protected the rights of the individual. Now we must take a look at the original objective of this bill; the strengthening of our capacities to get information with regard to the existence and the operation of organized crime. My submission to the committee, and in which I did not succeed in getting a majority decision and approval, was that we have unnecessarily crippled the capacity of the police commission to get this information.

Let us, just for a moment Mr. Speaker, review why you might want to have a closed session. In the first instance you might want to have a closed session for the protection of the witness. If this person is a person who has been involved in organized crime, as we have discussed many times in this House before, he is involved in a world all of his own, in which they have their own laws, their

own moral codes, their own forms of punishment. And if he is overstepping the moral code and the rules as laid down in the world of organized crime, it is very possible that within a few days of his emerging from a commission hearing he is going to be clubbed into insensibility in a back alley, or he is going to get a bullet in his back. This is their way. They deal—in a very arbitrary and peremptory manner—with anybody who violates their rules. So there is a very necessary protection of the individual if he is an individual in which there is very good reason to believe he is involved in the world of organized crime.

However, there is an even more important aspect of it, Mr. Speaker. This is the question of the police commission being able to gather evidence in the manner in which you have to do in the intelligence world, in the military, in the navy, or in the air force. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the proposition that anybody who is involved in what, in essence, is the gathering of intelligence, by forcing him to do this openly, publicly, so that all of his activities and all of the bits and pieces of information that he has gleaned are going to become public information immediately and get into the hands of the "enemy" who, in this instance, are the leaders of organized crime, means that you have frustrated, to the point of nullifying, these activities. Therefore, my contention is that, having protected the rights of the individual in every conceivable fashion, we have leaned over backwards. Now our necessity is that the police commission should have the right to hold *in-camera* sessions, as is done by the New York crime commission and is done in the American Senate investigations. In so doing there is no threat at all to the rights of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, let me be perfectly fair. I am quite aware of the sensibilities of people with regard to a possible violation of civil rights. I am quite aware—after what has happened politically in this province in the last month or month and a half—as to why these sensibilities are even greater today than they have been in the past. But I think we have to be rational. I think we have to be sensible in our approach to this.

I was interested, for example, to learn in the committee that—I believe I am being fair in saying—the hon. Attorney General tends to agree with me, if he does not agree with me completely. But he left it in the hands of a committee and for this I do not blame him under the circumstances at the moment. But the simple fact of the matter is that there were other people on the committee who, in my view, completely misrepresented it.

For example, when I acknowledged the existence of these sensibilities and said:

Well fine, if you feel that you do not want to leave the decision with the police commission because now, for very good reason, you have become a little anxious about the exercise of arbitrary power on the part of the police commission, could you not amend it to say that if they wanted to have an *in-camera* session they could appeal this decision to the Lieutenant-Governor in council?

Even this did not find favour. One hon. member—the hon. member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) for whom I have a growing respect—interjected at that point and said: “This would be Star Chamber.” This is a bit ludicrous to suggest that the situation would be Star Chamber when you have all of these built-in protections for the individual; and when you have an appeal, as I am now suggesting, to the Lieutenant-Governor in council. This, too, was discarded by the committee.

I submit, in summary, Mr. Speaker, that I think we have leaned over so far backward that we are now going to destroy the effectiveness of getting information at what is happening in the world of organized crime.

Let us not forget this, Mr. Speaker. The reason why we are having all this debate; the reason why this bill was brought in, in the first instance, was because the police commission stated in their report to us that they were uncertain as to their powers during an *in-camera* session. They had gone to the deputy Attorney General and he, too, had said that he was uncertain of the powers. He came back for a clarification and, in the report, they said to us specifically that there were certain reluctant witnesses, people who from general information and from past activities, some of which has been in the courts, involving convictions, are people who are obviously involved with organized crime in this province.

But they simply would not testify. They would not assist the commission in getting the information that was being sought. So, by leaving the power as it is, you are now, in effect, saying to the police commission that it can proceed no further with its work because no more of these reluctant witnesses will come before it and testify. They will say that they will want an open session so that all of their friends in the underworld will know that in an open session, anything that they are compelled to say or is extracted from them willingly or unwittingly, is immediately going to be communicated to “the enemy.”

With that intelligence in their hands, they will be able to take counter measures.

In other words, we are frustrated in our capacities to move forward in coming to grips with organized crime in this province.

We have done it even after including all of these protective measures to safeguard the rights of the individual. I regret it, Mr. Speaker, so I reiterate my views here. I acknowledge there are people in all political parties on both sides of this issue. But I was rather interested the other day, in reading in the Toronto *Daily Star*, in an article that reports on a meeting which was held in the city of Toronto and addressed by Mark McGuigan the day after the revised Bill No. 99 was brought into the committee. Just let me read two or three paragraphs to you:

New Police Act provisions for private hearings of witnesses are over-restrictive, an Ontario Liberal Party legal advisor suggested in his speech yesterday. A new amendment introduced at Queen's Park yesterday by Attorney General A. A. Wishart shows that the government does not appreciate what is needed to combat organized crime, said Dr. Mark McGuigan, associate law professor at the University of Toronto.

The amendment states that when holding an inquiry the Ontario Police Commission, if a witness consents, takes his evidence in private. The original bill would have given the commission the power to question witnesses secretly without counsel or on threat of jail or fines. That is all very right for responsible citizens, Dr. McGuigan told a meeting of the Toronto Women's Liberal Association at the YWCA, McGill Street, but no member of the Mafia wants his voice testifying in private. Criminals would never consent for fear their associates would suspect them of giving too much information.

So that henceforth you are going to have them testifying in public and communicating everything immediately to the people with whom you are attempting to come to grips.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Why did the hon. member not say that a month ago?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly certain as to the significance of the interjection from the hon. member over here. But without getting into an argument, I will say that I have said to this House from the first day this bill was debated, that there was a double-barrelled objective in this legislation; one of them is to protect the rights of

the individual; and the second one is to strengthen our arm in getting at organized crime in this province or they will destroy all of our rights. And I said that the first time I rose in this House.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): That is what we have done, we have done both.

Mr. MacDonald: And if hon. members over here did not hear it then, it is about time they quit playing bridge and paid a little bit of attention to the issue. This rather cheap kind of interjection is wholly out of place in a matter as serious as we are considering here today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to recapitulate any further, except to say this, that I am convinced that the hon. Attorney General in essence agrees with what I am saying.

And I also know that everybody who is attempting to cope seriously with organized crime on both sides of the border on this continent, tends to agree with the proposition that you must have *in-camera* sessions. So the responsibility for frustrating the original objective of this bill, that we should be able to cope with the threat of organized crime, now rests with the majority on the government side of the House, with the Liberals going along with them, and all I hope is that in the course of the next year or two, we do not discover that we have to suffer the consequences of not being able to cope effectively with the threat of organized crime.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, speaking in connection with the principle involved in this bill, and for my hon. colleagues in the Liberal Party, let me say that we have over the past several weeks made as searching an examination of this bill as we felt was possible.

On the Thursday, when the bill was first introduced, it took us a minimum of time—not like some other hon. members in this House—it took us a minimum of time to be aware of what this bill at that time represented. We did not say, as at least one other hon. member of this House was quoted as having said, "Well, maybe it's a little restrictive but the ideas behind it are good." The ideas expressed in the original Bill No. 99 we found thoroughly abhorrent to us. We still find the original ideas as expressed in the first form of Bill No. 99 as thoroughly hateful to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are as aware as any group in this House of the problems involved in crime, organized crime, syndi-

cated crime, breach of the law, or anything else, that will hurt our democratic system of government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, without repeating what has gone on in previous debates, the reason for the Roach commission and the reason for the police commission's investigation of the Roach commission was the result of speeches and action taken by the Liberal Opposition of that day. As I said previously in this House, sir, we are proud that our leader at that time brought these matters to public attention and awakened public interest and the government's interest, first to recognize that a problem existed and, secondly, to take some action.

But the action indicated, Mr. Speaker, was not to abandon all of our civil rights. It was not to allow an appointed body arbitrarily to take people off the street and hold them incommunicado for unlimited periods of time, to be judge and jury as to whether they were in contempt or not and send them off to jail for eight-day periods, to descend upon their homes and seize all of their documents, to prohibit them from advising anyone under the pain of further penalty, that they had been taken or questioned. Those are the things that we will not stand for at any time.

Mr. MacDonald: Nor will anybody.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for York South, having said his piece, should sit and listen to some of the things that have emerged. It is not too strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for York South was unaware on the Thursday of the dangers inherent in the original form of Bill No. 99, was unaware on the Friday, and it was only when this debate flowed over on the Monday, after having had a full weekend of public discussion, of front page newspaper editorials and so on, that suddenly he realized that something was at stake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come back in the committee and the hon. member for York South is taking it upon himself to say the new bill that is brought in by the present hon. Attorney General is not restrictive enough.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what Mark McGuigan said.

Mr. Singer: I will come to Mr. McGuigan in just a moment. Surely one would have thought that it is the duty of an Opposition party not to assist any government in measures that are restrictive of the rights of citizens. Surely one would have thought that this is one of the prime duties of an Opposition. In saying this, Mr. Speaker, I

am suggesting that if this government had felt that the measures in the present Bill No. 99 were something less than they wanted, they had a duty to come in here and tell us why, to make out a case. The hon. member for York South indicates that the hon. Attorney General does not agree with what is in Bill No. 99. The hon. Attorney General has brought in a bill and if the hon. member for York South is right, and the hon. Attorney General has brought in a bill that he does not agree with, then he has no business being Attorney General. Surely we must presume that the bill he has brought in is the bill he wants, is the bill that he thinks is satisfactory. How then can it lie in the mouth of an Opposition member, whose role should be dedicated to defending the rights of the citizens of this province, to say that this is not restrictive enough?

Mr. Speaker, if, in time, the hon. Attorney General wants to come back to us and say, "Problems have arisen, our thinking was incorrect and for reasons A, B and C, we think something more should be done," we, as is our duty, will listen to the case that he makes. And at that time we will judge it. But again, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot emphasize this too strongly, we are never going to be found in the camp of those who advocate restrictive measures, just for the sake of restrictive measures. Our duty, as we see it, is to defend the rights of citizens. Our duty, as we see it, is not to impose restrictions of the type to which the hon. member for York South refers.

He makes reference to what went on as he did in the committee and again this afternoon, in time of war. In the committee he told us what happened to German submarine captains who were captured and brought in for investigation. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is something that I, at least, cannot follow in the thinking of the mind of the hon. member for York South. He used the word "caught" insofar as a witness was concerned, before the committee, and in his earlier remarks he talked about people whom you know are guilty when you bring them in for examination. We, in this party, do not believe that a man is guilty until he has been proved guilty beyond all reasonable doubt. We do not believe that somebody whom a police commission wants to examine for any reason—and it might be you, Mr. Speaker, or any hon. member of this House—has been "caught." We do not believe that merely because the police commission has come to an arbitrary decision that it wants to ask Mr. X some questions, that he is in the same

position as a German submarine commander, captured in time of war. We think this type of thinking is the most arbitrary type of thinking.

Mr. MacDonald: This is a misrepresentation.

Mr. Singer: We think this is the most dangerous type of thinking that could inflict itself into the democratic process and, as I say, Mr. Speaker, we will oppose any arbitrary measures until the government has been in a position to prove chapter and verse, word by word, that such restrictions are absolutely necessary. Up to this time there has been no such case made out. At this moment, sir, we have Bill No. 99 before us in its present form. If this is not the view of this government, let them stand up and say so. But I think we must conclude that this is the view of the government.

Finally, just a word about Dr. McGuigan. Dr. McGuigan is a very fine young gentleman, who ran as a candidate of ours in the last election. He is learned in the law. He is, in fact, a professor at Osgoode Hall. As with anyone in this province, he has a right to his own opinions. The opinions he expressed, to the extent that they were quoted here, are not opinions that we in this party share in this particular aspect. My hon. friend from York South has brushed off on many occasions, the views of members of his party who are not in the House. The official view of this party, insofar as Bill No. 99 is concerned, are the views that I have been authorized by my hon. colleagues to express and am expressing. I hope, this afternoon.

I suggest to you, sir, that when the hon. gentleman from York South says that in other jurisdictions they allow these arbitrary procedures to carry on, that he has not investigated at all what goes on in any of these other jurisdictions. Comparing the New York crime commission to the Ontario police commission, is like comparing apples to oranges; if he studied it he would know full well that this is the case. Or to compare the Senate investigations in the United States, to the investigations that have been suggested in the original form of Bill No. 99, again, is like comparing apples to oranges. And there is one other very substantial difference—as the hon. Attorney General pointed out in committee—there is a privilege enshrined in the United States constitution, for better or for worse, called the Fifth Amendment, which is jealously guarded through all of its courts. Nobody in the United States can override the

privileges as set forth in the Fifth Amendment. And the hon. member for York South would know this if he wanted to make a real study of the problem and not try to throw red herrings across the trail.

I say, sir, that Bill No. 99, as presently presented, is not too unreasonable in its approach to this problem. My grave reservations, insofar as this whole scheme is concerned, are these. I have great difficulty in reconciling in my mind the gentlemen who presently make up the police commission, with the type of action with which they are now charged. However, sir, this does not lie with us. We do not have the task of appointing them, nor can we remove them. The government has appointed them and the government, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said on Monday, is responsible, and he is responsible, for their actions. But we have grave doubts in our minds as to whether or not the gentlemen who make up that commission in view of their arbitrary thinking, as expressed in their report, should be the people charged with this very serious responsibility.

As I say, sir, we are not going to concern ourselves, nor is it our job, with the way in which individual members of the civil service conduct themselves, other than to point the criticism to the hon. gentlemen who occupy the front benches. The hon. Prime Minister, as he rightly admitted, is responsible for the introduction of the original Bill No. 99. He and no one else. And if there is something wrong in the present police commission, it is the hon. Prime Minister's fault and we think now the public is aware of where this responsibility belongs.

Just one little aside, Mr. Speaker, and then I am through. Even in commonsense, other than in analyzing the philosophy of the hon. member for York South, I cannot comprehend the case that he makes, that the gentleman who he believes would be called before the commission and who is in danger of having a bullet in his back, or a knife put into him in the place that would do him no good, is going to be most anxious to have a public hearing. It would seem to me that a person who had these fears would be most anxious to let nobody know that he was going within miles of any police commission and rather than being urged to ask for an *in-camera* hearing, if—as his privilege is in this bill, and he knows it—he has the privilege of doing it, he would be the first one to be most anxious to say, "Do not tell anybody; if I have to come, please do not tell anybody I am here."

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we certainly express as strongly as we can our violent disagreement, not only with the suggestion put forward by the hon. member for York South, but with all of the thinking that lies behind it as he has expressed from the Thursday afternoon on, when this bill was first introduced.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I am not going to abuse the rules of the House by repeating my arguments here, but I just want to say this—

Mr. Speaker: Point of order?

Mr. MacDonald: Point of order! I have never on any occasion said that I am in favour of an arbitrary exercise of power. I am opposed to it; that is why I was opposed to the original Bill No. 99 and I am in favour of this one because I think we have removed that danger. The second and final point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it is all very well for the hon. member for Downsview to say that there is all the difference in the world between the New York commission and the American Senate investigation commissions and the original Bill No. 99. Of course there is all the difference in the world. But the difference perhaps between the hon. member for Downsview and me is that I accept the fact we have killed the original Bill No. 99. It is dead and I suggest to you that there is no difference in essence between the American Senate investigations and the New York crime commission and the investigations empowered under the new Bill No. 99, except that in the United States they generally have secret sessions.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 99, I did not speak to it at the time for the reason that as the hon. members of this House are aware, the bill had been referred after the first reading, to the standing committee on legal bills and with instructions that section 14 be deleted. This was done. In the committee the bill as now presented, was discussed by the committee, clause by clause, and very thoroughly considered in every respect there. Now that it has come back to the House for second reading, it is my thinking that it will then be debated in committee of the whole House, perhaps again clause by clause, and it is perhaps scarcely necessary to speak to the bill at any length, at least on second reading.

I note that the discussion today in the House is related apparently solely to one

section, that is the present section 17 of the bill. I would say this, that there are certain other amendments in the bill as it now comes before the House and that these other amendments are of considerable significance and I know that they will come before the House in committee of the whole for discussion. But I shall confine my remarks to section 17, because the discussion, as it has so far taken place, has been with respect to section 17.

I should like to take occasion, Mr. Speaker, to say this to correct something which was a very great misapprehension, a great fear, based upon a lack of knowledge—a lack of knowledge of what was in the original section 14 and what it implied, which perhaps fomented or furthered ideas which were baseless and without any ground whatsoever. First of all, I would like to say this, that the original section did not take away the right of a witness to have counsel. That was not in the section and yet it was broadcast and rebroadcast repeatedly without any hon. member taking the trouble to deny it.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Who started it?

Mr. Singer: That is not what the former Attorney General (Mr. Cass) said.

Mr. Bryden: Who started it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I say it was not there and I say I heard no one deny it. The rights of the witness to habeas corpus and to certiorari were not taken away and I heard no one take the trouble to deny it. I say this to correct a wrongful impression that went abroad and created a great fear and apprehension in the mind of the public.

Now we come to the section under discussion and to the particular portion of it. The words that were in the original section—and I shall read those words—said “for the purpose of an inquiry” under subsection one:

The commission may summon any person and require him to give evidence on oath *in camera* or otherwise and to produce such documents and things as the commission deems necessary.

This was one of the great things which was played up—the *in camera*, the secret hearing, the Star Chamber. An impression went abroad across this country that one would almost think witnesses could be brought in there and pulled up by their thumbs and tortured to give evidence which, of course, was so fantastic and so far from the fact that it deserves now to be said that this was just so fantastic that it was entirely unbelievable that

this could happen. However, this was one of the great fears which was built up by various means and it was one of the things that we attempted to allay.

There was, therefore, in this section, an attempt to spell out clearly and specifically, that witnesses had certain rights in this type of hearing before a commission made up of persons who are not judges, a body which is not a court; a body which was investigating the broad field of crime. It became necessary and, I think, very advisable to spell out there the rights which the witness would have and always enjoy, many of which he enjoyed under the section as it stood.

We are discussing here today, as I understand it, the question of the advisability of having an *in-camera* or secret hearing. In this I would like to say to the House I speak for myself and for the government and I need no one to tell me what my views are or what the government's views are. This bill as presented is the bill which the government presents to this House and it contains the views of the government. In the bill as presented, the section now is that:

(4) Upon the request or with the consent of a witness at an inquiry under this section, his evidence shall be taken in private.

That safeguard is included in order that no witness may fear to come before this commission, in this type of hearing, and be afraid that the fact that he is there will be published abroad or that what he says there before the commission will be published. This is so that he need not fear that he will be found in a field the next day with a bullet in his back.

That is the reason for the secrecy being placed at the discretion of the witness, so that he can say, “I have a story to tell you but I will only tell it, I can only tell it, in the circumstances if you will afford me absolute secrecy that what I say shall not be known.” That is there and spelled out along with the other safeguards upon which I do not need to dwell.

In fairness, particularly to my friend the hon. member for York South, I must say this, I did admit in committee, and I admit it here, that this is the bill as presented, this is the policy of the government, this is the policy presented to the committee and this is right and proper. However, there are occasions, and I agree with the hon. member to this extent, when hearings *in camera* have their value, when things can be learned in such security that cannot be learned in public. There are occasions of this kind but this is an area in which we face, in this type of situ-

ation, a great sensitivity and a great sensibility—as to the paramount consideration of making certain that a witness who will come before this commission and tell his story may do so with the utmost and the most absolute safety to himself, to his family, and to his friends and relatives.

This, I think, must be done. Whether in the course of time it may appear that something further should be done to give the commission on some occasion the possibility of holding a hearing *in camera* is something that would have to develop. I would draw your attention to the fact that the subsection which I have just read does say that the commission:

Upon the request, or with the consent of a witness—

I think there is quite a field there for the commission to say to a witness who comes forward and is prepared to give his evidence in public “we would like with your consent to have this in private.” True, the commission is at the behest of the witness. He can say no and the commission must conform. It must be held in public. But we have thrown this safeguard around the witness rightly, properly and fully and there can be a very honest difference of opinion here. Much can be said on certain occasions for the value of a hearing *in camera*, but I think that in the circumstances we face where we are dealing with such a dangerous subject as crime and where the danger to the witness is so great we must take, as our paramount consideration, the protection of the witness.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 102, an Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to Bill No. 102—I think I need speak very briefly about it—simply is an amendment to bring about certain administrative changes. They are very simple and I would say in general, self-explanatory. The “Minister” it defines as the “Attorney General”. Dealing with the departmental administration there are certain additions as to the type of records to be kept, the audit, and statistical returns which are to be maintained by the department. The type of statements which are to be filed, and so on, are the subject matter of this bill. It makes no change in the principle of the Act as it now exists but

simply fortifies and improves certain of the administrative features of the present Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE WAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This bill reduces generally the exemption of wages, in the sense that it increases it on one side and reduces it on the other from 30 per cent to 25 per cent, giving the wage-earner that much more protection where garnishee proceedings are taken to attach his wages. This is the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in the House will probably agree with the basic purposes of the Act.

There are some implications, though, that are not entirely clear to me and I would like to raise the matter with the hon. Attorney General now. Perhaps he could consider what I have to say with a view to making amendments in committee, if in his opinion and the opinion of his legal officers, such amendments are necessary.

The difficulty that I can see here arises in connection with this matter of wage assignment. I think I can understand what the hon. Attorney General has in mind in trying to limit voluntary wage assignments, but what would happen to assignments a man makes, for example, to a credit union? As I see it, the activities of credit unions could be interfered with a way that is not necessary or desirable by the bill as it stands. I would appreciate it if, between now and the time the bill goes either to special committee or committee of the whole, the hon. Attorney General would take a look at it from that point of view.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thank the hon. member for the comment. I take it he is referring to the general content of section 2 of the bill?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, that is right, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We shall be glad to consider that and I trust when we come to the committee of the whole we will be able to satisfy the inquiry that the hon. member has.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer), in the absence of hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs), moves second reading of Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO HURRICANE RELIEF FUND ACT, 1955

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, 1955.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan, in the absence of hon. Mr. Spooner, moves second reading of Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I did want to say a word or two on this, but it is not perhaps fair to the hon. Provincial Treasurer to ask him a somewhat technical question relating to this.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if we could leave this over, I will call that order again.

Mr. Speaker: Did the member wish to ask a technical question on sections of the bill or—

Mr. Singer: It is partly the principle, but again, in any one of these sort of omnibus bills it is difficult to debate the principle—

Mr. Speaker: You wish to debate the principle as well?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves second reading of Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves second reading of Bill No. 135, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about Bill No. 135. The hon. Minister in his estimates seemed to think that Bill No. 135 was the magic answer to all of our housing problems and I would hope that he is right, Mr. Speaker, but as I have read this Act carefully and as I have read the hon. Minister's references to it, the light just has not dawned on me as yet.

He is doing away with the Ontario housing advisory committee and setting up the Ontario housing corporation. The hon. Minister has suggested to us that this is going to cut down a lot of the red tape. I would sincerely hope this end is achieved. But I would like to know how the Ontario housing corporation is going to be able to deal better with the multiplicity of authorities that now exist in the housing field, than the present machinery. What I had rather hoped for when the hon. Minister was moved to bring in a new Act, was some sort of new approach that would cut down on the number of people

who had to pass these various housing plans. There is no mention of this at all in the Act, and I was not too clear in my own mind, as the hon. Minister replied to our criticisms in his estimates the other day, that the hon. Minister had really turned his mind to this particular problem.

Is it the hon. Minister's thought that the Ontario housing corporation is going to be able to cut down on the number of authorities that are going to have to pass new plans for houses? And if so, how is this going to work? In Metropolitan Toronto, for instance, is there still going to have to be various reviews taken by the local planning board, by the local council, by neighbouring planning boards and neighbouring councils, as it might affect them? By the Metropolitan council, by the Metropolitan planning board, and so on?

I would hope that there is something in this Act that I missed that will lead to some clarification, and I anxiously await the hon. Minister's word as to how this situation is going to be cleared up by this bill.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, answering the hon. member, I think first of all we have removed some of the main restrictions that we have to contend with on our present basis of borrowing 75 per cent from the federal authorities. In other words, the federal authorities are quite prepared to give the Ontario housing corporation almost the same freedom of action as they give Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in Ottawa. In the first place, I think that will speed up the programme for housing, and secondly, the problems that the hon. member brings still exist, I think, and many of them will continue to exist, because of the nature of the programme of building houses in various municipalities, with their various restrictions. I do not think it is possible to say that we will eliminate all of those difficulties, but I certainly think that now that we have—let us say—more freedom of action to plan the housing programme for this province, we will certainly be able to speed up the negotiations of these various parties, if not to eliminate a good many of them.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SHERIDAN PARK CORPORATION

Hon. Mr. Randall moves second reading of Bill No. 136, An Act to incorporate the Sheridan Park Corporation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOTEL FIRE SAFETY ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Hotel Fire Safety Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

On vote 504:

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Chairman—I will let the hon. member's question go ahead, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) to what extent parts of the courses that are given at the Ryerson Institute are offered at vocational schools across the province—that is, the same courses?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I was going to deal with that perhaps to a degree with the Ryerson vote, but really we have covered Ryerson rather thoroughly already.

We have two or three schools or boards that are offering the first year of Ryerson. It is offered here in the city of Toronto. Actually, now there are five such centres: the city of Toronto; London, at the Beal Technical School; Sault Ste. Marie; Sarnia and Kingston. These cities have been granted this right for next year.

Looking somewhat to the future of Ryerson and discussing some of the possibilities with its principal, Dr. Kerr, we are seriously studying the extension of this programme to other communities. We feel there is some merit in this economically. It will enable students to remain within their home community for an additional year and, at the same time, use some of the technical facilities that exist at established schools.

Now the plan has not become a matter of any firm policy yet, but it has worked reasonably well here in Toronto. We have had, I think, very excellent results in London and we are extending it to these three other communities next fall. We intend to hold discussions with the principal of Ryerson and their new board of governors to explore further the possibility of doing this in those areas that cannot be easily served by an existing, or perhaps a planned institute of technology.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just to pursue this a bit. Do the high schools that present this part of the course require additional facilities to what is presently there for the regular vocational courses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, my understanding is that the facilities that are used are the ordinary facilities, that they have not had to extend them for this particular course. They will not be required to do so until we decide whether we will do this as a matter of permanent policy.

Mr. Nixon: So no special grants are given to the schools that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are paid the usual grant for this.

Mr. Nixon: Is there any thought that perhaps the work that would be done at a trade school, I believe you call them—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Vocational centres!

Mr. Nixon: Vocational centres—that the work that is normally accomplished in a vocational centre could also be done by the regular vocational section in the collegiates across the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a possibility, except that we feel that if the work being done in vocational education is considered by levels, there would be the secondary school as the first level, the vocational centre as the second level, and the technical institute and the specialized work at the vocational centre as the third level. It is possible, but I think that perhaps there would not be as much merit in trying to do vocational centre work at the secondary schools. But if we find that the vocational centres are being taxed to capacity and that the courses are proving useful, we would certainly explore doing this in the secondary school facilities, if this were necessary.

Mr. Nixon: There certainly is, Mr. Chairman, the merit in the fact that the facilities

are there, offered in profusion; and that if they could be worked into these other streams of technical and vocational training, it would be very useful and economical, too, I would think.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, well this is our feeling as well. We want to see that many of these new vocational additions are used to the maximum of their capacity. Of course we will not be in a real position to see how this can be done until the vocational centres themselves are opened and established, and until the reorganized programme extends into Grades 11 and 12 and we see the student population that will be pursuing these courses. But very definitely, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's observation is well founded. We all want to use these existing facilities to their maximum potential.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, my remarks are going to be a little more extended than a question, but not much over ten minutes, on a subject which I started to raise yesterday a little more broadly than was permitted at that time. The subject I want to discuss, Mr. Chairman, is post-secondary school education, post-high school education in the province generally, and I started off by referring to it under the heading of senior education and including as a form of definition for the word "senior" in the use I was proposing, those people who are close to the age of 18 and who have completed Grade 12 level, or what used to be called in our day, I think, junior matriculation.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to outline for a few moments very briefly, some of the problems which are very familiar to us. I think we have discussed them in this House and we certainly have found them in our own families and our own experience. I might tabulate them, with your permission, Mr. Chairman.

First, the problem of university enrolment and the oft-described tidal wave of students with which the universities and the provincial and federal governments will have to cope. Second, the problem of quality of students and the dreadful wastage by way of failure in the first and second years, particularly, of university. Third, the problem of sheer size and physical management that faces the University of Toronto in particular.

Fourth, the problems facing the universities in their fight to maintain high standards and their oft-repeated objective of excellence. And allied with this is their plea for more financial support of post-graduate work and for a larger proportion of post-graduate

students. Fifth, the problem, the demand for more training and more retraining in the technical, vocational, industrial and quasi-professional skills which are required more and more from day to day by technology and automation. Sixth, the problem of the future of Grade 13, a grade which, as has been mentioned in this House very recently, is unsatisfactory for many students, is of concern to The Department of Education and the universities themselves.

Finally the last and perhaps the most important, the problem of financing education for more people and its impact upon students, universities and the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned those seven particular problems. They are readily discernible to a layman's eye and as a layman I would like to suggest, sir, to the hon. members of this House, some solutions for these problems. The first step, I submit, in finding a solution is to realize that all of the problems mentioned fall within one definable and comprehensible field—the field I have defined as senior education—and involve one task, that of providing a varied and comprehensive system of education for all our adults and post-secondary school population.

The second step follows from this, I suggest, and requires that the government of Ontario establish a department of senior education, organized and qualified to deal with senior education in all its aspects. University affairs would, in my submission, become a division of such an overall department.

Next, I suggest that the department proceed with all deliberate haste—this would be the new department of senior education that I am suggesting—to establish a system of what are variously described as junior colleges or, by another name, community colleges or two-year colleges, across the whole of the province.

These community colleges would comprise a complete and distinct section of our whole educational system. Their responsibility would be to provide for two years, and in some cases three years, further education beyond Grade 12. The courses offered would provide: firstly, Grade 13, and first-year and in some cases second-year university equivalent for students wishing to go on to university after community college; secondly, vocational, industrial, commercial, technical, agricultural and home economics training leading to employment in those specific fields; thirdly, general and liberal arts courses.

These community colleges would not be a mere extension of high schools. They would not be controlled by The Department

of Education, they would be organized on the same pattern as the present universities with local boards of governors reflecting local situations and closely identified with the needs, the interests and the personality of local communities in which they would be situated.

Apart altogether from our cities, I can picture, Mr. Chairman, some towns, often county towns, in this province ideally suited as locations for community colleges. Their financial support would be a blend of provincial, federal, municipal and student support, with the province carrying the main burden and the support from the students being essentially nominal. I would foresee, Mr. Chairman, local charitable and industrial support being greatly encouraged, and I am sure it would be forthcoming as one pictures the local communities receiving the benefit of such educational opportunities.

Not all students, in my mind, sir, going beyond Grade 12 would be required to enter community colleges. However, only those having excellent scholastic records would be directed to university, short-circuiting community college. This would mean that only excellent students and those who mature early from an academic point of view would move to Grade 13 in the present academic high school course and then straight to university. As a result, the universities would be asked to accept, firstly, only the very cream of the students graduating from high school, and secondly, students who have passed through the university preparatory courses of the community colleges themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the new department would, I repeat, in no way be an extension of the existing Department of Education. The universities must remain as independent of governmental and political interference as they are today. Once established, the community colleges should be encouraged to achieve an independence similar to that enjoyed by the universities. The new department's responsibility would be limited basically to the following fields: firstly, the provision of financial support of the universities and community colleges, and secondly, acting as a co-ordinating agency and a clearing house for advice and information between the universities as a group, the community colleges as a group, The Department of Education, The Department of Labour, The Department of Economics and Development, and all the professions.

Mr. Chairman, as all hon. members of this House and all persons interested in this topic know, there is essentially nothing new in the

proposals placed on record by me at this time. The junior colleges or community colleges or two-year colleges, as they are variously called, form part of a movement developed several generations ago in the United States. They have played a very significant part in the educational systems of some 42 of the states of their union. From all I can learn, sir, the recognition of their importance generally has been accelerating.

Nor is debate concerning their introduction new in this province. In fact, 14 years have passed by us since the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, the Hope commission of 1950, came forward with unreserved and sweeping recommendations for the introduction of a comprehensive junior college system for Ontario. One may disagree with the techniques and details recommended by the Hope commission, but the reasoning and the principles of the recommendations have become, I feel, sir, more valid with every passing year.

In the United States, with its tremendous resources for research, we find a steady flow of books, reports, commissions, committees and legislatures weighing the merits of the community college system and confirming its value. In 1947 the President's commission on higher education reported to President Truman:

As one means of achieving expansion of educational opportunity and the diversification of educational offerings it considers necessary, this commission recommends that the number of community colleges be increased and that their activities be multiplied.

In 1957 the President's commission on education beyond high school reported to President Eisenhower:

These institutions respond to the increasing demand for a greater variety of more accessible training and education, while at the same time helping other colleges and the universities to concentrate a greater proportion of their energies than would otherwise be possible on upper division, graduate and professional work.

And it went on to say:

Community colleges are not designed, however, merely to relieve an enrolment pressure on senior institutions. They have a role and an integrity of their own. They are designed to help extend and equalize opportunity to those who are competent and who otherwise would not attend college, and present a diversity of general and specialized programmes to meet the needs of diversified talents and career goals.

This committee, Mr. Chairman, went on to discuss the opportunity which community colleges provide for students to live at home and often to continue in part-time employment. In addition, it stressed the ability of community colleges to provide special services and educational opportunities for adults in their local communities.

In his book, *Citadel of Learning*, President Conant, of Harvard, referred to the important way in which junior colleges could relieve the tremendous physical burden on universities. President Sproul of the University of California has written of their significance as a part of higher education in the state of California. He mentions the different purposes they can serve when compared with university extension centres and the advantages involved in their lower cost-per-student for education.

More recently, in 1960 and in 1962, the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare published reports on research, including detailed recommendations as to how best a jurisdiction should proceed in developing two-year colleges and how they may be financed. There is also available an extremely interesting and exhaustive study made in California, entitled *The Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960 to 1975*. This survey covers the whole field of higher education in that state in great detail and emphasizes the extremely important role which junior colleges have played and should in future play in that particular state.

The California study, sir, foresees the role of community colleges expanding over the years and gives these reasons: First, easy accessibility to students and the consequent reduction in cost to students. Second, the high scholastic records made in both state colleges and universities by junior college transfers. Next, the junior college screening function of indicating those students most likely to succeed in their education beyond the lower division. Fourth, a means of permitting the universities and state colleges to place increased emphasis on upper division and graduate programmes. Next, a means of preventing the state colleges and universities becoming unmanageably large. And finally, a provision of a cost per student to the state for both operation and plant at a lower figure than state colleges and the university are able to achieve.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to three recent Canadian sources of comment on community colleges. The first is a book published in 1962 by Professor Macdonald of the University of British Columbia. This com-

prises a survey of higher education in the province of British Columbia and a number of strong recommendations for education in the future in British Columbia. Professor Macdonald reviewed the whole field in depth and recites the problems of post-secondary education which are essentially the same throughout North America. In the result, he comes out strongly with the recommendation that his province develop a system of community colleges. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that his reasoning is as valid in Ontario as in British Columbia.

When we discuss community colleges, we are not dealing with a matter of mere educational technique, we are dealing with a fundamental answer, I suggest, to fundamental challenges—challenges arising out of the very nature of modern North American society itself.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in concluding my references to sources, I would like to refer to certain authoritative opinions which are very close to home and very topical. They are expressed in speeches delivered very recently by Dean Smyth of Atkinson College, York University, and by Dr. Bissell, president of the University of Toronto. In fact, they are so topical that they have appeared since I began putting together my notes for these remarks today.

Dean Smyth deals with the basic problem of the need for new answers to new questions and believes that the community college idea deserves serious consideration in Ontario. He suggests as a first step in this province, that community colleges be established on an experimental basis in centres which at this moment have no local institutions of higher learning. And in addition, he is of the opinion that community colleges could perform a most useful function in the field of adult education.

Dr. Bissell in his speech suggests that Grade 13 be turned into a university preparatory year for students with scholastic aptitude and that community colleges be developed for the purpose of giving two-year courses after Grade 12 in technical, academic and artistic subjects for young people and adults. He would relate the courses to the interests and needs of the communities in which the community colleges again were placed.

Mr. Chairman, the reasons for the rather slow acceptance of the community college idea in Ontario are probably these: First, a fear that the community colleges would be mere "ersatz" universities—wasteful imitations of the real thing. Second, a fear that they would draw faculty and public funds away

from our hard-pressed universities. Third, we were fully occupied with the great projects involved in the growth of our present university system in this province.

But, sir, fears do not solve problems, and we still face the problem of exploding university enrolments, the problem of wastage of failures, the risk of overly large institutions, the need for a larger post-graduate population in our universities, the need for more training for more people, the problem of Grade 13 and the problem of financing our educational needs.

However, in 1964, I feel that the opinions of our university presidents, of the academic world and of the public, despite difference in emphasis, have converged to such an extent that the government of Ontario and we laymen of this House can now give active, useful leadership in a common assault on these problems by establishing a community college system in this province.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is under this vote, but it will probably come up under university affairs. I am very pleased to hear the hon. member bring up community colleges, because I think they have a lot of merit and serve a place in the overall educational picture.

Earlier in the debate we had a mention of trades training and the use of the vocational school for trades training. It does have some merit but it is only a stopgap measure. You are confronted with a discipline problem in a school when you try to combine the normal technical day schooling and then the trades training immediately after. You have two different ages of individuals attending the school and as a result—I should not say as a result—but generally those who are taking the trades training do not have the educational background that we would like to see them have, and as a result there are certain types of problems that the youngster is confronted with if he stays in after school, meeting the individual taking trades training.

However, the trades training should not be forgotten and I think the hon. Minister should seriously consider setting up the trades training institutes as was recommended in the manpower training report. It mentions: "It will thus be necessary for the government to establish more trade schools and to disperse them more widely across the province". I stress the point "widely" because you have three trades training centres in the Toronto area; one is being set up in London and I

think there is one in Ottawa. One is contemplated in Hamilton, and then in Welland. Well, if you are going to distribute your trades training centres widely—I would say to use the word “widely” in its full extent, that is, spread them out a little farther apart—my own community has been after a trades training school now for quite a number of years because of the labour difficulty. When I say “labour difficulty”, I mean the unemployment picture—and I certainly think that more consideration should have been given to the community for the establishment of a trades training centre. Not only a committee of interested citizens but the Unemployment Insurance Commission has recommended this. The mayors’ committee has recommended the establishment of a trades training school or a vocational centre, as is the common appellation now, and I would certainly hope that the hon. Minister would not wait until the time that conditions in my community have reversed themselves to the difficult days, but think seriously of planning for one now so that within two or three years the vocational centre could be a reality.

In 1958, the department set up a Western Ontario Institute of Technology. In 1959 and 1960 I discussed this in this House and the comment always was that it had not proved its value. They were a little hesitant to expand the institute there because they did not know if it would work or not. Well, the institute is now operating very efficiently. However—and while I am at this may I say that it is in five different buildings in the one complex—the facilities in there are not of the best. The students make do with what they have and they are most appreciative of having even this type of facility. However, the day has arrived when the hon. Minister should seriously consider setting up a new Western Ontario Institute of Technology.

Not too long ago a delegation from the local community met with the hon. Minister. He received them very cordially and gave them assurances that it would be set up within—I think it was mentioned—three years. May I say that when General Motors decided to set up a plant in the local community—and that was a body trim plant—they decided that within one year they would have the plant in operation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They have more money than the department.

Mr. Newman: Not in Canada though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure about that.

Mr. Newman: In the United States they may have, but not in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Maybe they would help pay for it, then.

Mr. Newman: The bare assets are not as great as the province’s assets in Ontario.

I would like to ask of the hon. Minister at this time to what extent have arrangements been made for the setting up of a new Western Ontario Institute of Technology in the Windsor area? Have the properties been purchased?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the properties have not been purchased. There have been two or three sites which have been explored, if this is the correct terminology. I have had several recommendations from not only the city of Windsor as far as site is concerned, but from two or three of the municipalities surrounding Windsor. The site selection is under active consideration and, as I told these young people who were up to visit with the hon. member and myself some few weeks ago, I hoped we would be in a position in the not-too-far-distant future to establish where the site might be.

I explained at that time that there was some interest in having it, perhaps, located in a downtown area. I indicated that, perhaps, the preference of the department would be for a larger acreage, perhaps 15 or 20 acres, where certain recreational facilities might be provided. But I can assure the hon. member that I have not forgotten the visit of these young people to this department, and we certainly will let them and the hon. member know just as soon as a site is selected.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may say of the hon. Minister, I always hear this story: That we are progressing, that we are having difficulty in purchasing properties, and so forth. How is it the department always seems to have difficulty, but private industry never seems to have difficulty arranging the purchase of properties?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not imagine the difficulty is involved in the actual purchase. I do not think the government has any difficulty in the mechanics of purchasing a piece of property. But certain considerations must be taken into account and, of course, there is always the problem of finding the funds that are required. This is what determines the expansion of any programme of this type.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister leaves us in the community with the

idea that he is sort of neglecting, or disregarding us. He sees the need there. He sees the programme has proven itself. He knows that in the coming year the programme is expanding and that it is going to take in commercial education also. He is going to be using another building. As it is his department now uses two different gymnasium facilities. There are five different buildings in the complex and he is going to add to it another building in the following year. Surely the department should hasten the day when we, back there, can look with pride and see a nice new Western Ontario Institute of Technology.

Now we have 400 students. Next year's contemplated enrolment, I think, is 525. Inside of three years—I understand it takes, normally, three years from the drawing up of the plans until the student actually enters the classroom—I certainly would like to see the hon. Minister speed up things if he would for the local area. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will do our best.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I want to remind myself and the House that at the moment we are discussing the technological and trades training branch because, while I acknowledge there are difficulties in these divisions that become blurred, and I will have to stray momentarily beyond the division, I reiterate this is where we are. I have a basic question that I want to ask the hon. Minister, then elaborate on it and then come back to the question. My question is: Where, in heaven's name, are we heading in this field?

Yesterday, when we started the estimates, the hon. Minister commented on the observations of the hon. member for Brant and myself. In the course of his commenting he implied—if he did not state—that there was no need for more technological institutes. I pointed out, for example, that the Deutsch committee report had called for a tripling of the objective to 18,000, and he dealt with this in a skillful way so as to not indicate that we were building any more; thereby leaving the implication that they did not need any more. Because, he said, in the vocational centres and in a tri-semester approach to the existing facilities, we could accommodate 26,000—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Forty-six thousand.

Mr. MacDonald: Forty-six thousand, well, even more: 46,000.

The hon. member for Brant queried the hon. Minister this afternoon. I tried to detect

from his answers exactly what is the position of the vocational centre as compared with, for example, the trade school that we have been talking about up until now and as were recommended in the manpower report. If I understand his replies correctly, the vocational centre is just a step beyond the vocational secondary school, so little beyond that if we found that our facilities were not great enough we could go back without any difficulty and build up the secondary school system to meet this need. With respect, I say to the hon. Minister that this picture is confused.

I raise this—and I raise this as pointedly as I can—because this is only the beginning of the confusion. Let me remind the hon. Minister that when the Deutsch report came down in 1962—at least it was prepared in 1962 although I think it was made public in the early part of 1963—their suggestion, apart from pointing out that we need triple the number of places by 1970, that were then envisaged or on the drawing board, was that we should take a look across the province of Ontario, and in implementing the recommendation of the manpower committee we should pick on some of these new secondary technical facilities that have been built with the assistance of federal money, use them as a sort of capital base and expand. In this way, you would avoid the duplication of a considerable amount of the capital expenditure involved.

Fine. There was one proposal. But nothing happened on it. Within less than a year the same group, in what is known as the supplementary report to the committee of presidents of provincially assisted universities, came out. This proposal has apparently disappeared. The basic objective of this secondary report was to look into the proposition of junior colleges. They dismissed the idea of junior colleges, but before they were finished they came back to something that was, I think to be fair, the Canadian equivalent of a junior college. In relation to what they are proposing perhaps I can just quote a paragraph or so here that indicates specifically what they had in mind. I am quoting from page 28:

We also agree with the committee's recommendation that the existing institutes of technology should be expanded and that more institutes of technology should be dispersed more widely across the province. We support the present policy whereby they are initially controlled by The Department of Education but given independence when they mature sufficiently to have well established standards.

Now I will just interject here. Whether or not this is to be done by building on the nucleus of some of the secondary schools they do not say here. That specific proposal of less than a year before has gotten lost completely in the shuffle. But to continue on page 28:

In addition, it is clear that there is a place for a further adaptation of the institute of technology, a post-secondary institution approved by The Department of Education, but under local control, that would concentrate its efforts on providing post-secondary and adult education for the immediate community. We have pointed out already in our discussion of the need for technological education, that the spectrum of careers requiring specialized training beyond the high school has widened to include a great variety of commercial and service occupations as well as industrial technology. This trend is going to increase to the point where it will not be possible for a small number of centrally directed technological institutes to meet the need and the demand for different kinds of adult education will surpass the existing offerings. Because the name "institute of technology" carries more of an industrial emphasis than we intend, we would prefer for the new institutions to be called "college of technology and applied science."

So here is another new, distinct, positive proposal—a college of technology and applied arts. That proposal was dropped into the pot of ideas and proposals. The hon. Minister a day or so ago got up and referred in passing—as though he were pleased to have still another proposal—I do not know how confused he wants to get—from President Bissell when he advocated community colleges. Whether it is the kind of college just mentioned, or whether it is some other variety, we do not know. Now, heaven help us, the Tory backbenchers are moving in and they are all going to drop in a new proposal, because we have had the one from the hon. member for Russell.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the time is long since past when in this area, at least, if not in the broader picture, and I have made my plea on the broader picture, we have got to have some resolution of the direction we are going. If we are going to build institutes of technology across the whole province, I personally think there is some unnecessary duplication of the proposal that the university presidents' supplementary report makes, along with that for the college

of technology and applied arts. The finances are such that it would seem to me that you would telescope those two ideas.

The basic point here, Mr. Chairman—as the hon. Minister, I know, is aware—is that we have got to bear in mind that our record in the province of Ontario is an utterly shocking one in this respect.

I was just reading Mr. J. Bascom St. John again this morning—an article in which he refers to all of the shortcomings in our educational achievements and says that the one that really leads all the others is on the technical side. We in the province of Ontario have often pointed to the province of Quebec somewhat condescendingly, with regard to the problems it has in its "quiet revolution" today, because its education has been concentrated on the classical side so that young people did not have the broader opportunities. Let us face it, Mr. Chairman—in the province of Ontario, Dr. John Seath recommended in the first decade of this century the building of trade schools—over 60 years ago, in 1908 or 1910. We passed an Act in 1911, and in 50 years we built one trade school; the one on Nassau Street. If this is not a shocking revelation of our failure to live up to this responsibility, I do not know what could be.

I give credit to this government in acknowledging how desperate was the distance that we had fallen behind when under the leadership of the now hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) they seized upon the money that was made available from Ottawa. But we are still far behind. Again, Mr. St. John points out this morning, six per cent of our working force is skilled. In the United States, 32 per cent of the working force is skilled. We have got away with our neglect for years, because we have been poaching on the countries of Europe. We have been going over and drawing our skills from Europe. We are not going to be able to do it in the future. So of all areas of the educational field, my basic point is that here is where we should have some clear indication where we are going amid all the clutter of proposals of where we should go. I earnestly say to the hon. Minister, when is the government going to take some action to resolve this lack of direction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, perhaps answering the first question posed by the hon. member, and that is the suggestion in the initial report, which has now been forgotten in the second report, of the possibility of using the new vocational centres as sort of a core for some type of further technical

training; I think the answer is that the vocational facilities that are presently in the secondary system, if they are not in use to their capacity today, are very close to it and certainly will be within a year's time. I think when the initial report was made—and I cannot say this with any authority, I am only guessing—I think the feeling was then that there could be a surplus in capacity at many of these vocational additions or vocational schools. While I suggested that perhaps we might consider extending the first year of, say, Ryerson into the secondary area, I would say to you without any hesitation that to extend it to beyond, say, a one-year period in the secondary school programme would not be wise.

The vocational centres—we have changed the name from institute of trades—really encompass or envisage the principles that are set out in the manpower training report. I think they refer to them there as institutes of trades. We are calling them vocational centres. We are extending the scope of their courses beyond what was contemplated by the manpower training report. As I said yesterday, we are relating them to the courses that are being given at the institutes of technology.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member has raised a very valid point, and one that concerns the whole area of post secondary education, apart from the universities proper. The institutes of technology obviously are directed toward primarily the technological or technical fields. The vocational centres are to a very high degree in our present planning, related to this same field. I think I said yesterday that we feel that the actual estimate that was given in the first report of 18,000, is a very conservative estimate. I think perhaps the number will far exceed this by 1970 or perhaps by 1973, and I can assure you the department is planning accordingly.

There is still a problem that gives me concern. It is one that the department is studying and one that I think some of the university people are now beginning to study, although when that report came out, I can recall two or three of them who really were not too enthused about the terminology, "institute of technology and applied arts." This is the problem of the academic student who wants perhaps another two years of school, but who is not yet qualified for, or who does not want to go to, a university. Now, I am just expressing my own views and this is not government policy, but it may be that this type of academic course could be

offered at the vocational centres, because these are being located in community areas. I do not know. We are planning them on a regional or geographic basis, in the same fashion as we have done with our institutes of technology. Whether these vocational centres, over a period of time and after study as to the need, can be used for an expanded or extended type of programme to include some other areas of adult education, Mr. Chairman, I do not know, but this is an area we are presently studying.

I cannot tell the hon. member today exactly where we are going since this is one of the very great problems facing us at the post-secondary level. It will be compounded, obviously, in three or four years' time, when the first graduates start leaving the re-organized programme at the secondary level. I anticipate we will have some more concrete answers for you in this field in the fairly near future. However, I regard this as a problem area, and I think my hon. friend is quite proper in observing that we must resolve it and this we are attempting to do. We have to remain flexible, if at all possible, because the needs will obviously be changing almost from year to year. Certainly you cannot say that this is the best pattern for the next ten years. This in itself would be foolish. What we must do is to see that there are adequate physical plants that we can adapt to whatever type of courses are going to become necessary in the years that lie ahead.

I am not suggesting to the House that the figures I gave it yesterday are the end as far as this programme is concerned. We are exploring three or four sites and actually have had suggestions of many prospective sites for vocational centres and institutes of technology. All I am saying to the House, to give it some encouragement, is that the figures mentioned in the first Deutsch report of 18,000 students can be met earlier than was suggested in the report. But this does not satisfy me because I think we shall have to meet a greater demand than that, perhaps even earlier than is suggested by the Deutsch committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I cannot specifically answer the hon. member. I can tell him however, that this is a problem that concerns the department and the government and that it is receiving very serious consideration at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, just let me pursue this. I appreciate the hon. Minister's explanation. It reduces the uncertainty to a degree but when he said, "We are studying this," may I ask him pointedly who "we" is?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Department of Education, Mr. Chairman, through the technological branch.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect, I want to suggest that this is an urgent enough and an important enough issue, that, if there ever was an issue that should be placed in the hands of an advisory committee—call it what you will—that will devote fairly full time to it and get the answer as quickly as possible, then this is the issue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think there is some merit in what the hon. member suggests but I suggest to you further that one of the areas that must be tapped for suggestions will be from the universities. I am not content with the depth of the report that you refer to, the second report, because as I see it this goes beyond the technical and vocational field. It involves both the academic and the nurses' training. When the new Department of University Affairs is functioning I think one area that must be explored by that department in conjunction with the universities is a joint study by the people who are responsible for higher education in this province and the department or this government, as to what might be done about post-secondary education, apart from the universities. I think they have a real contribution to make in this area.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if in effect what the hon. Minister is stating is that this is now going to become a major project of study and research by the university affairs department, at least this is an answer to the question; but whether or not this is exactly the place for it to be done, I am not certain, because I think it should encompass experts brought in from many fields.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I agree with this. We have already made one or two preliminary visits personally to two or three other jurisdictions to look at this whole question of community colleges. Not only will we consult experts from other jurisdictions in Canada but we may learn from experts from south of the border where they have had considerable experience in this type of development.

Mr. MacDonald: I reiterate finally my plea for getting a plan, and a resolution of this confusion—and for this reason.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville was pleading, Mr. Chairman, as to when he is going to get his institute of technology. He

says he now has 400 students, next year it will be 525 and so on.

You know, if you will forgive me, Mr. Chairman—and this is the last Minister I would like to be sarcastic with—I have a horrible suspicion that they are going to get their institute with a capacity of about 1,000 after they have reached the thousand, and when they are just about to have 1,200 or 1,400. I say this advisably—

Mr. Newman: In two years we will have a thousand.

Mr. MacDonald: —for this reason: We have just built a new Eastern Ontario Institute of Technology. The wisdom of building this kind of an institution, which, I understand, even now is overcrowded, in that they are going to be using labs for classrooms right from the very outset. In addition, I submit to the hon. Minister, their inadequate library facilities; there are more cubby holes for many of the office needs of the staff in the institution. Within a year or so this institution is going to be really bulging at the seams.

Now whether it is a wise proposition, in face of the kind of a development that we all anticipate—and the hon. Minister at least has shown the magnitude of it when he has dismissed 18,000 as a conservative figure—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no, I just said conservative.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, a wrong figure, and he suggests a 46,000 level. This, at least, indicates and confirms the proportions of the problem we have got. I think we have to have plans, we have to have them clarified and we have got to start to build these institutions in Windsor and elsewhere so that they are not going to be overcrowded before you almost get the doors open and the ribbon cut.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who does not like to be over-optimistic about the numbers of students we can handle because I do not want to mislead the House. But take Ryerson Institute alone; we anticipate that when the three-semester system is introduced—which will take place in the latter part of 1964, or in the early part of 1965, depending on how the semesters are worked out—there will be 6,000 students on Ryerson's downtown main campus alone.

With the board of Ryerson and their principal we have been discussing this. We have been considering how this can be done fairly rapidly by providing—I do not like the word "satellite"—off-campus branches of Ryerson

in the three areas, perhaps, surrounding the main campus that would accommodate 3,000 students. This too can be done rather rapidly. This is one reason, Mr. Chairman, that there is merit certainly at this point in confining post-secondary institutions of this nature within The Department of Education because we can move with some rapidity in spite of what the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville may feel.

At the same time the hon. member raised the problem of Ottawa. We already have tentative plans for additions to that building. When the student population increases there to the point that we anticipate in the fall of 1966, the plans, I can assure the hon. member, will be well prepared in advance, some of them are ready now.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in what the hon. member for Russell has presented and it certainly is in line with our thinking in sections of northern Ontario. We also support the view of the hon. member for York South because it is a project about which I have been quite concerned since coming to this Legislature. He pointed out that it is years and years since Dr. Seath presented his report and it was years and years before anything was done about implementing any of the suggestions.

The hon. Minister has said that the new vocational centres are regionally located. With all due respect to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart)—who is now a Minister of the Cabinet—it is a very narrow region where that vocational centre is to be located. I think if you took the advice of your inspectors in northern Ontario you would find that they would suggest the centre should be either in the city of North Bay or the city of Sudbury. I presume that there must be other factors though, in addition to political, that dictate where you are going to set these up.

Finally, sir, in regard to the programme which you spoke about earlier this afternoon—in reply to the hon. member for Brant—you said that there would be an opportunity in some of our technical schools already in operation, to have the first year of the Ryerson course. I understand, sir, that a change has been made and in order to get into Ryerson Institute and the other institutes of technology you must have senior matriculation and be a graduate of Grade 13, which went into effect, is it this fall or next fall?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is perhaps under some

mistaken impression. There are some courses at Ryerson that do require Grade 13, I believe journalism requires it, but there are still a number of courses that you can enter at Ryerson with a Grade 12 graduation.

Mr. Troy: And will that continue for some time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell the hon. member that this is going to continue indefinitely. I am not in a position to say that.

Mr. Troy: I agree that certainly in the course of journalism one of the prime requisites should be at least Grade 13. I think that is a very good idea. We have evidence of it in our press gallery.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the hon. member suggesting that the press gallery are not properly qualified?

Mr. Troy: Oh, no, no, I say it is quite evident that they had a very fine course before they became members of the press.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Ryerson has an excellent course.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question about the department of youth that was announced some time ago. I believe the name—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the question at this time, but there is a particular vote for the department of youth.

Mr. Kerr: I thought it was under technology.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is 513.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister a specific question. Has he an estimate of the number of women enrolled in the various institutes throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I can get this specific information for the hon. member. I have visited, I believe, nearly all the institutes now. I can tell the hon. member that with the exception of Ryerson, there are very few women enrolled at the technical institutes. But at Ryerson we do have a high percentage of women, comparatively speaking.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, in the absence of a percentage, I am sure—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a low percentage.

Mr. S. Lewis: —the hon. Minister would agree the percentage is low. I want to perhaps make one or two points which I think might rightly be made in this vote.

One of the most striking phenomena, I think, Mr. Minister, is that women now occupy one-third of the work force. If memory serves me they are coming into the labour force at a remarkable rate. The male infusion into the work force has been something like six to eight per cent over the last five years. But women have increased at a rate of 20 per cent to a total of one-third of the work force.

The significant thing here is that their jobs are the most vulnerable jobs in an automated society, at least in a society that stands on this verge of immense technological change. I think it is true to say that it is in the area of women's employment that the computer will strike so that typists and key-punch operators, and this vast area of related skills will simply be eliminated.

Indeed, in a recent federal Department of Labour study, I think it was demonstrated that of 11,000 to 12,000 jobs affected in a survey of office automation, the number of women's jobs affected was twice as numerous as those of men. In the immediately foreseeable future one can see very, very serious dislocation of women. Although you may not get an army of unemployed, for by the mere process of attrition women will be removed from the labour market.

Now, the ironic and unfortunate thing is that women in the process of retraining are not the ones who were invited into the area of computer programming and electronic data processing. These have become the preserves of the male, and more and more the preserves intensify. Indeed, women are perhaps excluded in the sense that, as I understand it, their wages for the same job tend to be less.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just for the information of the hon. member, I spoke to the Data Processing Management Association the other evening. When I discussed some of the implications of data processing in the future of the school system, I made this specific inquiry. Ten per cent of their membership is made up of the female of the species and they tell me that this is growing, that the women are quite adaptable to this type of work. Because I was curious I found out this information last Monday or Tuesday evening.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is interesting because IBM, on the other hand, in its programme to

teach computer programming and EDP to people in the field, originally had female instructors. Those instructor places are now being usurped by males, partly because males have now taken an interest in the field, and partly because female salaries for identical work—this is fairly natural in this society—tends to be less.

The true fact is that even in the area of computer programming and electronic data processing, there are by no means sufficient jobs to absorb the vast masses likely to be technologically displaced by keypunch and typewriter automation.

I think, Mr. Minister, that this presents us with a truly serious problem. I do not think it can be underestimated and I suspect the hon. Minister would agree. I would be sad indeed were there to be a new movement of suffragettes on the economic plane. I would strongly suggest to the department that a very special emphasis should be made to provide skilled trades and new jobs for women, so as to overcome the discrimination that is naturally inherent in society, and to make some kind of programme available for the automated techniques by which women will be displaced.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I should point out that I think that there has been at least one, or several young ladies taking nearly every course at the institutes of technology with the exception, perhaps, of the mining course, but the numbers are limited, except here at Ryerson. The courses are definitely open to them. The home economics course is open to the female and the male, but of course this is where the young ladies do predominate.

At Ryerson—and I intended to send the hon. members a copy of this—they are instituting two new courses starting in September: a nursing course and a welfare services course. Both of these are directed obviously to the female students. The difficulty will be not in having the facilities. The difficulty will be in interesting the young ladies leaving secondary schools to go to the institutes of technology. Mind you, having some great interest in the availability of teacher supply, I would still encourage the bulk of them, if possible, to go to either teachers' colleges or OCE.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, may I thank the hon. Minister for his very precise explanation of the programme of his department. I have noticed, particularly, the remarks he made regarding the very large expansion in the teaching of

French at all levels. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that because of the lack of facilities in all of the trades schools and the institutes of technology for the teaching of various subjects to French speaking pupils, they find it quite difficult to get all the advantages offered by the schools.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister is aware that students coming from the bilingual schools find it very difficult to follow classes being given entirely in the English language after receiving most of their previous instruction in French.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is not to ask any special favours for French-speaking students. These students will be found predominantly in eastern and northern Ontario and in the southwestern part of this province. The hon. Minister is no doubt aware that these students have greater difficulty than others in following the classes, and more especially in trying the examination. My suggestion to the hon. Minister would be to make an effort to have French-speaking instructors, Mr. Chairman, more particularly in the areas that I have mentioned before.

Now, without mentioning any names, I would like to mention two cases that have come to my attention. One was an apprentice electrician. His employer told me that this young man was one of the brightest apprentices he had ever had in his employ. Unfortunately, he had received his elementary education in the province of Quebec and found it very difficult to follow instructions and pass examinations entirely in the English language.

The second case is that of a young apprentice plumber who had to be dropped by his employer because he had failed some of his subjects. He had been employed for a period of four years and nine months and, as in the other case mentioned, had developed quite nicely in his trade.

Unless something is done to help cases such as the ones I have mentioned, we shall find in the ranks of the unemployed people with tremendous skill who cannot receive their certificates because of language difficulties.

May I ask the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, to give this matter very serious consideration, particularly in relation to the new trades school to be opened this fall in Ottawa, and for the institute of technology which will move to its new quarters in the near future? I would ask the hon. Minister to consider the possibility of employing in those two schools a number of French-speaking instructors who can do a tremendous job.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am aware that this problem may exist. I think there would be no purpose in my telling the hon. member specifically, today, whether or not we shall do this. It will depend on the number of applicants that would be available and the type of courses, because you obviously cannot provide a separate instructor for a class of two or three individuals. The hon. member would be interested to know that we have a number of French-speaking graduates from schools in the province of Quebec presently attending our Hamilton institute of technology. They are specializing in the textile field and the results from these students are quite excellent. I assure the hon. member that we will be quite considerate of this problem. We shall see that something, if possible, is done about it, but it will depend to a very great degree on the number of students and the different courses in which they are interested.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, before being critical of the government on this bill, I should like to congratulate the government and the hon. Minister on his choice of the director of education, Dr. Rivers, because we are very proud of him in Owen Sound and of the job he is doing.

I do want to put this point as a citizen of a small, remote city, in that various times we have made approaches to the government and to the department for the location of a higher education institution such as a university in the Owen Sound area, in that geographically we are away out of the picture so far as having our graduates come to Toronto, London or McGill for their higher education is concerned. This is a real problem for parents in that they have to put at least one of their children through university with a financial hardship. And therefore it is reasonable to assume that we have a just request that the government consider such a location of a university in our area.

The answer usually is that there is not enough money, big money, in an area like Owen Sound to finance initially the capital costs of a university. Now, I think it is important to ask, is this the yardstick where we will locate our universities? Where there is enough money? We all talk about decentralization of everything from soup to nuts, but we have a just case here and I would like to ask the hon. Minister, is it the policy of the government in locating universities where there is enough money? I understand that in North Bay they made approaches along the same line some years ago and they were told probably the same thing, that

money was the basic starting point in the locating of a university. I think that policy should be defined, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would like to tell us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not know where this policy came from, I cannot recall any group from Owen Sound since I have been Minister, approaching me on the possibility of a university. I shall check whether such a group has approached the university advisory committee. I am not familiar with it if it has. I do recall a group coming from the Owen Sound community to chat about the possible location of a vocational centre or institute of technology. The policy of the government has been clearly enunciated without referring to the question of money at all; that there will be no new universities considered prior to 1970, that the efforts will be expanded on the existing universities and the new ones which have already been created or are in the process. As to the suggestion of the hon. member that the amount of money in the community determines whether or not there should be a university there, certainly as far as I know, Mr. Chairman, that is not the criterion. I think it is quite obvious that the population of the centres, the availability of students and so on, are more important—I assume this should really be under the university affairs vote rather than here—but dealing with this question at the moment, the policy of the government as enunciated a year and a half ago, was that there would be no new universities created, and, as I say, I do not recall any representation, certainly in recent months, to myself, from the community of Owen Sound.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in 504, quite often one of the difficulties in programme No. 5, the retraining programme, is to get staff. Now, there is available in practically every community in which programme No. 5 is operating, sufficient staff in the academic line in retired school teachers. Yet these school teachers are a little hesitant when it comes to getting involved in the programme of teaching because of superannuation difficulties.

I think that the hon. Minister should give serious consideration to perhaps overcoming some of these difficulties so that this available source of skilled, experienced teachers could be used in programme No. 5. The teachers that you do get sometimes are not as good as you would like to have in the programme. And here you have a source of skilled teachers that could be put to its full use.

Now, the next is the setting up of courses for young ladies, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Scarborough West. One of the difficulties, Mr. Chairman, we have found in our own community, is how do you interest girls in technical education? The school of which I happen to be on the staff, a technical school, has advertised throughout the secondary schools in the community that there are courses available in the school for them, but yet in the one year all they could do was interest eight girls and the following year six girls. Surely there will have to be some type of awakening of the female half of the population, if they are going to work in the technical fields, that they should get some type of technical education first. And I think probably the department might have to do a little better selling job in this case.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister does not want to comment on that? Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would report to the House the findings of the committee that investigated irregularities in the programme number five work in the Windsor area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I guess this should be under vote 514, but to bring the House up to date—I recall that the former Attorney General issued a statement wherein it was stated that the matter in Windsor was investigated quite thoroughly and that as a result of the investigation, there was a recommendation that no charges be laid. That, Mr. Chairman, is the result of the investigation. The programme number five course in Windsor I understand is operating quite effectively at the moment. The courses are being well administered. Now, this is the information that we have, of course, in the department. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville may have some other views and we would be happy to hear them, but our information is that the programme is now working quite effectively.

Mr. Nixon: Is it true, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Taylor, the man whose services were used by the programme number five authority, has been offered a position in The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, this is very definitely not true.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, seeing that the programme mentioned is in the community from which I come, may I state that the programme is coming along very well. We have a top-notch programme and we are certainly meeting the needs as we find them in the community. However, I would like to

suggest possibly now, through the House here, that maybe the programme try to look into the idea of running some type of programme for young ladies in the sewing trades, because General Motors will be setting up a body trim plant back in the community.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to the remarks of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. We had a very fine programme, too, in the city of North Bay and a very fine and interested director. Unfortunately, he has left and I do not know just what the state of the programme will be next year.

Vote 504 agreed to.

On vote 505:

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hon. Minister would allow under this vote a discussion of OCE, inasmuch as it is normally contained in the estimates under university affairs. If he does permit it, I have some observations I should like to make.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have no objections, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member wished to make a speech on secondary school teacher training and actually this would come under OCE, which is considered as part of the university estimates. In speaking to the hon. members for Brant and York South, it was decided that we would deal with the whole question of universities, *per se*, at one time if possible. Therefore if the hon. member wishes to discuss the general problem of teacher education at the secondary level under this vote, while technically it perhaps is not in the right place, I have no objection.

Mr. S. Lewis: I should like to express very considerable appreciation to the hon. Minister for allowing it. I have some comments, perhaps a little extended, but I trust they will be greeted as comments which are the fruit of some thought.

Our party is exceedingly anxious about the state of secondary school teacher training in the province of Ontario. As you know, on the North American continent generally, the Great Debate is now waging, and within the last few months you have had two major treatises: firstly, James Conant's rather excellent book, *The Education of American Teachers*, to which I will refer later, and secondly, Koerner's book, *The Mis-Education of American Teachers*; not to mention the number of learned articles in the field.

I rise to speak on the question of OCE, because I am greatly disturbed about that institution. If the feelings are strongly put,

they are not meant in belligerence, they are meant simply because they are strongly felt.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Minister, that something has gone wrong at the very heart of OCE; that the institution is sinking beneath reputable academic waters and that in large degree the whole area of secondary school education is transfigured in a state of rigidity, of frustration, and alas, of mediocrity. In a recent article in the *Toronto Varsity* weekend review, a fascinating study appeared called, "Alice, OCE and Teaching Standards." It began with a quotation from Alice in Wonderland, which I would like to read to the hon. members in the House.

"Once," said the Mock Turtle at last with a deep sigh, "I was a real turtle. When we were little we went to school in the sea. The master was an old turtle. We used to call him Tortoise."

"Why did you call him Tortoise if he wasn't one?" Alice said.

"We called him Tortoise because he taught us," said the Mock Turtle angrily. "Really, you are very dull."

"Yes, we went to school in the sea. Though you may not believe it, we had the best of educations. In fact we went to school every day."

"I have been to a day school too," said Alice. "You needn't be so proud as all that."

"With extras?" asked the Mock Turtle anxiously.

"Yes," said Alice. "We learned French and music."

"And washing?" said the Mock Turtle.

"Certainly not," said Alice indignantly.

"Ah, then yours wasn't a really good school," said the Mock Turtle in a tone of great relief. "Now at ours they had at the end of the bill, 'French, music and washing extra.'"

And that in the minds of many, Mr. Chairman, is just about an accurate evaluation of what OCE is deemed to offer. Instead of being viewed as an exciting intellectual milieu, it is viewed as an oppressive and much-to-be-avoided tedium.

For a vast number of people, OCE is the last refuge of the undecided. It does not have the tremendous appeal that an institution of that kind should have. It is considered as a year wasted in the curriculum of students entering the field of secondary teaching.

If I may give a personal observation; when I finished my university work, I too

contemplated the illustrious profession of the hon. member for Brant and others in this House, and was positively deterred by the thought of the ignominy and humiliation of spending a year at OCE.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand that you were contemplating law.

Mr. S. Lewis: I quite appreciate that. I was not so deterred in the law until experience taught otherwise. Nonetheless, I might say, I might have been better equipped to handle The Police Act.

On the other hand, I do not think the personal reflection is far from typical, Mr. Minister. I think that teachers in the field will agree. There is surrounding OCE at the moment an atmosphere which is not particularly conducive to attracting people. Why did this attitude infiltrate the community? I suggest to you that the critique of OCE, from those who are presently in attendance and those who have passed through its gates, is essentially seven-fold. I want to deal very briefly with all areas, and to elaborate each to the degree that it is worth.

First, whether the staff or principal wishes it otherwise, OCE still has a definitely high school atmosphere imbued with some regimentation, what students feel is an excessive degree of classroom discipline. A sort of paternalistic knuckle-rapping has haunted OCE for the last several years. As I say, although I understand that situations have changed and there is a very real effort on the part of the principal and the staff to correct it, the atmosphere tends to prevail.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But there is a change.

Mr. S. Lewis: There is a change, I grant that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As long as you mention that.

Mr. S. Lewis: I grant there is a change, but the change is not yet decisive. Indeed, the same article from the *Varsity* describing the 700 students who passed through OCE portals in the winter session, says this:

This lonely remnant chooses to endure the manifold indignities and horrors of the winter course at OCE. As the year progresses the group establishes itself as an entity, developing a camaraderie within itself and an *esprit de corps* and good will which may well be compared to the kinship among the passengers singing on the decks of the sinking Titanic.

That is the first part of the critique.

The second part is that the very building itself, Mr. Minister, is a study in depression. As you know, I spent a little time with the principal of OCE recently, and he was kind enough to take me through the institution. An institution it is—an impossible environment. It is bleak, it is overcrowded, it is cramped, it is desolate, it is cell-like. The greatest instinct is to flee. There may have been an old theory—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder if the hon. member would answer a question? Do you recall seeing a number of students in the same building attending one University of Toronto school and sharing the same facilities? Do you recall seeing that?

Mr. S. Lewis: I do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, and would the hon. member be interested to know that these young people not only do not flee these premises, they regard it as being something of a great opportunity to attend this school. The results from UTS I think are rather significant.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, as a matter of fact—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not saying that the facilities at OCE are perfect, by any means. In fact, we have plans to alter the facilities. But nonetheless I do not think that one can say that the facilities, because I have examined them very closely myself, would tempt a person to flee the profession.

Mr. S. Lewis: I did not say they would tempt a person to flee the profession. I said they would tempt a person to flee the facilities. I was thus tempted, and I know of others who are so tempted, and I have a couple of observations to offer on UTS later.

I find the hon. Minister's interjection interesting, because, of course, that is precisely one of the points. The people about whom I am talking are not high school students willing to accept any environment into which they are placed. These are university graduates and the environment, I suggest, should be rather more conducive to maturity and to the learning process. There should be, perhaps, a greater degree of physical amenity and a much greater attractiveness. But the hangover of paternalism and the actual physical facilities, if I may say, Mr. Chairman, are not nearly so important as the third part of the criticism which I would like to emphasize.

I would suggest that the course structure at the Ontario College of Education is obsessed with technique and methodology at

the expense of almost everything else. There are, in the winter course, only nine weeks of practice teaching and in the summer course, six weeks. Although there are other courses which I will enumerate in a moment, the essential emphasis is on straight methodology.

What is more it is a methodology of a "how" and "what" kind. It is the ancient type of methodology. It does not probe "why"; it does not ask the goals for approaching certain subjects in the schools. It is essentially a "what" formula.

Indeed, I was amazed to find that the former principal of OCE—and I stress that it is not the present principal—wrote a fascinating letter along these lines to a young man who had applied to him for a teacher's certificate in the province of Ontario. This person, as I understand it, had received his qualifications and his degree in another jurisdiction—the United Kingdom, I believe. He had been a public school principal in Nova Scotia. He wanted to know why he would be forced to take a summer course in methodology at OCE. One of the sentences which was in the letter returned to him from the principal of that institution read as follows:

In Ontario schools we consider academic qualification and experience less desirable than methodology.

With the greatest respect to the former principal of OCE I suggest that that is a seriously misplaced emphasis.

There are, of course, other subjects. There is psychology and the philosophy of education. But these, I suggest to the hon. Minister, are exceedingly superficial. They are survey courses, not substantive—"Why Will James was a pragmatist" or "What John Dewey believed"—in a sense highly uncritical, as all survey courses tend to be; and leading to undesirable results.

I do not want to tax the House, but I think a fairly lengthy quote from James Conant's book, *The Education of American Teachers* from the chapter on "The Theory and Practice of Teaching" is here relevant. I should like to read it:

In the philosophy of education course a well-trained philosopher should turn his and his students' attention to the problem, the language, the assumption and the value premises that enter into educational theory and practice. Using the new tools of the logical analyst and demonstrating by his own behaviour the philosophic impulses for clarity, the professor of the philosophy of education should train his

students to think clearly and critically about educational issues, including those raised by the psychologist, other professional educators, and informed laymen.

And then Mr. Conant says this:

Occasionally one finds a course in philosophy of education so taught. Far more often one finds that it represents little more than the professor's attempt to indoctrinate the student with his own educational values or to make the student vaguely familiar with the views of eminent men who have written about education—a few of whom may have sought to put their views into practice.

I suggest that it is the latter approach which characterizes, if you will, such courses at the Ontario College of Education. Indeed, one of the things which astounded me was that in a recent summer examination in the course "psychology of education," there was held an objective examination! I ask hon. members to contemplate that. An objective examination; 200 multiple-choice questions in a field of that kind, supposedly training high school teachers!

In another recent incident to which some of the students would be willing to attest, they were asked to check a list on what makes a good teacher. On the form were listed all the various attributes—voice modulation, gestures, etc., etc. One of the students put up his hand and said, "What about knowledge of subject matter?" and the professor said, "Surely that is there." The student said, "No, it is not there." The professor replied, "Well, that is a very good idea—put it down, class."

That, I think, is basic to the fundamental problems in the psychology and philosophy of education courses that they are taught at OCE; that they take second place to the methodology fixation and preoccupation; that they are essentially survey courses; that they often teach too little, and too little knowledge continues to be dangerous, and that they breed—and this is what disturbs me—an anti-intellectual atmosphere.

I want to quote again from the *Varsity*. It said this:

Significantly, the mental vitality, the fact of deep intellectual involvement and mutual commitment, the sense of developed and developing wisdom which ideally characterize the academic community and which in part are the very qualities which justify its existence, are absent from OCE.

Now the fourth part of the critique then follows very logically from that, because the

anti-intellectualism spreads. It is reflected in the predominant mentality—and I submit to the hon. Minister that this is a fictitious mentality—that only teachers can teach teachers; that only the practical classroom experience gained over a certain period of time is relevant to the Ontario College of Education; that the total emphasis must be to demonstrate to people how to teach a class of 30 in 35 minutes.

Indeed, if I may suggest to the hon. Minister, the emphasis on “only teachers can teach teachers” is reflected in his establishment of the Minister’s committee on the training of secondary school teachers. When one looks at the people who comprise the committee, you find only a solitary member of the organized university community and he in the administrative field, to boot.

As Bascom St. John pointed out, this meant that:

The continuance of departmental control of teacher training will delay indefinitely the teachers’ goal of a self-governing profession. And the result of setting up this kind of committee with only teachers-to-teach-teachers attitude is that you have—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Was that Mr. St. John’s recent article?

Mr. S. Lewis: That was Mr. St. John’s article of March 20, 1963, which was a commentary on the report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He wrote a very similar article about elementary school teacher training. I just want to tell the hon. member that we have university people on the elementary school teacher training committee, which I mentioned yesterday, or the day before.

Mr. S. Lewis: In the one the hon. Minister is now establishing for an elementary school? Well, I am glad that perhaps the lessons of the first will be applied to the second. I appreciate that that may perhaps have prompted it, maybe not. But what Mr. St. John says about the outcome of this report is as follows:

Therefore Ontario is destined to retain a secondary teacher training system of a type which exists almost nowhere else. In other words, in this particular we are right and all the rest of the world is wrong.

You may take issue with Mr. St. John but these are his thoughtful comments from the same article on the report.

I might add one aspect in discussing the

anti-intellectual atmosphere, and the non-university character of the report and the particular philosophy which pervades it. I should point out that in the make-up of this committee there was not a single representative from the technical or vocational side. When the hon. leader of my party stood up today with a very justified sense of urgency about the direction in which society is heading in its technological training field, I think his urgency is considerably bulwarked by the make-up of the committee. If I can come back to him, Mr. St. John referred to it this way in a subsequent article on the same report:

This is a fine example of the haughty snobbery of the academic toward a profoundly important aspect of our educational programme. The irony is that their side of the programme is certain to diminish in relative importance in the ensuing decade.

This has implications of course, beyond technical and vocational training alone. When we will be discussing Ryerson as an independent institution later on, it will of course be pointed out that many Ryerson teachers have been and will be compelled to take certain instructors’ courses at summer school at OCE, over which courses they have absolutely no jurisdiction and about which content they have never been consulted.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: Again, I think it is a reflection of the approach that the teachers at Ryerson must take, I believe, a summer instructor’s course. Many of them have been told that it is arbitrary. They must take it and certainly none of these people who themselves teach at Ryerson—now to be elevated to an institution comparable to that of a university—have been consulted, to their knowledge, on the content of the course structure. If, in fact, they should have been consulted, then I suggest that the committee or the hon. Minister should communicate it.

Now, what I would call this general sterility of attitude leads me to the fifth point: the attitude also extends to the practice teaching in which the teacher trainees engage. It never ceases to amaze me that the reports of student practice teachers from OCE are expected to be non-critical, they are expected to be non-analytical. Indeed, if I may say so, it is fairly common knowledge amongst the regular teaching community that when inspectors visit their ranks, teachers often alter the lesson planned to meet the predetermined expectations of the inspectors and of the Ontario College of Education as it

communicates them. I would not suggest that this applies to any of the eminent members who sit in this House, but it may indeed apply to others. But that is a peripheral point. It is true, however, that a wholly uncritical attitude is required of the student teachers who are expected to comment.

Sixth, Mr. Minister, I want to suggest that there is a serious lack of experimentation and exposure to educational cross-currents at OCE. I am not sure that practice teaching at UTS as such is anything to be vastly admired now. UTS is very much an eminent high school, but part of the establishment not generally reflective of community trends and classes.

What we want to see as a party are experiments in predominantly low-income areas or with underprivileged adolescents, in rural teaching experience, in special work amongst the emotionally disturbed children and the slow learner, and experience in special techniques—such as use of educational television.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the slow learners and emotionally handicapped, how many of these students does the hon. member anticipate that the teacher, the graduate from OCE, will be dealing with at the secondary level? My own information is that this would be a very small percentage of the group. If he were to apply this maybe to the teachers college's training in the elementary field this would have more validity, but I question really whether his observation in this regard holds too much water for the secondary school teacher.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, as a matter of fact, I am prepared to defend the statement. Not long ago, in fact within the last month, the hon. Minister was presented with a brief which I trust will be raised under vote 507 of his estimates, a brief from the Ontario association of the emotionally disturbed children. The contention in that brief, based on various studies, a health survey in 1950 made by some professional people in the field, general news reports, and indeed on a specific study of communities in the United Kingdom, suggests that anywhere from six to twelve per cent of the students attending secondary schools suffer from some degree of emotional disturbance. Now, if that is in fact true, Mr. Chairman, then teachers at the secondary school level having to deal with, let us say, ten per cent of the student body, should have some practice teaching exposure, some experience in the areas of experimentation related to the emotionally disturbed.

Indeed, what of the fields of the Robarts

plan and the terminal classes and all the aspects there involved? One indeed feels that the teachers at OCE are not getting the training and stimulation of atmosphere that I think they should have.

That leads me to my final point. In the opening of the hon. Minister's estimates in this branch—I cannot appreciate too fully the nature of his estimates and the work he is doing—in the opening of his estimates a great deal was said about research. Now I want to suggest to the hon. Minister that the Ontario College of Education is not a humming centre of research in the meaningful sense.

If it is a humming centre, it certainly is not filtering down to the students. The graduates who attend the Ontario College of Education are certainly not feeling the communication of research materials. It may be that Dr. Jackson is off doing a highly statistical study of patterns of students over a generation. This is exceedingly valuable. But clinical research, meaningful teaching pattern research in methodology goals, special experiments, and all the aspects that now come within the ken of modern thinking on education; these things are not being communicated to the students at the regular level.

I am told, and I believe it, that at the graduate level of the Ontario College of Education there is a very good research programme. If true, it, too, has not filtered down to students who are taking the winter and the summer courses. What do you have? Such students are exposed to new experiments and new methods only in isolated examples, if they are lucky enough to come within the area of a school board or a principal specifically enlightened and prepared to implement them.

Now, frankly, for all the aforementioned reasons—and I know the hon. Minister will disagree with a great many of them, although some he might agree with to a lesser or greater extent—for all the aforementioned reasons I suggest to you that secondary school education in the province of Ontario is, at the moment, tottering. The problem is a pretty serious one, and I do not think I present a purely subjective judgment. I daresay that it would be corroborated by those who have passed through OCE, by those who are presently in OCE, and by those who are about to enter OCE. Indeed, if the hon. Minister thinks that I speak too subjectively, I would be happy to undertake to table in this House a week hence a petition embodying these basic criticisms and the ideas I am about to put forward from at least a couple

of hundred teachers in the area, all of whom have had association with OCE.

I think that I present a mirror of a deep-seated feeling. It may be that as a person who speaks rather strongly about it, I exaggerate the extent of the reflection in certain areas for certain people; but the general reflection, I think, holds true.

As for the solution—the answer to the malaise—I have no pat revelations to put before the hon. Minister. But I want to suggest to him a series of four fundamental revisions. They are these:

First, the Ontario College of Education should be a defined post-graduate university faculty or institute, comparable to medicine or to law, and under university control—not under the aegis of The Department of Education as such.

Indeed, I think one of the invidious and sad facts of these estimates is that OCE has been isolated within The Department of Education and, at the same time, alienated still further from The Department of University Affairs. The staff at OCE should be qualified university professors conversant with the theory and practice of education. They should be giving the courses.

I would like to quote to you, shortly, from James Conant on his observations in this regard.

I believe that the role of the professors of education in the undergraduate training of teachers is, at its best, that of an intermediary to bridge the ravine that separates theory and practice. If this is true then the professors of educational philosophy, educational history, educational sociology and educational psychology should be professors of philosophy, history, sociology and psychology who have a commitment to the public schools and their improvement.

We should have professors teaching prospective secondary school teachers.

I would go further. A new faculty or institute of education in the province of Ontario should have the power to invite eminent outsiders to give specialized courses in various aspects of university education. I would say James Conant, Paul Goodman, Eric Fromm, Robert Hutchins—*les eminences grises* in other fields of education—should be brought in and asked to give specialized courses.

The institute could draw on the newly formed institute of criminology, on the institute of child psychology. You would, in fact,

develop at the Ontario College of Education precisely what it now lacks, namely, a community of learning. That is the logical tone for it to have.

I would go even further in discussing the new faculty of education that one could envisage. I would say that its system of admissions should be such as to accept people with mature adult experience in various fields: businessmen, authors, scientists, journalists and what have you. Even in the absence of precise academic entrance qualifications they should be able to come in to take extra courses leading to secondary school certification, to help overcome the shortage and to help give that institution the dignity and the breadth in the academic world which is presently denied it. The second proposal is that the entire course structure of the Ontario College of Education should be dramatically overhauled. We should de-emphasize methodology, leaving it only to the bare-bone basic subjects and there apply it intensively with emphasis on the goals of methodology; why we teach the new mathematics, not merely how we teach the new mathematics. Then put a much greater emphasis in the time that is thus released on the general framework of learning—psychology, sociology, history, philosophy, even economics, and anthropology. Intensive seminars in the behavioural sciences should be given by university professors attached to the faculty of education by virtue of their specialized knowledge.

Finally, a much greater proportion of time on practice teaching, the workshop of educational training. Not a mere nine weeks in the winter course or a mere six weeks of observation in a summer course; but teacher training that allows the teachers analytical critiques and evaluation of their experience; criticisms of the people whom they observe, which criticisms would then be discussed in tutorial.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How many weeks?

Mr. S. Lewis: How many weeks? I have looked at it on the basis of hours. If the hon. Minister allows me, I have not suggested a precise number but I could do so given a little time to work out the course allotment—roughly as Conant has done. I think that the imbalance that presently prevails should be righted, and that it should be righted in favour of courses like the philosophy of education and the psychology of education and similar fields, plus seminars in the behavioural sciences, and much increased practice teaching.

Third, I would like to suggest that the new institute should become a community of learning where there is unrestrained experimentation, and the research becomes an integral part of the curriculum. Thus would you have students attracted by the excitement of the atmosphere. I want to suggest, Mr. Minister, that we should have all materials of research available to students as part of their course instruction—all of the research that is presently going on.

I want to suggest that the teachers themselves should prepare intensive research papers in the course of their learning, and thus participate in the formulation of the learning process. This is a regular university procedure. This is the way you develop a maturity of mind and a sensitivity to social issues.

Finally, for the last part of this section I want to suggest there should be one, two or three specific experimental schools in Ontario, or indeed several specific experimental classes throughout schools in Ontario, for which a certain percentage of practice teaching time would be designated. The students at OCE would have the opportunity to try every single new technique in all fields, ranging from the emotionally disturbed to the slow learner, to all the areas with which the hon. Minister is far better acquainted than I. Such knowledge would then be a matter of experience rather than of chance. Such an experimenting laboratory for teachers is in fact widespread in parts of Europe and the United Kingdom.

The fourth and final suggestion I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the Ontario College of Education should become a university faculty which launches a continuous learning programme for its graduate teachers. I think it is absurd in this society that learning tends to end with one formal year or two summers at OCE, or these M.Ed. courses that you can pick up over a summer—indeed which even I could pick up over a summer. Maybe the hon. Minister in his reply will induce me to do so.

But I suggest to you that there should be some kind of a curriculum devised for year-long sabbatical leave, for intensive specialization over summers, or even specially led learning and experiment groups within the staffs of individual schools. A continued learning programme within OCE is precisely the place from which such work must derive.

There are all kinds of other modifications that are obvious, including the changing of the building, but which I shall not go into.

I think it would be a challenging and exciting development to make OCE a community of learning as a university faculty rather than isolate it as it is now with all the general dissatisfaction and attendant anxiety with which students view it. It may be that individual criticisms and ideas are not palatable.

But however much the hon. Minister is unpersuaded, this, I think, cannot be denied; that the fundamental malaise at OCE persists even now, less serious than it was in the past—but it persists. The fundamental student dissatisfaction also persists, as does the fundamental concern and anxiety within parts of the profession. And it ill behooves the hon. Minister of Education to maintain the *status quo* with only marginal amendments.

Robert Hutchins, formerly chancellor of the University of Chicago, has a series of comments he calls "On Education," and I would like to read the first paragraph into the record:

Ideal education is the one that develops intellectual power. I arrive at this conclusion by a process of elimination. Educational institutions are the only institutions that can develop intellectual power. The ideal education is not an *ad hoc* education, not an education directed to immediate needs. It is not a specialized education or a pre-professional education. It is not a utilitarian education. It is an education calculated to develop the mind.

I suggest to you that the atmosphere of the Ontario College of Education is not consistent with that fine definition of educational objectives, and I hope that some of the suggestions outlined, however moderately, find favour with the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to commend, of course, the hon. member for his statement on his views of secondary school teacher education. I was aware of his visit of course to OCE—

Mr. MacDonald: You have a good spy system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I was not only aware, I knew he was arriving.

Mr. MacDonald: Better than I thought.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For the first time this afternoon I feel my age a little bit because I can recall at least two articles similar to the one the hon. member read from the *Varsity* newspaper. The wording is not identical but it is not dissimilar. They were written in

1949, 1950 and actually there was one in 1951.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): And nothing has been done in all those years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can recall rooming with a gentleman who spent a year at OCE. We commiserated with each other pretty well every evening. I was articled at the time and not getting the intellectual experience at Osgoode Hall that I had anticipated, having spent the day searching titles for the senior with whom I was articled. Of course, my roommate had spent the day learning methodology and being treated, he felt, like something of a secondary school student. The statements and the views expressed by the hon. member really take me back just a few years.

I fully appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the concern the hon. member feels about teacher education and certainly some of the ideas that he suggests are worthy of consideration. However, I think in fairness to the institution of OCE and to the number of the people in the profession who have graduated from that institution, it would be inappropriate to say that teacher education in this province is on the verge of tottering. I am not sure that I am using the exact phraseology of the hon. member or not.

Mr. MacDonald: It has tottered.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Chairman, this is an area that gives everyone concern. I quite frankly accept the fact that the physical facilities at OCE are not of the best. Yet I know of many institutions of higher learning where the physical facilities are not even on a par with OCE, and where a great deal of academic good is accomplished. I have not personally attended either Oxford or Cambridge but my friends who have been there tell me that the surroundings are not any improvement over what you might find at OCE. I am not holding out UTS as an example of the type of school where practice teaching should be done. The great bulk of the practice teaching is in fact now done outside UTS. Nonetheless the results from that school, I think, indicate that there are a number of students who are studying in the same atmosphere or in the same physical facilities who do well when it comes to the Grades 12 or 13 examinations.

I was very interested in the last quotation from the past president—at least I think he is a past president of the University of Chicago—concerning his views on education. Of course, he always confined his views

strictly to the academic area; if memory serves me correctly he was indirectly responsible for the elimination of all athletic endeavours at that university for which he is held in very high regard in some areas, and very definitely not in others in that community. And I can also tell the hon. member that I have looked at the problem of OCE, and I have visited other teacher training institutions and jurisdictions outside this country. The problem is not necessarily similar and yet in many respects it is not dissimilar in many other jurisdictions. I have visited certain institutions in the state of California and Florida where they have perhaps a very progressive policy when it comes to certain aspects of education, and you can hear the same criticisms, the same complaints about the teacher education programme in some of those institutions.

My good wife happens to be a graduate of Michigan and some of the teacher training education centres in the United States, having taught in the state of California. I told her of the possibility of these views here this afternoon and she observed to me, "This sounds very much like the problems that they face in many teacher training institutions in our own jurisdiction." So I think, Mr. Chairman, that we must look at this very objectively. In teacher training there has to be a certain amount of instruction, I would hope, in methodology. I am not sure that you can look for a complete academic experience at any institution where the practical nature of the course must be taught. The hon. member for Brant may have some observations, in that I understand he experienced this same situation when he was attending OCE, but I can indicate to the hon. members that I am personally not content with what is going on at the Ontario College of Education, and yet at the same time, I accept some of the limitations that must be there in any type of institution that is training teachers.

But with the new Western College of Education in London, I think I should make these observations. They will not fill, of course, the requirements or the suggestion expressed by the hon. member, but he will be interested to know that a legal agreement for the joint operation of the college by the department and the university has been signed by the Minister and the president of the university. Incidentally we are considering the same type of agreement with the University of Toronto. In accordance with certain recommendations, Dr. Turner has become the dean designate; he became this on July 2 of 1963, and his appointment as full-time dean will become effective July 1 this year.

We have followed the recommendation that the new colleges should be attached to a university, which of course this will be. They should offer teacher training in a post-graduate year in order to maintain high standards and should provide opportunities for post-graduate study in conjunction with the graduate school and the university. This is also being arranged.

There should be ample facilities for practical work in the secondary schools of the vicinity and all the practice teaching will be done outside the existing facility at the new OCE in London. The applicants should not be restricted on the basis of geographic area—this was not really raised by the hon. member, but there will be no restriction on the geographic area, although we expect logically that the larger number will come from the western part of the province.

A combination of lectures, seminars and tutorials will be used for the first time in the methods of instruction. A total of 40 seminar rooms have been provided in the architectural plans. These are presently completed. And the seminar method, particularly suited to the instruction and training of graduate students in a college of education, will allow for the mature discussion of ideas and questions between members and the instructor.

An exchange of personnel between the university and the college is being arranged in addition, of course, to the placement of practising teachers for tutorial work. This arrangement will draw the university and college much closer together and will also ensure close liaison between student teachers, practising teachers and the college of education instructors.

And the hon. member will be interested in this, I am sure: Special lectures will be given by departmental officials, and these will include members from the departments of the university and by secondary school principals. We are asking them to participate in lectures, and superintendents or directors of secondary schools will also take part in the new college programme.

Offices of the inspection staff of the western division of the secondary education branch of the department have been included in the building in order to give the opportunity for a closer liaison between teacher education and secondary school inspection. We think this has obvious advantages.

The new college of education building will be equipped with many modern facilities. The cost is of some significance, \$3,600,000, which will include the equipment and furnishings. Tenders have already been called, and

completion is expected in July of 1965. We have provided for a normal capacity of 600 students, but the plans are adaptable to accommodate 800 students at slightly increased cost.

Also, we will offer professional training courses to prospective teachers of academic, commercial and technical subjects in all branches of the reorganized programme for the secondary schools.

Accommodation is planned to resemble a secondary school building, including the classrooms, library, science laboratories, rooms for special subjects and modern methods of teaching. Provision will be made for every prospective teacher to gain experience, not only in the urban composite schools but also in the rural composite schools. Staff appointments will be made by agreement between the university and the Minister on the selection of the dean, according to the procedure outlined in the agreement.

In the theoretical subjects—the hon. member will be interested in these—philosophy, psychology, administration appointments will be made to scholarly applicants with an interest in the application of their subjects to educational practice. Appointments to staff in the methods field will be made on the basis of academic command of subjects and outstanding competence in teaching in a secondary school.

The implementation of recommendations here at the OCE, of course, are now under consideration. We are considering having visiting lecturers from the university, the cross-appointment between the university and the college and an increase in the number of practice teaching schools. And we intend to provide that every student teacher will have the opportunity to gain experience in the composite schools outside the city of Toronto.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this in itself will not completely solve the problems raised by the hon. member and they are problems that will continue to be studied in the department. I would just like to mention one or two things that we are doing in teacher training at the elementary level that I think will be of some interest to indicate the thinking of the Minister and the department. We have been recently negotiating to relocate the site of the St. Catharines Teachers' College. Rather than having it in the other area of the city, we are negotiating with Brock University to see about the possibility of establishing the new teachers' college on the site on the campus. We intend to establish the Sudbury Teachers' College on the site of Laurentian University. And we have had

very unofficial discussions to do with the Peterborough Teachers' College as well.

So this whole area, Mr. Chairman, of secondary and elementary school teacher training is one that of course deserves very serious study and consideration and I think it is obvious from the remarks that I have made dealing specifically with the new OCE at Western, that while we do not perhaps go to the extent that the hon. member has suggested, certainly these moves will be welcomed by the people in the profession and I hope will attract many people to the teaching profession, who prior to this time, perhaps, had some hesitation.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, my views on this matter were stated earlier, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister if my understanding of the figures are correct when I say that approximately 700 students go to OCE in the winter course and over 3,000 take the summer course?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Including the library school, Mr. Chairman, it would be 832 students that are there now.

Mr. Nixon: How many are expected to be there this summer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, we cannot tell yet for this summer, but with OCE and the other summer schools, I would think it could be something over 4,000 to 5,000. In the summer session of 1962, the enrolment was 4,781, in 1963 it was 6,000, so I would think that it could be, just guessing at this, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 6,000 to 7,000 students for this coming year.

Mr. Nixon: Now, many of those, of course, are taking courses that would up-grade their certificates?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, this is correct.

Mr. Nixon: And special work along this line? But I think if you are going to compare the number that are actually working for a basic teacher's certificate, the ratio would be four or five to one. That is, comparing those who take their basic teacher's certificate at the summer school, with those who go to the winter session. Surely this must indicate to the hon. Minister, that some far-reaching re-thinking of this whole plan is needed. I must say I agree with the hon. member for Scarborough West's assessment of the problem and I am very interested in his suggestions to solve the problem. But I feel his suggested method for breathing life into a system which

is essentially dead, basically rests on drawing it away from the direct control of the department. But aside from that, the suggestion of allowing graduate students, or students holding university degrees, to take their teacher training in the schools themselves, with the training involving philosophy, psychology at the university level and perhaps at the undergraduate level, is one that you should examine very carefully.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I was not sure yesterday or the day before, whether the hon. member was going to suggest that perhaps the winter course programme at OCE was not really necessary in view of the success the summer course students were having.

Mr. MacDonald: It is just avoided by everybody who can.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The point is this, Mr. Chairman: You have many people coming back now, wishing to get into the profession, who have left university for a number of years, and the summer course is one way of getting them into the profession. But it also poses a very distinct problem for the type of institution, perhaps, that the hon. member for Scarborough West suggested, because as I understand it, what he is suggesting is more of a continuing sort of educational type of programme, not too dissimilar to some of the institutions south of the border, which makes it very difficult for a person, say, with even an M.A. degree, who has specialized at the university. What institution does he go to, for what period of time? Does this mean he should go back and take a two- or three-year course, or can he not receive some credit for his experience, which must be worth something in business or industry? We have many engineers today who are going back into vocational or technical streams, whose experience, I think, is invaluable. Is it wise to have a system that is so rigid that they have to take another two or three years of training?

These are the areas that are complicating the problem at the moment and this is why the summer course has certainly some validity. It is not just a case of their not wanting to go back, it is a question of economics for many of them as well.

Mr. Nixon: If I might interrupt for a moment. The summer course is not—in the hon. Minister's view—just a stopgap means of providing teachers that will be eliminated? Is it bound to be a continuing and valuable part of teacher training?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would go this far, because I do not think this situation has become crystalized, I would go this far and say that for the person who has been out in business or industry or some profession and has been acquiring certain knowledge and experience, I think it is advisable at least to consider some type of programme or course, whereby he can spend a period of time, but not necessarily the full period of time, becoming qualified on an interim or temporary basis, to instruct, certainly on the vocational side of our secondary school programme. I think we would be very unwise to eliminate this from our thinking altogether. I am not saying it is necessarily permanent and yet at the same time I would not want to suggest to you that this avenue should not be open. I think perhaps it should be.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, referring back for a moment to this preoccupation, to the point of an obsession, with methodology that the hon. member for Scarborough West referred to in the whole approach of OCE. This accurately reflects, as far as I have been able to find out, the department's approach, because I am going to remind the hon. Minister once again of something that I took up with him and other members of the department a year or so ago. The more I think about it, the more I become baffled and the more I can understand the sense of indignation, in fact, outrage, at the regulation being imposed upon teachers in our technological institutes. The proposition that a teacher in a technological institute, a lecturer in a technological institute, has to go for—I believe it is three summers—to OCE, to study methodology which he is not going to use.

Indeed, I can tell the hon. Minister of one class, where a group of them came into the class in the summertime at OCE, and the instructor came before them and started, at almost grade level, instructions as to the punctuation you put in a sentence. The class was absolutely astounded, and very quietly informed him there were three MAs in English in that class. The instructor, to his credit, was embarrassed by this and they did some revamping of the course. Now, surely, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister, even if he has to exercise arbitrary power within the department, can get rid of this kind of thing. Because you are losing good teachers.

Just let me give one more point, if I may, Mr. Chairman. I know a chap, he happened

to be a personal friend of mine years ago, who left business because he wanted to go into Ryerson, because he wanted to teach. He took a teaching job as a civil servant in the province of Ontario. Indeed, I believe he had something to do with the preparation of the book in one of the business administration classes and courses that were developed at Ryerson. He just became fed up to the teeth with this kind of thing. And he is not the kind of person who gets indignant and outraged very readily. But he wanted to do advanced study in the course he was teaching. He wanted to get more information on his course, but he was compelled to go back for three summers, Mr. Chairman, and waste them at OCE.

You know what happened, he just left. He went to an institution of higher learning that was beyond secondary level and was not going to treat him like a grade school pupil, let alone teacher. He has left and you will never get him back again.

Now it is this kind of thing, and I cite this not just as an instance *per se*, but as an indication of the kind of approach. If the hon. Minister is very anxious to comment on that, I have one other pedestrian point in relation to it afterwards.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I recall, I think the hon. member used the same example last year and I recall it now and I did some checking and you will be interested to know that actually there will be a staff member from Ryerson in the structural programme in the summer course this year and that the staff people at Ryerson have assisted now in the designing of the summer course, the programme for the Ryerson instructors. This might be of interest to you.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the question, the pedestrian point I wanted to raise with the hon. Minister is that I had a letter—this may fall within this estimate, maybe it is outside; perhaps the hon. Minister would permit me to put it to him—from a person who is teaching in some of our institutions of higher learning. He is going to become a civil servant. Let me just quote from the letter:

I have just discovered at that time that the regulations required that civil servants must be Canadian citizens or British subjects to be eligible for permanent appointment. Apart from the obvious discriminatory aspect of this, it hits us directly since we must rely on other countries to provide us with qualified teachers.

In other words, in many of these institutions where you are having difficulty getting qualified teachers now, when you do get them, you find that you have this regulation that they cannot become a permanent appointee because they are not a British subject, or a Canadian citizen. Why this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think this also applies in the United States. I am not sure that I can give the hon. member any reason from our department standpoint. This is an area, I guess, for the civil service and yet, perhaps, referring to the way we might solve this, it could be with the proposal we have now. As far as vocational teachers are concerned, in our new vocational centres we are hiring them on the basis of being outside the civil service, so this would not apply. But this raises a very interesting point. I shall try to get a more definite answer for the hon. member. It is something that certainly has not affected the department to date. But it is one that might unless we were to bring them in under the other provision that we are attempting to introduce. I shall endeavour to find out.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Nipissing has allowed me just to make two or three minor observations on this field before we move on.

I would like to say to the hon. Minister that three things are on my mind. First, because problems are the same in other jurisdictions, I am sure he agrees that it does not invalidate the need for a solution in this one. In fact, because problems are the same in various generations—I smile when I say that—it does not invalidate the principle.

Now, two more substantive observations: First, I appreciate what is being done with the new college of education associated with the University of Western Ontario. I appreciate that some of the ideas may apply to Toronto. But two of the fundamental suggestions I put to the hon. Minister, I suggest, are not being regarded. The one—and I want to go back to the hon. member for York South because he re-emphasized it—is that this preoccupation with methods is driving people away from the teaching field.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made his point. There is nothing in what he said about the new college of education in London that indicates there will be a preoccupation with methods or methodology.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister concedes the point?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not conceding any point. I am just saying there is nothing in what I said that indicates there will be a preoccupation with methods at Western.

Mr. MacDonald: That Osgoode training stands by the hon. Minister well.

Mr. S. Lewis: There is nothing in what the hon. Minister said that indicates there will not be a preoccupation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I think there is. I think there is, Mr. Chairman, if one wants to look closely at what I suggested: That one of the reasons for increased costs will be the plan for tutorial instruction at the new OCE and Western. This, hon. members will recall, is one of the basic principles in the secondary school teacher training report.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not try to defend the indefensible while—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, no.

Mr. S. Lewis: I will withdraw that with the quiet and closing observation that the reason I put it rather strongly, Mr. Chairman, was that most educationists in the field are beginning, like a man such as Conant, to question the whole concept. He says in the part of his theory and practice of teachers chapter:

I conclude therefore that such general method courses are unnecessary and duplicate materials already studied.

The other thing I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman: I would like to have explained to me why it is that in fields of philosophy, psychology, and so on, those who will be involved in the teaching should have good academic qualification and outstanding competence in teaching in secondary schools. Those are the hon. Minister's words.

What kind of emphasis is there with an educational system that provides the teaching of these areas from people in secondary school education? Surely in the areas of educational philosophy, and so on, the teachers should be provided from the university area. This, I think, is one of the things that worried us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Obviously these instructors will have had university degrees and experience. I think it is obvious, too—and this is where the hon. member and I may have some disagreement—that there may be some slight difference in the educational philosophy that you want to impart, or the

attitude you may have with the Grade 9 student than what you might have with, say, a second- or third-year university student, because you are dealing with different people. And I think it is quite important that you accept or realize this. A person with secondary school experience, a competent person who specializes in the field of psychology or philosophy, could quite conceivably do a much better task working with these prospective teachers than could a person who is academically orientated at the university level, with this being his sole experience. Now, I just offer this as a suggestion.

Mr. S. Lewis: Okay, I accept it in the spirit in which it is offered. But it does not tend to conform to most of the attitudes that I have read—no one denies there has to be some practical aspect, but that is gained through the practice teaching. To suggest that certain fields, so obviously within the ken of a university milieu and a community of learning, should be delivered to the students at a lower level makes no sense to me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, is the hon. member suggesting—I do not want to labour this point—that a person who is a graduate from the institution of higher learning with his doctorate, say, in psychology or philosophy, and because he spent two or three years in the secondary school field, is not competent to do this type of task because he is no longer a professor lecturing at the university? I do not think this makes too much sense, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: I agree. Is the hon. Minister saying that throughout the experience of OCE the people who have done the philosophy of education courses—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are talking about the proposals for the OCE at the University of Western Ontario—

Mr. S. Lewis: All right. What about the one in Toronto? Is the hon. Minister saying, then that the people who are in charge of the psychology-philosophy and history of education courses at the new OCE will be doctorate people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh? The hon. Minister did not say that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I said they would be as competent as we can find.

Mr. S. Lewis: I imagine that our—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member may have his doctorate by then and wish to lecture there.

An hon. member: If he does, will the hon. Minister give him a job?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: I hope to be around a little longer than—

Hon. Mr. Davis: But not in political philosophy.

Mr. S. Lewis: I appreciate that.

One other question, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask, finally, why this distinction in the hon. Minister's mind, or the need in his mind to have the ambivalence of control from the department and the university? Why does he not see justification for bringing an institute or faculty of education within a university environment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is an area where we could spend a great deal of time in theory and so on. I think the only thing I can say to the hon. member is that with this new agreement with the University of Western Ontario, and one that we are considering with the University of Toronto, it is obvious that we are establishing a closer relationship than we have had in the past with the universities.

I think that the hon. member feels we should immediately move into this area. There are problems involved; the question of teacher certification for example. Is the hon. member suggesting that this be taken away from the control of The Department of Education? I think this becomes a very basic situation and one which, quite frankly, I doubt whether we will settle here this afternoon, or in several weeks.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I also, as the hon. member for York South, take a pedestrian approach to this. The president of the Ontario Federation of Teachers, or the former president, is quoted as saying: "Ontario is lagging behind other provinces in the improvement of elementary teacher training." He brings out the point that the minimum should be three years university training and he suggests The Department of Education establish a committee to investigate possible improvements. I presume that will be one of the jobs of the committee that the hon. Minister has now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is right. The committee the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Troy: Fine. And then I note, too, at the Canadian Conference of Education—which, of course, also includes educators and professional men from other walks of life and trustees from all across the country—it was certainly their recommendation, or at least it was agreed, that teaching was the work of a professional. It is a professional task and therefore should have at least a minimum of a university degree, both in the elementary and secondary schools.

Now, with reference to a subject that is peculiar to my own area. It involves the North Bay Teachers' College, one of those relics, at least in construction, of the past. Not in construction by its teachers, but in construction. I wonder when, Mr. Chairman, may we have an addition at least to that institution so that the hon. Minister's programme of physical education, the fitness programme, could be carried out properly in that school. That is one thing they need and there is a desperate need for accommodation. One of the teachers on the staff who has been in charge of that programme through the years, is doing an exceptionally fine job, but the difficulties are quite severe.

I might also ask whether in September, 1963, while the students at the North Bay Teachers' College were enrolling, a report from Sudbury disclosed that the public school board was entirely dissatisfied with the physical facilities of the college? The chairman of the board said they would move a strong representation to the provincial government for a new building. The principal of the college said naturally his staff, and certainly the students that go there, do appreciate the interest shown by the Sudbury board and that everybody would be in favour of facilities.

Then later, I believe when the hon. Minister was in the city during a certain occasion last summer, I believe the possibility of moving that college from North Bay to Sudbury was mentioned. He, at that time I recall and I think correctly, said that the institution would remain in the city of North Bay, that it would be the institution for the training of English teachers, and the college in Sudbury would be bilingual.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I made this statement, Mr. Chairman. The position today is the same as it was then. We have no intention of moving it from North Bay.

Mr. Troy: Well, that is fine. Has the hon. Minister any intention now, or in the future,

of adding either a new building or at least to add that facility?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have the intention in the future of adding to the existing building some facility to improve the physical education, and some classroom facility accommodation to the teachers' college at North Bay.

Mr. Troy: Yes, sir, but that is the same thing I—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the hon. member asked me in the future.

Mr. Troy: Yes, I know, but the hon. Minister realizes that he has a programme in his department of physical education. He is emphasizing fitness and amateur sports, and this has gone on for years. All they can do is go to the picture show and see "Tom Jones" or one of those.

An hon. member: What do they do there?

Mr. Troy: I will leave it to you, you are just young.

An hon. member: You are past that age, eh, Leo?

Mr. Troy: Yes.

I still urge the hon. Minister that he look at it very, very carefully.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the young hon. member for Scarborough West. My memories of OCE, Mr. Chairman, go back many, many years. I know there were some frustrations but fortunately at that time—I was a member of a class in which most of the men were all veterans who had just returned from overseas—we had ways of getting rid of our frustrations very quickly. I assure you I have memories of some of the professors there that I will carry with me into my declining years.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister announced the personnel of the committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have not, Mr. Chairman. I expect I will be announcing this within a matter of a very few days. The groups that are appointing representatives to this committee are now beginning to turn in their suggestions. The appointees from the department—the ones that we are directly responsible for—we shall have in a matter of days.

Vote 505 agreed to.

Vote 506 agreed to.

On vote 507:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this vote, of course, covers quite a variety of services. And there is one that I would like to make a brief comment on at the moment, and that is the correspondence courses which the department has been providing for a good many years and which according to the figures I have seen are growing in popularity. I have put forward the proposition on previous occasions in this House, and I would like to put it before this new Minister, that the department should do more to make the public aware that these courses are available. I realize that the public is sufficiently aware that the department has trouble keeping up with the growth of demand. Even so, the courses offered are, in my opinion, so much superior to those offered by private institutions, and the courses the department offers are free in most cases whereas those offered by the private institutions cost considerable money, so that I think the public should know that these courses are available.

Everything possible should be done to encourage people who want to repair gaps in their education to know that they can do it in this inexpensive way under the guidance of what I would judge are highly qualified instructors. I think the department should do some advertising of its correspondence courses. I periodically read advertisements in the paper quoting some harassed young man, shall we say, saying, "I got my senior matric in six weeks." Well, I do not know, he may have got his senior matric in six weeks but it is very doubtful if he got an education. He got some sort of a cram course. I think the department's correspondence courses offer the opportunity of an education.

I would like to commend the department on these courses. They started in a small way, I think for the benefit of people in remote areas. They are now becoming a useful instrument in dealing with the whole problem of upgrading skills and education which the advance of our society makes necessary. I think the government should go out on a real campaign to encourage more people to take these courses, to make them aware that they exist, to create in people an awareness that they may need them. Of course, that means that they will have to increase substantially the facilities available and I know they have been increasing rapidly over the years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very good suggestion. We have

started in a limited way to make this more available, or certainly to publicize it to the public. We want at the same time to keep a very high quality in the course, which I think we have succeeded in doing to date. We have since April, a year ago now almost to the date, 7,700 students, and it is interesting to note that 69 per cent of those who wrote their Grade 13 through correspondence courses last year succeeded in passing. I can assure the hon. member that it is our intention to make the fact that these courses are available more widely known to the people, because I think this is a very excellent way of upgrading some people who left school either too early or for some other reason. I accept this suggestion from the hon. member for Woodbine. He will not object in the estimates next year if we have a certain amount in for publicity?

Mr. Bryden: No, not a bit, as long as Dalton Camp does not get any of it.

Mr. Nixon: In this connection I wonder if the hon. Minister or anyone in his department takes any responsibility for investigating the courses that are offered and promoted through ads referred to by my hon. friend with headings such as, "Getting my matric was easy," and comparing them with the matriculation of The Department of Education. I just wonder if he has taken a look at these courses.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we do not police these, Mr. Chairman. It may be becoming a bit of a problem and one that we might consider, because I personally know one or two people who were initially misled by these. When they arrived at the institution they realized that this was not quite what it should be, but there is nothing in our Acts or regulations that gives us any power to investigate this. We do over trade schools, but these other institutions are perhaps an area that we should take a look at.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, as you may know, the Ontario School for the Blind, which is situated in Brant county, has students from every part of Canada and has earned a very worthwhile and valued reputation. The government is presently extending the facilities there as far as the dormitories are concerned and we are very pleased that this is so.

But I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Education that the salary scales for the staff of the Ontario School for the Blind are very seriously out of date. I understand that reclassification was

to have taken place there many months ago. The salaries were improved for the upper echelon on the staff, and indications were given to the remaining members of the staff that their salaries would be raised, too, along the lines of the new classification with their pay being retroactive to a date that was given to them at that time. I understand that when their salaries are changed, there will be retroactive pay coming to them for 18 months.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education if he is aware of the fact that these schedules are getting seriously out of date and that this seems to be a criticism that is directed to many departments of the government, and as a matter of fact, the whole civil service. The service is losing confidence in its employers, and certainly we in the Legislature are very conscious of this and concerned.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to tell the hon. member at the moment about the question of this being retroactive. I can get this information for him. We are of the impression that the basic salaries are adequate to attract staff. I think where the problem is is with the maxima. It is possible—and I put this in the area of a possibility—that the thought we have come up with for staffing the vocational centres by offering a yearly contract similar to that offered by a school board might. This might be extended into our other teaching-type institutions. Now whether this will come about, I do not know but this is something that is under study.

Mr. Nixon: There is a definite feeling among some members of the staff that they would not stay there except for the indication that they are going to get these raises, and that everything is in the works and has been for many months and they are getting a bit tired waiting.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will look into this, Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with this.

Mr. Nixon: I would appreciate it, if you would.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I shall let the hon. member know.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to bring to the attention of the House and again to the hon. Minister, a situation that I know that he is aware of. Yet since it has become public and in the newspapers, I feel it should be raised again in this House. It has to do with the situation at the Ontario

School for the Deaf in Belleville, and particularly the complaint of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Fisher, who live in St. Catharines. According to this newspaper report they have withdrawn from the school at Belleville two of their children, Bruce, 19, and David, 9, and they say that these two boys developed serious illnesses after being released from the school's infirmary. Until they are satisfied that services have improved they say they will keep Bruce and another of their children, Marilyn, out of the school. The Fishers claim, and I am now reading from the newspaper report:

—that David was treated at the school for an upset stomach in late 1960; he came home at Christmas and it was found that he had developed Bright's disease and the youngster spent six weeks in St. Catharines General Hospital.

Now the story is considerably longer than that and I will not read it all to the House. Really the main reason why I felt that it should be raised in the House was that after it had become public knowledge and printed in the newspapers, a constituent of my own phoned and said that their family had experienced a similar difficulty when the boy concerned, who was, and I believe still is, a student at the School for the Deaf at Belleville, had been hospitalized there—that is put into the hospital at the Belleville school itself. The reports they received at home were that he was coming along well, and evidently enjoying television and this sort of thing. But when he did arrive home following this hospitalization they were so concerned about his condition that they took him to their own doctor and he was immediately hospitalized with a serious ulcer condition.

Now this particular boy—and I am not free to divulge his name but I would be glad to give it to the hon. Minister privately—is still in the hospital and the parents concerned were of the opinion that the school is well run down there, and they are aware of the fact that a general practitioner is available, but these young children, many of them who cannot speak as well as being hard of hearing, should perhaps have available the service of a pediatrician; one who might more readily recognize the symptoms that evidently have been missed in at least these two cases.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into the case that the hon. member raises. I have a letter here from an individual who read of this case or heard of it on the television, I guess, and who wrote to me that I would be quite free to use his name and commending the superintendent

and the staff at the school, saying what a very excellent job they are doing and how careful they had been in regard to the health and welfare of his son when he was at the school. The part that I find most difficult to accept in the case that the hon. member raises is the fact that the parents have taken out these two children from the school. I can see no purpose or reason in this because there is no reason for the future of the children to be influenced. I think the hon. member is aware of the parents' attitude and their feeling towards the school. I am not sure really what they expect the department or the government to do.

I met with them, as the hon. member knows, myself. We had this matter investigated; and while I will certainly take under consideration the suggestion of the hon. member, the people who looked into this matter felt that there was a very adequate form of medical service available at this school and this is certainly substantiated by the letter that I have with me this afternoon. It is something, Mr. Chairman, that I question that we should go into in any detail as far as the Fisher case is concerned. I do not know what purpose would be served other than to say that the superintendent and, of course, the department are very concerned that we do maintain a very high medical standard there. We are interested in the welfare of these students. The school is providing, as the hon. member knows, a very excellent service and it is regrettable that this matter should be raised, I think.

I am not suggesting the hon. member should not do so, but it is unfortunate that these children in the Fisher family perhaps are suffering in their education because of this.

Mr. Nixon: If I might just continue, Mr. Chairman, I would say that it is regrettable particularly that these young people are not having the advantage of the continuation of their excellent education. I would repeat that the only reason I did raise it was that a second case came to my attention, and I must also repeat that in the second case there was no complaint with the administration of the school whatsoever. The suggestion was there simply that the services of a pediatrician might well be expected in these circumstances.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, through you, I would ask the hon. Minister to recall that a few weeks ago during this session I handed to him a piece of correspondence, signed by the secretary of the Hamilton Association for the Deaf and Hard

of Hearing. I believe the correspondence asked for consideration in financial assistance towards a building project for pre-school training. I feel that probably the fact that I did not get an answer was maybe an oversight. I wonder if the hon. Minister would make some comment in regard to the request?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this request is still being considered and quite frankly it is one of those areas where we, if we were to undertake it, would be under some miscellaneous type of grant; we cannot do this as a matter of any policy because these are being done, as you know, through the local boards. Actually I attempted to see the hon. member about this some two weeks ago in hopes of arranging perhaps for these people to come over here, and as I recall the hon. member had been away two or three days.

I was anxious to meet with this group to see if we could find some other way perhaps of resolving their financial problem, and if the hon. member wishes to arrange this I will be happy to meet with them.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before we leave vote 507, there is another matter I would like to raise and I think it probably comes under this vote, and that is the question of emotionally disturbed children. At least I can see no other vote where it would appropriately belong.

Not long ago the Ontario Association for Emotionally Disturbed Children presented a brief to the hon. Minister, I believe, and sent copies to other hon. members of the Legislature. It raised a number of matters that appear to me to be quite important, and I would like to find out, if I can, what the views of the hon. Minister and the department are on some of the questions raised.

In essence, the brief indicated that, as I see it, the majority of emotionally disturbed children are not discovered or, at any rate, are not discovered soon enough. Their brief has a quotation—I thought it was this brief had a quotation on it—I guess it was not this one. It was some other document I read. At any rate, it was to the effect that if you scratch an acorn, it will show itself in the oak and if you scratch a child it will reveal itself ultimately in the warped personality of an adult.

The concern of this brief quite properly is that the evidence of emotional distress or developing emotional stress should be noted as early as possible and that the children

concerned should be given the proper kind of training and treatment to head off the situation before it reveals itself in an adult who may become an alcoholic or may have to go to a mental hospital or who may end up in jail.

The brief also get across the point that when disturbed children are discovered it is frequently possible to deal with them right within the regular school system so that we would not necessarily be involved in huge costs of building special types of facilities.

There will, perhaps, be an increase in the cost of regular school facilities but it would not be the kind of additional cost that would be required from building special institutions. Therefore, there is all the more reason for trying to discover these problems early, and then, when they are discovered, doing something about them, particularly under the regular school system.

There is one paragraph of the brief on page

seven that I would like to read into the record, Mr. Chairman. I quote:

The above information emphasizes the following points in the association's opinion:

(1) the small proportion of emotionally disturbed children who are discovered by the customary method of referral;

(2) the fact that, generally, referrals are made only when the child's condition has become critical or his behaviour something of marked anxiety; in other words, he must have done something alarming before he is drawn to the attention of the authorities concerned; and

(3) of the small group discovered, a marked number are not treated anyway.

Mr. Chairman: It being six of the clock, I do now leave the chair and will resume at eight of the clock.

It being six o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 30, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Thursday, April 30, 1964

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	2659
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2690

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

On vote 507:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, at the supper recess I was in the process of referring to a brief that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) had received from the Ontario Association for Emotionally Disturbed Children. I had read some extracts from that brief, indicating that only a small number of cases of emotionally disturbed children are discovered early enough, and that even when they are discovered, frequently nothing is done about them.

Now, I would like to refer to one or two other portions of this brief, Mr. Chairman. On page nine, the brief quotes from two authorities in California as follows:

When at comparative ease, these children often display their true mental capacities. Many are quite brilliant, and often have even unusual abilities in certain fields . . . to be sure, it may be impossible at times to teach, or get through to the child, but at other times if he wants information or wishes to learn something, he learns it rapidly.

Then a little later, the brief quotes from a statement from the California State Department of Education:

Children with emotional handicaps who are identified early in their school life can be helped most economically and effectively by a variety of educational procedures, including (a) special classes; (b) providing the children's regular class teachers, special teachers, and counsellors with consultation services by a psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker; (c) providing opportunities for children who cannot attend school to receive adequate educational services at home or in the hospital.

Then after a further review of the problem, Mr. Chairman, which I think I have fairly well summarized already, the association makes certain specific recommendations to

the hon. Minister, five in all, and perhaps he would be willing to indicate to the House what his views are on each of these recommendations and what the possibilities are that action will be taken. For the information of hon. members I will read each one of them in turn.

1. That The Education Act be changed to make provision for special education by the board of education compulsory, instead of optional as it now is.

Would the hon. Minister care to indicate what his position is on that recommendation?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I should tell the hon. member that we met with this group, as he knows, and discussed this with them in some detail. Subsequent to this, one of their weekly or monthly news letters came out—perhaps the hon. member has not received this—indicating that they were at least partially satisfied or pleased with the discussion and the progress that was being made.

In dealing with the first item, they also referred to the same quotation that came from the state of California and we had a rather pleasant discussion, at which time I think they acknowledged that, while in theory these sentiments were being expressed, in practice there was not a great deal being accomplished in that jurisdiction in this particular area.

But as far as The Education Act being changed to make it compulsory is concerned, Mr. Chairman, this is not advisable at the present time because—and the group themselves would, I think, admit this—there is not a sufficient supply at the present time of properly qualified teachers. As the hon. member knows, there is already provision for operating classes for these children, under the local boards and there is financial assistance from the department for approved classes. But there is not a sufficient supply of teachers and until this is the case, then I think it is obvious that we cannot make this compulsory under The Education Act.

I should also point out that there are certain financial implications here, in that—at least this is what they suggest to us—a good

teacher probably could only handle between eight and ten students, rather than perhaps the 25 that would be handled in the normal class, so that it does impose further financial obligations on the board. This is the reason why this first recommendation would not be practicable at this present time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, that perhaps leads to the second recommendation, namely:

2. That The Department of Education assume leadership in helping local boards of education to provide educational opportunity for emotionally disturbed children.

Perhaps I should go through all five of them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Actually they are related.

Mr. Bryden: Yes.

3. That such children be educated, as far as it is possible, in the same school as the apparently normal child, instead of, or in preference to, there being set up separate institutions for them;

4. That The Department of Education foster the setting up of machinery necessary for reliably discovering (a) the number of emotionally disturbed children in the province, and (b) the educable percentage of such children; and

5. That in special remote areas, or other areas where the local school board cannot provide for emotionally disturbed children, The Department of Education assume greater responsibility for the education of such children.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we are all sympathetic to this problem. There are some obviously practical difficulties. As far as the third recommendation is concerned, I think we would all accept the fact that these classes, if at all possible, should be conducted within the regular school programme and that the children should not be separated the way they are. With the trainable retarded I think this is a different situation. In fact in discussing this with other people and the officials of the department, actually there are some of these children who might benefit from, say, short periods in this type of class and who should be spending the balance of the time in a regular classroom atmosphere.

As far as providing leadership in the development of staff, the hon. member will be pleased to learn that we are going to have a course in the summer of 1965. It is not possible to have it for this summer. We shall have a course in the summer of 1965 for the training of teachers for these types of classes.

Now, the other recommendation, that the department seek out these people in the more remote areas. Of course this is desirable but I think the hon. member realizes the practical difficulties of doing it, the problems of finding out just who these children are. It would take a rather extensive staff to do this properly and I think to be quite frank about it, this particular part of their proposal or suggestion, is still some time in the future. But as for the balance of it, I think we are moving in the right direction. The main problem is the provision of staff and this we are going perhaps to accelerate, if this is the proper terminology, by the introduction of the summer course in 1965.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, what about the other rather large problem that the association referred to, that is the problem of discovering or identifying these children? Great stress was laid and I think with much sense, that the important thing is to discover them as early as possible, so that they can receive such special treatment as may be available before their disturbance proceeds too far.

Now the brief pointed out that there really is nobody—nobody really knows how many emotionally disturbed children or potentially disturbed children there are in the province or in the country and that a great many of these cases proceed to quite an advanced stage before they are discovered. Are there any facilities—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we are in the process of doing a study on this now. It is a very difficult thing and some of the boards, I am not sure I am correct in this, but I believe Etobicoke is doing this and they have people available to assist us and I think Scarborough has as well. I may be wrong in the latter board, but we are conducting a survey now to see if we can determine the percentage of pupils affected so that we may know what we are dealing with. This survey is being conducted by the department.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, I noticed with some interest that there has been a small increase in the budget this year for guidance, something over \$8,000 in a budget of \$102,400. I have some serious doubts as to whether we are giving this subject either the funds or the importance in the department that it deserves. This facet of education is a comparatively new one. It is one that I did not run into when I went to school, but it is one which has become increasingly more important with

the advent of the Robarts plan and will become even more important in the future.

This screening plan that we have now is in the process of revolutionizing our secondary school system and has shown a great deal of promise in the short time since its inception. But this plan is a very complex one to most adults, and it must be even more confusing to students preparing to leave the primary schools, or the students already in the primary schools who find that they are in an unsuitable course and wish to change to another one more in keeping with their particular ability.

I would like to quote a few words from the hon. Minister's remarks. He said:

The holding power of our schools must be increased through the offering of a sufficient variety of courses to appeal to the different interests, abilities and aptitudes of the student population, and second, to ensure efficient utilization of our human resources, everything possible will have to be done to provide every student with as much education and training as he is capable of effectively absorbing.

Then he goes on to say:

The reorganization of the secondary school programme is in the three branches (1) arts and science, (2) business and commerce, and (3) science, technology and trade. In each of these there is a five-year programme completed in Grade 13 and leading to institutions of higher learning, and a four-year programme which gives a good general education but which does not lead to university. There is also provision for one-year and two-year occupational courses for students who have limited academic abilities and interests and who are preparing for almost immediate employment. These diversified occupational programmes, I may say at this point, are meeting the learning pace of about 10,000 boys and girls this year. Last year the number was around 5,000 and it is predicted that in a few years it will be over 20,000. If we add to this the growing enrolment of special vocational schools, we find that the number in these occupational programmes will be well over 30,000.

I would also like to quote from *The Nature of Guidance* an article on "Education for All American Youth." It says here that:

Guidance is no mechanical process whereby counsellors and teachers sort out our boys and girls as a grading machine sorts apples, this one to stay on the farm, that one to work in an airplane factory,

this one to be a teacher, that one to run a local garage.

Guidance is rather the high art of helping boys and girls to plan their own actions wisely in the full light of all the facts that can be mustered about themselves and about the world in which they will work and live.

Guidance is not limited to vocational matters. It includes the whole gamut of life's problems. Guidance, moreover, is not confined to the secondary schools. Good education from the earliest grades onward includes guidance from understanding teachers, principals and counsellors.

I think we will see from these quotes, Mr. Chairman, that it is quite obvious that the success of this plan hinges on the guidance these students receive from the guidance teachers who channel them into the most suitable stream.

Here we have the weak link, the Achilles' heel of the plan, for we are simply not obtaining enough of the right people in our guidance system. There are many applicants but too many of them are people who are not properly qualified and too few are those who could really do a job in guidance.

I suggested that perhaps there should be more money in the budget for guidance and while that might be helpful to some degree, what is really needed is a programme encouraging qualified people to enter this field. Guidance is still not a major subject, Mr. Chairman, at the Ontario College of Education, and I submit it should be in order to give the subject the importance it deserves.

An ambitious teacher has now many more advantages for advancement in almost any other subject. History, physics, mathematics and physical education all rate higher, and down near the bottom of the scale we find guidance. The department does not seem to encourage this field to the degree that it should. Good guidance teachers feel they are being discriminated against. Very few of them, if any, are accepted by the department for the principal's course and so it is to be expected that a good many prospects seek other fields in education, knowing that they can go on to higher-paid administrative positions.

I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Education that the department should take a long look at this subject of guidance. As can be seen from his remarks, there are going to be more and more students channelling into these various courses and if we do not have the proper guidance teachers to guide them along their way and show

them which course they should take, we are going to have a great many failures.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with some of the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat. Yesterday I discussed this subject, guidance, in a general statement. I hope that the guidance itself will be extended into the elementary schools because it is my opinion that that is the area where the need is greatest.

I can remember that some of my friends went into the guidance branch of their schools and I asked them how they were getting on. They said it was really wonderful in guidance. You could be dashing around corridors with a few papers or a folder in your hand and did not have to report to anybody. They could be quite busy just carrying around papers. But seriously though, it is a very important branch of the educational system as the chief director very well knows and I am certain that the hon. Minister does.

I agree with the hon. member for—excuse me, I have to get some guidance myself—I agree with the hon. member for Scarborough Centre wholeheartedly that more money should be channelled into that particular branch. It is most important.

I was at the Canadian Conference of Education and that was a point that was stressed in all the branches, I think, that met at that conference—the necessity for proper guidance. As I said before, not only must the boy or the girl be guided or given direction to what courses they are going to take but the most important thing is that the parents also be brought into the picture. I say if there is any branch that needs further support it is that particular branch of the field.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have just one or two observations. I think I have already stated in my remarks on two or three occasions that we recognize the importance of guidance and that more has to be done.

I would like to point out to the hon. member for Nipissing that 40 per cent of those taking the summer courses last year were in the elementary field. This is an encouraging sign. I should point out to the hon. member for Scarborough Centre that one reason we have problems with procuring appropriate people for guidance is in fact that we do lose a number of them to the vice-principal's and to the principal's courses. He would be surprised that this percentage from guidance is probably as high relatively as from any field in the profession.

I should also perhaps point out that this is the area, too, where I think the local board can do much to help improve the guidance services. Certainly salary is one way and taking a genuine interest in the guidance programme within the schools under its control. I think this is one area in particular where boards can, perhaps, exert a little greater influence than they have in some areas. But I would acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, that there is still much ground to be covered in relation to guidance. It is becoming increasingly important but, as the hon. member for Nipissing so properly observed, the ultimate decision for the future career of the child must rest with the parents themselves.

Mr. Troy: May I repeat what I heard so often in Montreal, particularly from those who represent the labour council, that the guidance teachers should have some knowledge of the world of work. Of course, work can mean many things to many people. I think that most of the people there knew something about the work world, maybe not in the particular connotation that the others had, but that was the point they stressed. I presume they meant they should know something about the opportunities in industry.

Mr. Peck: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be reassured by the hon. Minister of Education that there is a high percentage of these people going into the principal's course and becoming vice-principals and principals. I think this is a very encouraging sign and that these people, when they are principals, will recognize the value of guidance. But I made the remark that very few of them were taking the principal's course.

Although I have no figures to go from, and do not know the guidance people from all over the country, I do happen to have a few friends who are in that field. It seems to be a bone of contention with them that they have put in applications for the principal's course and they did not know of any of their particular acquaintances that had been received into the course. They felt that perhaps their particular branch was being discriminated against.

Vote 507 agreed to.

On vote 508:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I take it that departmental examinations come under vote 508. Am I correct in that?

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I am somewhat concerned about what I have heard about Grade 13 examinations, or senior

matriculation examinations as they used to be called. There is a group of high school students from my constituency sitting in the gallery and I have no doubt I could make myself very popular by saying I am in favour of abolishing examinations altogether. I am not sure that I want to go that far, but I have grave doubts about the efficacy of the Grade 13 examination as it now exists and as I understand it. I raised the matter in the public accounts committee with the departmental officials concerned. What I heard there has induced me to raise the matter now with the hon. Minister himself.

The specific example I took related to history exams. I have been told by history teachers who have been engaged in the marking of history exams at the Grade 13 level that the procedure is simply that the examiner ticks off points the student makes in his answer to a question. If he gets 15 points—if that is the predetermined number he should have and those 15 points happen all to be in the textbook he has been studying he will get full marks for the answer.

But if he happens to have a more inquiring type of mind and has read beyond the textbook; and knows more than is in the textbook to the point where he may have a somewhat different approach than the textbook has taken, and therefore may attach less significance to some of the textbook points than some of his more conforming associates do, he will be penalized. The person who really wants to study and understand is crazy if he carries that propensity into the examination room.

The important thing in the examination room is to know the things that have been decreed from above and make sure he spews those out on the examination paper. This, I say, I have been assured is the case by teachers who have been engaged in the examination process. When I referred to the matter briefly in the public accounts committee, nothing was said there to lead me to believe I was wrong. I would like to know if that is correct. And if it is, does the hon. Minister consider it is a good system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I was not at the public accounts committee. As I understood the ground rules of the public accounts committee, they were to seek out the financing and the accounting problems of The Department of Education. But I gathered from some reports that some of the discussions went further afield than the actual financial problems.

Mr. Bryden: Only occasionally.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, only occasionally. Just at every meeting. But as far as this question is concerned, I can assure the hon. member that when the marking scheme was established and when these papers are marked, the student is, in fact, given credit for outside reading. There is no question about this whatsoever.

Mr. Bryden: Well, in such a monumental project as the conduct of the Grade 13 examinations, with pupils from all across the province, how does one ensure some sort of uniformity of marking procedures? If a student uses his originality, it will to a certain degree be a matter of opinion by the marker as to whether he has shown true originality, or simply is talking around the subject.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I gather from the question there are marking plans that are prepared for the markers. But I gather from the initial question, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member was proposing the hypothesis that the student might answer the question correctly from the regular course, and then add his own embellishments to it; and since there are only so many marks for a question it is obvious that if he achieves 15 out of 15 in the regular or routine part of it that he cannot be given a bonus. At the same time, if he indicates that he has achieved a marked degree of success in the particular question, but perhaps not the full amount, and he goes beyond this and shows he has done some outside reading, there is some validity to what the hon. member is suggesting, that the student be given credit for that.

Mr. Bryden: I understood that if he did not have points, say it was 15 points that the god who wrote that book laid down, he would not get 15 marks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would assume, Mr. Chairman, if he was asked when was the War of 1812 fought, and he said 1810 because he read it somewhere else, that obviously he is not going to get full marks. If he is asked a question, he has to give the appropriate answer. But if he goes beyond this and indicates some other thinking, and some outside reading, then he is given some credit. But I think it is only proper to assume he should be expected to give the correct answer first if it is at all possible.

Mr. Bryden: Well, what is the correct answer? And why?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): 1812!

Mr. Bryden: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Grade 13 examinations are not as simple-minded as the hon. Minister's example. I would hope that if the War of 1812 is a matter of inquiry on a Grade 13 examination, the student would not be asked when it occurred. He might be asked something relating to the causes, if we want to call them that, leading up to the War of 1812.

What were the issues involved in the War of 1812? This is very much a matter of opinion. Many authorities will give you many different interpretations. I have no doubt the author of the textbook has to give one interpretation, pretty well, and that is his interpretation. He is entitled to make it. But the thing I am concerned about is that we should create in the student the notion that that is the revealed truth, that the interpretation given in that textbook is the sum and substance of what you have to know about it.

That, sir, I am assured, is what happens, and I admit that when there are thousands of papers to mark some sort of uniform standards have to be maintained. It is a difficult thing to avoid. But it certainly is discouraging to true education, to a true spirit of inquiry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I have already told the hon. member this is not the case. I think it is obvious if he were asked a question and he were to state that according to the teacher or the authorized text, or the text that has been studied, these would be the causes of such and such a situation. But if in his further reading he came to the opinion that maybe something else transpired, well then I think he would have very adequately covered both sides of the problem and certainly would be given full credit. But I think it is quite obvious that he also has to give some indication that he knew what he was talking about as far as the prescribed course is concerned. There is a degree of flexibility and these students are given credit.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I read recently in the midst of all the discussions about machines taking over the functions of the departments of education; even to the extent, I understand, that in Florida a machine collates the results and determines whether or not a student has passed. If he has passed it sends a letter of congratulations to him which is signed "The Machine." I think that is an example the hon. Minister himself is reputed to have given.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not go quite that far, Mr. Chairman. I do not recall the letter of congratulations.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I read that about letters of congratulations. Perhaps we could solve a lot of problems if the computer answered the questions, too. But in the midst of all the discussion that has appeared in the press recently I noted a comment by somebody to the effect that about 30 per cent of the Grade 13 examination questions now are in the form of what are usually described as objective questions. The person who made this comment made it in the context of suggesting that a good deal of the marking could be done by a machine. Is that a fact? Do objective questions form that large a proportion of the examinations at the Grade 13 level?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to determine the exact percentage on an examination. But it would be something less than 30 per cent. These are not marked by machines—certainly not as yet. There are objective-type questions and their extent could vary from one paper to another, say 25, maybe close to 30 per cent, but it is less than 30 per cent of the paper.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put in a protest at the use of the objective question. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that if he is going to use them he might as well have them machine-marked. There is only one right answer, unfortunately, although any thinking person with a knowledge of the subject looking at some of these objective questions would give you quite an argument as to what is the right answer. But under the system there is only one answer and if a student does not get that one right answer then he scores zero on that particular question.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that the objective question in most instances puts a premium merely on undigested assimilation of information without any understanding of the information that is assimilated, or without the necessity of any understanding. The pupil may understand it but he can answer the objective question perfectly satisfactorily without understanding it at all, and I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister that that type of questioning is not appropriate in a Grade 13 examination which essentially is a university entrance examination and is not the kind of question that indicates whether or not a student is actually prepared to go on to university.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I think this all depends on the course. If it is, say, in the mathematics field I think it is quite obvious that objective-type questions

would be quite in order, maybe even in science. It is obvious also that you would not have too many, if any, objective-type questions in the English or English literature or the language examinations. I recall that somebody—and it may not have been a representative of the hon. member's party—was discussing in the estimates last year the advisability or the feasibility of the college entrance board situation being developed here in this province, and I want to assure the hon. member that the college entrance board uses a large percentage of objective-type questions. This is one of the problems they have. We feel quite strongly that the essay-type question has great merit and we intend to retain it as long as we retain Grade 13 or a reasonable facsimile thereof. But at the same time in certain areas the objective-type question can be used. It shortens this part of the paper for the student, gives him a greater opportunity and a longer time to express himself in other areas, and we do not feel that the objective-type of question that we have made available to the student so far is in any way damaging the writing of the papers as they presently are constituted.

Mr. Bryden: Finally on this matter, Mr. Chairman, I am going to put to the hon. Minister what may be a somewhat more radical proposition than I have as yet. I will reveal my age by stating that when I went to high school we had to write departmental examinations at the junior matriculation level as well as at the senior matriculation level. That first ordeal has long since gone by the boards—I do not know how long ago but a good many years ago—without any serious danger to the educational system.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister, perhaps tentatively, if it might not be possible to dispense with most of the Grade 13 examinations—at the departmental level that is, the uniform examinations all across the country—at a certain time in June when the students come in and try to put on paper in 2.5 hours as much as they can to convince some examiner that they have completed their course of study satisfactorily and are fit for admission to university or for such other further activities as success in Grade 13 might merit.

Conducting examinations on this mammoth scale makes it difficult to give a full opportunity for originality and initiative to express itself and to be properly rated, and at the same time to maintain uniform standards.

I would like to ask why it should not be possible to permit Grade 13 students to proceed on the basis of recommendations from

their schools in the same way as Grade 11 and 12 students. For those students who are interested in getting scholarships, let us have scholarship examinations. That would then reduce the number of candidates to manageable proportions and it would, in my opinion, permit a much more sophisticated type of examination which would be a challenge to the student and a worthwhile test of his ability. I know the universities, especially with the large numbers of students clamouring at their doors, are anxious to make sure that no one gets through the doors, who is not likely to make a success of university. In actual fact, however, a large percentage of those who do get through the screen of departmental examinations fail in university and they are usually failed out in the first year or two.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not a large percentage.

Mr. Bryden: A fairly substantial percentage certainly are failed out in the honour courses and shoved into the pass courses.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They stay in the university, a great number of them.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am glad if that is true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In many instances it is not because of a lack of academic ability either, when they do depart.

Mr. Bryden: Well, from my own experience, which admittedly is a long time ago, I would say it is because the high school system does not prepare them for university and that the first year in university is probably the most difficult period in any young person's life since he has to make such a sudden transition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a social adjustment, too, for them.

Mr. Bryden: Well, there is a real academic adjustment. The student comes from this quite sheltered academic environment of the high school into an environment where he is almost entirely on his own and he can sink or swim on his own, and apparently there is nobody who cares very much whether he sinks or swims. However, that is beside the point. I am suggesting that there would not be a significantly larger number of misfits getting into university if students went in on the recommendations of their schools, and that the examination, as I suggested, was reserved purely for the minority of students

of top quality who are seeking scholarships or other special forms of recognition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, this specific proposal has already been discussed and until recently many of the university people were not enthused about it.

I notice that Dr. Bissell perhaps is having second thoughts on the matter, at least having other thoughts on the matter. Such proposals are being discussed now, as the hon. member knows, by the Grade 13 committee. Actually one of the reasons the Grade 13 departmentals have been maintained in their present form has been the fact that the universities have used them almost exclusively for their entrance requirements. The gentlemen who look after the computers indicate that they could perhaps forecast even from the Grade 12 results of those students who might conceivably be promoted at the Grade 13 level.

But the question of scholarships and, to a degree, bursaries, is important in determining some type of passing mark, but I can assure the House that this matter is being studied at the present time and this is one of the proposals that, if it has not been, it certainly will be proposed to the committee.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I was quite shocked to see in the statistical section of the report of the department that 46.28 per cent of the papers written in 1963 at the Grade 13 level were graded under 60 per cent. And I was quite interested to see that the range of percentage failure from subject to subject at the Grade 13 level was from 7.84 per cent failures in German composition to a high of 32.45 in accountancy practice, and—if you want to get away from that to something better known—to 24.47 in geography.

I wonder if the hon. Minister has any views when he considers the importance of the mark obtained in these various papers as to whether or not more uniformity from subject to subject in the final statistical result might be achieved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, to a degree, Mr. Chairman, this depends on the number of papers written. There are not as many papers written, I think the hon. member will notice, in, say, the geography course. So that actually what would amount to a fewer number of either passes or failures would affect the percentage more substantially than it would, say, in English or history or some of the larger papers.

Mr. Nixon: There would not be many in the German composition?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are not as a rule too many in the German composition. It is difficult to forecast, of course, from one year to the next what the percentage will be, but there is a greater fluctuation in those subject areas where fewer papers are written. I have not the 1961 and 1962 reports here, but you will not find quite the same fluctuation in the English courses or in the history courses.

Mr. Nixon: Do those in charge of the examinations have the power of some overall adjustment if the results tend to be considerably out of line?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is a very complicated procedure but there is a special revising committee. I think it is obvious that if a paper were set, and written by, say, 200 students, and 199 of them failed, that there would be a substantial revision. This has not occurred in these figures, but there is a revising committee, and the marks are revised.

Vote 508 agreed to.

On vote 509:

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, on vote 509, item 5, I notice an amount of \$10,000 for the advisory committee on university affairs. On that subject I would like to make a suggestion to the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. Minister advised us the other day that several more appointments would be made to that committee and I think it might be appropriate if he would consider the appointment of a French-speaking member. He might already have thought of that, but I would make that as a suggestion. The point of view of that member might be a little bit different from that of the other members and I think might bring something to the committee.

In connection with that, I would like to say a few words about a subject I think should be brought to the attention of the advisory committee on university affairs. I would like—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but I gather perhaps he may be making reference to the University of Ottawa?

Mr. Racine: Yes, I would have some remarks to make—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was just wondering if this would not be more appropriately dealt with under vote 518, with the specific amount that has been granted to the University of Ottawa. It is dealt with there specifically.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I could make my remarks on that item. Thank you.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Why has item five been put in that vote, then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the superintendent of the curriculum and textbook branch has acted as the secretary to the advisory committee on university affairs. Just for this reason it was put in this particular vote, I believe, in the last two or three years. This will be the last year because it will in future come under The Department of University Affairs.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister about a brief. I have not the brief—unfortunately I cannot find it—but I believe it was sent to the hon. Minister. I do not mean my brief, but he was sent a copy of the same brief. Let us be clear about this. The brief was from the Canadian Booksellers' Association. Did the hon. Minister have a copy of that brief?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder if the hon. member would explain what was in it?

Mr. Troy: I guess the gist of the brief was that nowadays schools are getting tuck shops and selling all sorts of things, including, I presume, books and periodicals and things of that nature. The booksellers are complaining that the schools are going into a field which should be left to those who have been in the sale of stationery and books for almost a century. That was the gist. I am sorry I cannot find it, otherwise I would read it all. Probably most of the hon. members are quite happy I cannot find it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have just a very vague recollection of it myself but I think this is a matter that the hon. member would appreciate is for the local boards. This is certainly the case in the elementary school area where, the hon. member appreciates, most of the purchasing is presently done by the boards. Of course, this will extend into the Grades 9 and 10 levels.

As far as the department is concerned, we do not encourage this. I have had letters, I think as far as musical instruments are concerned, from some groups suggesting that the department should prevent the local boards from doing any bulk purchasing. But I think, Mr. Chairman, this is an area that should be left to the discretion of the local

boards to settle with the local taxpayers and the merchants in the area.

Mr. Troy: But does the hon. Minister send a note to the boards saying he has that brief, bringing out these points, or does the hon. Minister touch on it at all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I make a point, Mr. Chairman, of leaving this matter entirely up to the boards.

Mr. Troy: As the former member for Victoria used to say: "local autonomy."

Vote 509 agreed to.

Vote 510 agreed to.

On vote 511:

Mr. Troy: I am sorry that the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) is not here. I do not know how many of those 50 questions he asked, but however I do want, on behalf of an organization in which I have a small part, to thank The Department of Education and the hon. Minister himself for the support they are giving to not only our organization, but those other organizations in this country that are quite concerned with fitness and amateur sport. This is not the type of organization that we find on the pages of our metropolitan newspapers, which mostly concern themselves with the professional sports and say very little about the amateurs.

The department has helped my own organization, the Canadian Legion, which as everybody knows, now has taken as a major project the promotion of track and field across the country. We have brought to this country one of the outstanding coaches in the world in the person of Mr. Geoffrey Dyson. In addition to national clinics that we hold at Guelph every year, we also have a provincial responsibility of promotion of track and field in our own provinces.

Fortunately, our aim for some time has been, and will be for some time, the development of an upgrading of our coaches in track and field and the holding of regional clinics. The Department of Education has graciously assisted not only our organization, but a great number of organizations in this province in their leadership clinics which is most important. As you know, in any field it is most important that you first of all have the leaders; so I wanted to speak on behalf of the organization which I represent in this field, and because I am the Ontario chairman of this committee, to pay my respects to the hon. Minister and particularly to the very

fine director of the physical education branch, Mr. Jack Ross, and the others in the community programmes branch, too, which are also doing a wonderful job in the field of recreation. I hope that the requests of groups across this province, not only by my own organization but by all the other groups that are interested in amateur sport—there still is a bedrock across this province of people who are quite concerned for the game for the game's sake and not for the "filthy lucre." But, of course, most people will accept it if they get the opportunity.

Nevertheless, sir, again I say thanks very much and I hope you will continue to support this programme and I hope your final arrangements will be made with the federal government so that you can even go beyond and expand.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I should not really, because I realize we want to get on with the votes but I should mention that under this particular area, and not in conjunction with the federal government, the government has decided, as many of the hon. members know, to award what we will refer to as an achievement award in the area of physical fitness and amateur sport. As a result of this decision, we appointed some time ago a committee to look into this for us. I do not recall the personnel of the committee in its entirety, but Mr. George Duthie, Mr. Douglas Maxwell and Mr. Norman Marshall are at least three of the members of this committee. And, Mr. Chairman, I should point out to the hon. member that we intend to present the first 45 achievement awards on Tuesday. I understand that the leaders of the parties opposite have very kindly consented to delay the opening of the House on that occasion for a few moments to make this presentation. The real reason I mention it is that one of the first recipients of one of the achievement awards will be the hon. member for Nipissing.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A free ride on the ONR!

Vote 511 agreed to.

On vote 512:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Vote 512, Mr. Chairman; I want to make a few remarks. Vote 512 deals with the encouragement and the building of libraries and training of librarians and so on. Vote 516 deals with the grants so perhaps what I have to say can be said here under vote 512.

Certainly, I think there is no argument in this House and in this country about the importance of books and libraries in our civilization; this is part of our heritage, and I understand that ever since the present hon. Minister has been appointed and has been giving some encouragement to the reading of books, even the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) has been seen upon occasion to open a book and delve into it, although this is a rumour which I cannot confirm.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Would the hon. member repeat what he said? I did not hear it. Let us hear it again.

Mr. Young: I would be delighted, Mr. Chairman, to repeat it. I said that since the hon. Minister of Education has taken on this portfolio and has evidenced some interest in this business of libraries, and has been encouraging the reading of books, I have heard that even the hon. Minister of Mines has been seen upon occasion to open a book and look at it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, Mr. Chairman, I might say this that my education was gotten mostly the hard way. I learned to work, but some people who read books never work. I might say that for the hon. member.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You reveal that every time you get up.

Mr. Young: Yes, some of the people who got their education both ways, both the hard way and through books, at least learn and eventually come to some state of wisdom. I am sure the hon. Minister of Mines has also arrived at that situation, or will eventually, we hope.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on this business of libraries I think that we have to face the fact that in Ontario, as well as across Canada, we have not been giving it the attention that we ought to give it. We have on record a matter of \$100 a year per capita being spent on education as a whole and yet we are spending only about \$2.15 per capita on libraries.

I am not saying that we should spend as much on libraries as upon general education because the library is simply one part of the total educational process. But certainly in a wealthy province like Ontario and a very wealthy nation like Canada, we should be able to find more than \$2.15 which includes all costs—buildings, salaries, books, everything. I think we have to look at ourselves and ask whether this is adequate, particularly

in view of the fact that today, with the coming of automation, more and more leisure time is going to be available to our people. Leisure is going to be part of our heritage and we hope that leisure will not be in the form of unemployment for part of our population, but that it will be in the form of paid leisure, ordered leisure, for all our people. And as that leisure increases, then the use of books should fill a part of that leisure at least. And so as automation increases, the availability of books ought to increase as well.

Now, during the past, we have had some surveys in connection with this and it is pointed out to us that the qualified librarian needs as much education and training as a high school teacher. But the income for the librarian has lagged far behind, in many cases many thousands of dollars behind the salary demanded and received by the high school teacher. There is a tremendous gap to be made up here.

And our library system, our building of libraries and the stocking of those libraries with books, has not kept pace in the post-war era with the growth of our population. We have not enough buildings, we certainly have not enough librarians trained, we have not enough library schools to train librarians and, worst of all, we have no plan in Ontario nor in other provinces for the development of a comprehensive library system. I welcome the indication here that the hon. Minister is going to make certain grants to encourage surveys in this field. But those grants, it seems to me, are phased over too long a time and I would hope that the hon. Minister, if real initiative and real drive is shown in this field, might speed these grants up so that this study can be accomplished more quickly, so that once it is finished we can get on with the fundamental job of building.

We are told by Louise Schryver, librarian in Chatham, in a letter to the *Toronto Globe and Mail* recently, that the library situation "is a national disgrace, and it is going to continue as that for some time." And she points out a survey which was made by one Eric Spicer. I have a copy of that survey here. I am simply going to quote two or three figures from that work. He says this:

The 1963 production—

and he is giving Canadian figures:

—of 171 BLS graduates from accredited schools and 55 from non-accredited schools, is just not good enough. And this continued division of our profession is unhealthy. We need some 500 new librarians each year and they should be

carefully selected and all of them should be well trained.

And he says that:

—the shortage of librarians is not only immediate but it is increasing year by year. Whereas the 1957 survey showed only that the shortage was immediate and likely to continue, we can now state with assurance the situation is far worse today—

in 1963 that was:

—than it was in 1957. And by 1967, it certainly will be a national disgrace unless some positive steps are taken to recruit new persons into the profession, to retain those already working and to reclaim those who are no longer active but are still capable of making a significant contribution. If we are to have the library service we should have by 1967, if we are not to see an acceleration of a shortage, we must fill 573 existing vacancies, Canadian figures, and in addition 1,696 impending vacancies.

And Mrs. Schryver goes on to say this:

Since Mr. Spicer's survey, in Ottawa there are 60 vacancies and one university in Ontario this spring is recruiting for 50 qualified librarians. This is a total of more positions than the number of students graduating from the one accredited library school in Ontario this year. It takes no cognizance of the other universities in Ontario, new universities just starting libraries and requiring staff for them, or the 470 secondary schools in the province, for which there are only 235 school librarians qualified in any way. Nor does it consider the professional requirements of the 13 or so regional library complexes projected for 1967, for the provincial library services, many of these as centennial projects. There were only 114 teachers enrolled in 1963 in a library course given by The Department of Education and only one accredited library school exists in Ontario, at the University of Toronto. There is accommodation for fewer than 100 students a year in that school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the hon. member because I am interested in libraries? I believe, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Downsview and I discussed this at some length last year, if my memory serves me correctly. I do not want to have the issue confused. The course this hon. member refers to is run by The Department of Education for those who wish to become, sir, elementary or secondary school librarians. I think perhaps they should be

distinguished from those who might seek employment in the municipal system or at the universities. They are two separate groups of individuals, really, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, that is true, and this figure I gave is for those who are thinking of going into the educational system, the others being qualified for the public libraries in our towns and cities. But the fact is that even though this number of people is taking the summer courses and the other courses, we are going to face a very desperate shortage before too long. As a matter of fact, the shortage is here now.

Worse than that is the fact that many librarians today facing low incomes and overwork are being drained away to other kinds of work and to other countries, and so we are facing that kind of brain drain in the library service. I think it is a very, very serious matter.

We know that about one sixth of the expense of our general libraries comes from provincial grants and it seems to me that this must be increased. Too often the municipal council, perhaps thinking in terms of libraries as being expendable, thinks that here is a part of the budget that can be cut out or cut down. The library board is there but it is not quite as urgent as some other applicants for funds. So very often it is easy to cut down on the budget to the library. It seems to me that if we are ever going to overcome this, we have to not only press from the provincial level for municipal councils to accept their responsibility here, but also to increase at the provincial level grants that should be made.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister should do certain things and I am sure he is perfectly aware of this, but I will remind him of it. I would hope that he will speed up the survey that is now being undertaken so that we cannot say two or three years from now, "Well, we are looking at the situation. The survey is being done. We are doing all we can." I think that survey must be speeded up radically. I think certainly there should be more library schools established and I would hope that steps are now being taken to establish library schools perhaps in other places than the University of Toronto so that people can readily arrive at these schools and do the job.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the hon. member not think that this might perhaps be inferred as an infringement of the autonomy of the universities to suggest that some universities establish library schools?

Mr. Young: I do not think it is any infringement. Any university, I think, in the province of Ontario would welcome the announcement from the hon. Minister that he is personally willing to give certain grants for this purpose and I think the boards would not regard it as any infringement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the university.

Mr. Young: The universities? I am sorry, I did not get what the hon. Minister said.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just wondering whether the hon. member would construe the suggestion by the government to the university that it should start a library school, to be an infringement on its academic autonomy. I am just asking this for information.

Mr. Young: No, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any university board of governors would regard this as an infringement, particularly if it carried with it a substantial grant for this purpose. Any objections that might be made or would be thought about could easily be overcome if the hon. Minister would work out this kind of arrangement with universities. So I think this should happen.

The summer courses perhaps can be speeded up and this is something again to which I hope the hon. Minister is giving serious consideration, so that teachers who might supplement the teaching with work in the school libraries can be given the skills they need to do this work adequately, and do the work that ought to be done in that field.

Of course, the final big thing that should be done is this matter which I have already mentioned of much larger provincial grants. We always come back to this matter of money and the question of where we are going to get it. But I think in a matter as important as libraries and the building up of the library system of this province, money must be found for this purpose and found speedily. We are now dropping steadily behind vis-à-vis our population in this development. I would urge upon the hon. Minister that this matter be given very serious and very immediate consideration.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just in answer to that, I recall in our discussions last year when the hon. member for Downsview raised this, I pointed out at that time my own personal interest in library development. It stems from the interest of a senior member of our family who happens to be the chairman of the local library board.

I agree with much of what the hon. member has said, except that not only should he make these suggestions here but much of what he has said should be brought to the attention of the local municipal councils, and I am not trying to avoid the responsibility of the government, but in the development of local libraries, local interest is of prime importance. As the hon. member has said, many councils look at libraries as being sort of not in the top priority category and as a result in many instances their budgets are chopped. I suggest that not only should the government be urged to participate perhaps to a greater extent in the provision of grants for libraries, but that the hon. member might use some of his very persuasive eloquence on the members of local councils. There are many municipalities in this province where this is a problem.

As far as the supply of staff is concerned, I am quite familiar with Mr. Spicer's report. I think, as I tried to point out earlier, there are two categories here. This is the question of the supply of librarians within the school system, and while there is a shortage, of course, of qualified librarians, it is not any more serious perhaps in the school system than the shortage of other qualified specialists. Where the main problem occurs with librarians is at the municipal level, and perhaps with the universities. Here there is great demand and it is not just a question of dollars and cents. This is part of it, although inexperienced librarians are starting out, I understand, in the neighbourhood of \$5,000 to \$5,600, which is comparable to new graduates in perhaps the teaching or even the engineering fields.

I would agree that some further encouragement to one or two of the universities might be appropriate. But at the same time there has to be some other way of interesting young people in the library service. It is not just a question of straight dollars and cents.

I received some communication from Mr. Spicer personally over the past two or three months as to the possible location of library schools. I suggested to the hon. member for Downsview last year that we would try to appropriate more money for libraries this year, and we have done so. It is not as substantial as perhaps some of us would like, but nonetheless there is an increase. This survey that is being conducted by the OLA is once again of some significance because it gives the members of this organization, who really are the ones basically interested in the development of the library service, an opportunity to participate. This came about

in a rather unusual fashion. I spoke to the annual meeting of the OLA up in Kitchener, as I recall, some time either last spring or early—

Mr. Singer: How did it get there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know how it got into Kitchener. Oh, yes, this was the library association. This was another group and a very good group. When speaking to it I knew something of its interest in conducting a form of survey. I think the thought at the time was that perhaps the department might undertake it, so I issued a bit of a challenge to the group. I suggested to the association that if it would undertake this survey, that we would provide the funds. It did not take very many days before a letter arrived saying the association had accepted this challenge and that it would undertake the survey on our behalf. I suggest it will perhaps be a better survey as a result.

Whether it could be expedited any by the provision of greater funds in this coming year is doubtful. We are providing \$10,000 this year and \$5,000 for the balance of the survey but we anticipate we will have results from the survey after the first year. It will be a continuing situation.

Mr. Young: Might I ask the hon. Minister something regarding the survey? I might also say to him that I have already had the privilege of using whatever persuasive powers I have in my own municipality. I think in North York we are building a very extensive and very commendable library service and it is moving forward very rapidly. I only wish other municipalities would do as well as my own municipality is doing. So I think what he said is true. But it also seems to me that real leadership could come from the provincial level to other municipalities and to give more direction in that field. The hon. Minister says that by the end of this year some significant part of this report will be completed.

Does he have any further comment to make on that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have nothing further to comment, Mr. Chairman, other than that we expect it will be fairly comprehensive. Also, at our suggestion, they will be studying firstly the organization of library services. They will go on from there to the children's service field and the reference service field. The organizational part is obviously the area that we want to attack first and foremost and this is what they will do in this first year.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think it is the better part of five Education estimates that I have said words about library services, to the present hon. Minister of Education and to his predecessor (Mr. Robarts). I do not recall, sir, whether or not Mr. Dunlop held that office when I first came into the House. But in any event, my former colleague, Mr. Ray Edwards—who was then the member for Wentworth—and I, spent a considerable amount of time and effort inquiring into and studying the library problems of Ontario and we tried to bring them before this House with as much force and effort as we could exert, sir, to convince the various Ministers of Education that here was a field that was screaming for action. On many occasions we have quoted Louise Schryver who has been the president of the Ontario Library Association. We have quoted many other people in this field. As a matter of fact, as recently as the supplementary estimates I made some reference to Mr. Spicer's report. The hon. Minister indicated some of his thinking then and indicated that at this time when he brought his own estimates forward, in full, he would give some further elaboration.

Again, by way of laying the groundwork to my comments, I was interested to hear the hon. Minister's remarks about municipal libraries. My hon. friend from Yorkview and I, over a period of a substantial number of years, were able to assist in establishing what is now the second largest circulating library system in the province of Ontario. I think my hon. friend followed me on the council, but as he came on, certainly his help was of the utmost value. The council of the township of North York was aware of this problem, and was able to attract from the city of Peterborough a gentleman named William Graff who came to the township of North York as chief librarian and built this system up from absolutely nothing.

We had one of those neighbourhood library systems that is familiar in many parts of the province, run by a group of very devoted citizens of the community, not professional librarians, but people who had some public interest in what was going on. They collected books, they held drives and suggested if you had any old books in your attic, "bring them in and we will put them in the library." There was that sort of library system until, I would suppose, about 1954 or 1955. Then the township of North York embarked on establishing as good a system of public libraries as it could.

We were very successful as I say. We were able to attract Mr. Graff.

In the township of North York today we have a main library on Yonge Street in Willowdale which is an outstanding example not only of architecture but of a building designed as a main library. It received favourable architectural criticism and certainly has been hailed by anyone interested in libraries as an outstanding method of building and handling library problems. In addition to that, there are some three branch libraries open now. There is a bookmobile system. The library in Don Mills is being doubled in size at this moment and, as I say, the library system in the township of North York, starting from nothing in 1953 or 1954, has now become the second largest. I would suggest, with due respect to the hon. members from Toronto, it is at least as good as the city of Toronto's library service.

I do want to pay a word of tribute to Mr. Graff who was so responsible in helping build this system, because unfortunately a year or so ago, he passed away. The library system is a credit, not only to his ability, but to the devotion he paid to his work and to his fine sense of public service.

This sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, is somewhat unique in the annals of the approach of various municipal councils to library services. The township of North York has in the last ten years or more, made available substantial sums to produce a good library system. But this is not happening all over Ontario. This is not happening by any means. There is very little encouragement coming from government, and I think the remarks that Mrs. Schryver has made over the years and that others have made, should be ringing a warning bell in the mind of the hon. Minister and should urge him on to the same sort of effort that is bringing about a solution insofar as the education of retarded children is concerned.

I commend him for that because he is one of the hon. members of the House who did not forget when he assumed ministerial office, the sort of things he said as a private member. When he went into that office, he carried out this particular idea which he had expressed very ably as a private member. He is interested, as he said tonight, in libraries, and he and I have discussed them on other occasions, along with his father who is the head of a library board and has done a very good job in his community.

But I would hope that he would bring the same sort of zeal to the problem of libraries that he has to some of these other problems he has handled. I would think that the time perhaps has come to examine whether or not the public library system and the school

library systems could not and should not be co-ordinated. As we have been building all of these new schools, and there have been hundreds of them built in the province of Ontario in the last ten, 15 or 20 years, each new school has a library room and each library room has a teacher put into it who has received some sort of special training. I tried when I was on the municipal council to encourage a type of discussion which perhaps could lead to the co-operative use of these facilities and I ran into a series of brick walls, resistance from the educational authorities and resistance from the library authorities.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it might be the path of good common sense to use these facilities over and beyond the school hours in every day, over and beyond the five days a week that the schools are open, and over and beyond the nine months that the schools are open. Here are new facilities, hundreds of library rooms in our schools, that are being built and used for limited purposes. It would seem to me that if the hon. Minister was interested in getting into a crash programme to provide for library facilities, he could well turn his attention to these new library rooms that are in these new schools.

In addition to that, the teachers who are taking these extra courses to qualify them as specialists find it much more rewarding perhaps in a financial way to be school teachers, and specialist school teachers and librarians, rather than public librarians. So they are being funnelled off. While they are doing a very fine job insofar as the school libraries are concerned, their usefulness as public librarians is just not available. As Mrs. Schryver has pointed out in the letter to which the hon. member for Yorkview referred, there are not enough librarians presently in the university course who will take care of the needs of one university. She suggests that by 1967 the professional librarian, as such, in the public field might in fact disappear unless the department is prepared to embark on a very extensive crash programme to take hold of this situation and do something about it.

Now this sort of crisis, and I suggest it is a crisis, is something that the government has faced before. Reluctantly it did admit some years ago that there was a shortage of teachers, and reluctantly and slowly it embarked upon a crash programme for training teachers and somehow or other the programme did work and as many things were done, more teachers were produced and the crisis was lessened and perhaps has disappeared completely today.

Some of my hon. colleagues have dealt

earlier with the effectiveness of the methods, but in any event sufficient teachers were produced to take care of most of the classrooms but I think the next important matter that has to be faced by this department and faced most realistically is the real shortage, the real crisis in library services. The shortage in money to municipalities, the shortage of trained individuals, the shortage in facilities, and the real shortage in making available to all of these people in Ontario who want library services. In this age of specialization new training, new techniques, new reference books, new sources of knowledge, are most needed and I do not think that any educational system can be considered as beginning to cope with the problems it has to face unless it has a most efficient library service as an integral part.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say again tonight as I have tried to say in the past five years and as my friend Mr. Edwards from Wentworth used to say with me, and as the hon. member for Yorkview has said tonight, this is one part of the Minister's responsibility that demands his immediate attention, demands the immediate attention of the government and demands many more dollars, much more thought and much more technique to be given to it right away. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. Minister say, "Might we not be infringing on the prerogatives of the universities, if we urge them—"

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to be very clear on this matter. I asked the hon. member if in his opinion this would be. I did not say whether it was in mine, or even suggest in my opinion it would be. I was asking the hon. member's views. Nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. Singer: Well, I might ask if, in the hon. Minister's opinion, this would be an infringement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Chairman, that this comes to the area whether or not, if you ask a university to undertake this situation, what percentage or what amount do you make available, and what do you do with the university that has an existing course? You can see that there are many ramifications that have to be studied before one can pass an opinion on the subject.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister is playing very nice footwork with this problem and since there is only one university in the province that has a library school, he has a brand-new field and he has a real challenge facing

him and I would suggest that if he approached the boards of any of the other universities, other than the University of Toronto, that they would welcome, with open arms, whatever assistance he could give them in setting up library schools.

I would suggest, sir, that if the hon. Minister approached the board of the University of Toronto, they would welcome him as well with open arms and say, "We need more facilities in our library school. If the Minister will just give us the money, we will get on with the job."

Mr. Chairman, this is the responsibility of this department and of this hon. Minister and if he wants more to be done—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not wish to correct the hon. member but I would suggest that suggesting matters to one of the universities is not the responsibility of this department. Now, Mr. Chairman, this might become the problem of the new Department of University Affairs.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, over the years we functioned without a Department of University Affairs. Is the hon. Minister saying it is only because we are going to have a Department of University Affairs that we are going to pay some attention to what the universities are doing? I do not think that is what he meant, but until The Department of University Affairs comes into existence—and it is not in existence as yet—it is still the responsibility of the hon. Minister and his department to provide library facilities.

Mr. Young: If this hon. Minister is also going to be Minister of University Affairs, he should have a serious conversation with himself about this matter. Maybe he'd get results!

Mr. Singer: I would not even want to hazard a guess as to who the Minister might be, but if by any chance it might happen to be the hon. Minister from Peel (Mr. Davis) as he moves from one hat to another or from one chair to another, he might meet himself on the way by and do something seriously about solving the library problem.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, just before I continue on this vein of the other hon. member's, I understood the hon. Minister to say that the grants were increased this year and I am rather surprised, then, to read, from all places, a city of London headline that says: "Ontario

Library Grants Setup Rapped—London Payment to Drop \$37,081."

The chairman of the board goes on to say, and this is a very pertinent remark—

Mr. MacDonald: I think that one was made up.

Mr. Troy:

Noting the decrease in grant from the province, M. C. Keem, the new board chairman, said: "It seems like double taxation to me. It seems wrong to not know definitely each year how much grant you are going to get until you get it."

Well, that is a pretty fine statement. I have listened to the hon. member for Yorkview and the hon. member for Downsview talking about books and libraries and so on and they are talking away beyond what I want to talk about. Here in your metropolitan areas your young people and the whole population have opportunities to get to the Royal Ontario Museum, to libraries, to theatres, to centres of culture and so on, while all across this vast province there are areas where they are very deficient in even books.

The hon. member for Brant talked about the lack of knowledge of history, Mr. Chairman. I remember when I was a boy our libraries had books like those by Henty. George A. Henty's books gave us adventure and history at the same time. We had the *Boy's Own Annual* and *Chum*.

This was something we all used to get at Christmas time. They were wonderful stories of adventure, none of the trash that the kids bring to school now. But seriously, Mr. Minister, I believe a library service or a depot that was destroyed by fire, a number of the books destroyed—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, that is true, Mr. Chairman, and I am advised that the library after some real effort is now back up again to full strength.

Mr. Troy: What about the books, though?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The books are replaced as well.

Mr. Troy: Yes, that is a crying need. You see, some municipalities in my own riding—and I am sure it is the same possibly in the ridings of the other hon. members from northern Ontario. These smaller municipalities have not got the money. They have not even got a library. They have none of the amenities of life that you have down here in

the cities, and so books are most important to them. I am glad to know that this library service—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I did not hear what you said, would you repeat it?

An hon. member: He has quite a library—

Mr. Troy: Well, thanks, very much. I do not know what you are talking about but it must be all right. I am glad to know, however, that the library service will be functioning again. I was reading that very fine journal, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the other day. There was an article about bookmobiles. Is there such a thing as a provincial bookmobile, travelling library, just as we have the travelling dental corps and we have the dental coaches and travelling schools and the railway schools? I am sure such a thing as a mobile library might be a very fine thing in certain areas of this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the head of the provincial library service attended a meeting in Sudbury last month with representatives from the area in the hope of enlarging the libraries in the north central region and the Muskoka-Parry Sound region. Both these regions presently have bookmobiles for library service.

Mr. Troy: Do they go into Nipissing too? Sudbury is in another district. Parry Sound is another district also.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is anticipated, Mr. Chairman, that this will extend into certain areas of Nipissing. Perhaps not all of them, but they will extend into certain areas of Nipissing within the next few months.

Mr. Troy: As long as they get to the areas where there are no libraries. That is the important thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They will not go into North Bay.

Mr. Troy: There is a very fine library in North Bay and a very fine library in the schools. There is another library in Sturgeon Falls. But in the Mattawa, Kiosk, and other small areas there is not. I hope that in its travels it will stop in these certain sections.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have no intension of repeating what the speakers ahead of me have said. But there are a number of questions with regard to administration and policy that I would like to direct to the hon. Minister.

May I ask the hon. Minister: What personnel have you in the provincial library service?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The provincial library service, Mr. Chairman, includes the director, of course, five librarians, three assistants, three clerical assistants, and one shipper. It is a total of 13.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that if there is any substance at all—and I am convinced there is—in the magnitude of the problem that has been outlined by the hon. members for Yorkview and Downsview, and that if the government is really serious in laying the plans for providing library services across the whole of this province of Ontario, there is the point where they have to make a beginning.

I do not profess to be an expert in this field, but I have been well coached in the last week or two by somebody who is, and he does not happen to be somebody from the city of Toronto. From his detailed information and knowledge of the library problem in the province of Ontario, he said that when you get out into the hinterland you simply do not have the dynamic drive and the planning and which I submit the provincial library service is the logical place for it to come from.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we have moved into a completely new era in one respect. It is really not new, but the needs are becoming so much more pressing and the public is conscious of them. It is not only the thirst for adult education, which is filling evening classes; it is not only the growing recognition of the need for retraining, which is creating an interest in books on the part of people that have never had it before; but it is this whole flowering, so to speak, of adult education and the tendency to develop reading habits. We are not getting out into these areas to meet this need.

For example, let me ask the hon. Minister another specific question. What system of grants have we to help fill the areas where there are no libraries now? I am thinking partly of suburban, but more important, the outlying areas?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman this, of course, is mainly done through municipalities, but it is also done through county or regional co-operatives. This is what we are endeavouring to do in the larger rural areas where, perhaps, there is not a large centre of population. We have been developing a number of these. In fact, there was legislation introduced at the last session providing for not

only this, but the regional reference type of library as well. This is how it is done and these are the areas through which the grants are channelled.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the hon. Minister, what does the director of the provincial library services and his limited staff of five for a province the size of Ontario do in terms of getting out and assisting in the development of libraries in these outlying areas?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the director was up in Sudbury, as I mentioned earlier, attending a meeting there of representatives from these rural areas surrounding Sudbury, Parry Sound and Muskoka areas. He assisted them in the organization of the structure that is necessary. They spend a great deal of their time in the field and, of course, they operate the actual library service, the bookmobiles, and the primary job of mailing or packaging of books on a rotating basis to many areas throughout the province.

As I recall, they are to be in Kapuskasing, some time within the next week or ten days and they spend a great deal of their time meeting with people. But the desire has to be there. It is difficult for an individual to go to an isolated community and say there should be a library. I think the hon. member will find that in all those areas that have expressed interest we have been able to give assistance in some form or other; and, of course, they then qualify for their grants under the regulations.

Mr. MacDonald: We are back to an old problem with regard to many things. True, I suppose the government can sit back and say the desire has to be there. We have to be asked to come in before we go in. But it seems to me that if the need is as great as has been spelled out, then it seems to me there is need for more leadership and more initiative. I am not being critical of the people who are involved. Trying to cover the problems of Ontario with only six professional people is almost as impossible as some of the inspection jobs they have in The Department of Labour, where you try to cover the province with a few people.

Let me move on, without taking too much time on each phase of this, to another aspect of policy. As I understand it, there have been new grants established during the past year or so in which more generous grants have been made to schools. As I see the picture, there are a lot of unresolved problems being created by this. For example, I am told that in Hamilton, or even Port Arthur, they will discover, for example, that the grants going

to the school library are larger than the grants that go to the public library.

Until now, the public libraries have knocked themselves out in terms of not only servicing the community as a whole, but servicing the schools. And suddenly we have this reversal of position. I am not being critical further as to school libraries, but it is creating administrative problems. Indeed, as I understand from the quotation that the hon. member for Nipissing read, the hon. Minister had a bit of a public furor on the issue in the London area—I imagine that is a section that gets attention rather quickly—because they discovered that the public library board's income was going down.

In the relative size of these grants there has not been any working out of policies—for example, billing the schools for the service that the public libraries have been provided with in the past. My question to the hon. Minister in this particular area is: What is being done to iron out all of the uncertainties and questions that have arisen because of the development of the school libraries—in terms of working out a more efficient co-operative effort between the schools and the public libraries, along the line the hon. member for Downsview spoke about a moment ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this matter is, of course, of some concern. The problem of using joint facilities is one that has been explored. But there are many problems. I think they are obvious. We have been spending greater funds for the development of libraries in the elementary schools but such libraries are really not suited, perhaps, for use by the general public. They could not be used, of course, during the school hours and if open after school, the books themselves are not very useful. There are not many adults who would want to go in and use the facilities. At least the books that are made available to Grades 3, 4, 5, 6 and even 7 and 8 would not be too suitable. At the secondary level the problem is not quite as difficult, except once again in connection with the timing. A lot of people like to use the public libraries, it has been my experience, that people like to use the public libraries not just during the evenings but during the daytime period, and for this reason it is difficult to use joint facilities.

As far as the grants are concerned, the regulations for library grants are presently under revision. This has been partially brought about by the fact that some elementary school boards, particularly, have been receiving sums that might be in excess of what the public libraries have been

receiving. We are going to try to relate the two so that there will not be this disparity.

But nonetheless the possibility of joint use of these facilities presents some real practical problems. I think the hon. member can appreciate what they would be.

Mr. MacDonald: I can appreciate the problems, Mr. Chairman, and I am glad to hear that the hon. Minister is looking into the question of the relationship between the two because I think it would be most unfortunate, now that we have helped to develop libraries within the schools by these more generous grants, that we should create friction with the existing public libraries. There is no doubt about it, that those frictions have grown up and this is, I think, what we should look into.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I might add for the hon. member's enlightenment, that this problem was created in the city of London and he may be surprised that we have not resolved it.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, well. It is unique. I have a couple of questions in relation to the library training facilities. Has the hon. Minister had any representations, or what is his view on the proposition of separating the training of librarians from OCE and making in effect a university course in conjunction with the accredited library at the University of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am just going by memory. I do not think I have had any representation on this. I may be wrong; I get a number of representations, but I do not recall this specific one. If you want me to pass an unofficial opinion—I am not sure that this would resolve the problem. I can see certain benefits, of course. There might be a more intensive or extensive training of the librarian in a larger school, say, at the University of Toronto, but I do not know whether it would improve the numbers of students or the numbers of prospective librarians. I do not know that I see an advantage from this standpoint.

Mr. MacDonald: It may well be that it is just a part of the problem of the attitude toward the OCE and the fact that if they were associated with the university community—it may be a reflection of that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You mean some people's attitude toward the OCE?

Mr. MacDonald: The majority attitude, even among teachers. My final question is, Mr. Chairman—as I understand it, the University of Ottawa has a library school but

it is not an accredited school. Now—it is an accredited school?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is not.

Mr. MacDonald: The question I want to put to the hon. Minister is this: It has not received grants until now. The faculty of medicine in the University of Ottawa has received grants because of the obvious capacity to fulfil a need in the community as a whole. It is rather ironic that a distinction is being made—that there is a grant to the faculty of medicine and one is refused to the library school.

If it is of the standard—which I understand that it is—that is worthy of accreditation, why does the government hesitate on the proposition of making it an accredited school with grants? It has the capital base and the working operation to train more librarians. I do not need to emphasize that our desperate need, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Yorkview and the hon. member for Downsview, is to train more librarians. Here, Mr. Chairman, is a school in operation, why not accredit it, give it some grants and have it turn out more librarians, because our need is so great?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the structure of the University of Ottawa is rather complicated. The medical faculty qualifies as a provincially assisted portion of the University of Ottawa and the library school does not because of its denominational nature. This is the reason.

Mr. MacDonald: Can it not be broadened, has it got the facilities for the teachers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have suggested to the University of Ottawa that perhaps there might be merit in bringing the whole university in under the umbrella so that they could receive total assistance.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. Minister would like me to make my remarks now because I think I could answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection, I have some idea as to what the hon. member wishes to say about the University of Ottawa, and whether he does it here or under the university estimates is entirely up to him. I think that it is perhaps more appropriate there, but that is up to the hon. member.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to throw a little light on the question of the University of Ottawa and I think

the question from the hon. member for York South gives me the opportunity.

Now, the Budget, as presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer of this province (Mr. Allan), shows a sum of money being given to the University of Ottawa, which is entirely inadequate and which will prevent this institution from doing the job it is expected to do by The Department of Education and by the citizens of this province who choose to send their sons and daughters to this university, rather than to other existing universities in this province and in Ottawa itself.

Of course, the price for higher education has been increasing at a speed which presents us with a major financial problem. The presidents of different universities have deplored that the grants have not been higher. But in my constituency, sir, an institution of higher learning which is in no way inferior to the other similar institutions in this province, is given treatment which does not afford her the unhampered opportunity to contribute her maximum to the enrichment of the whole community. As the member of this Legislature for Ottawa East, and as a French-speaking Canadian, I would like, Mr. Chairman, to express briefly my views on this problem to the members of this assembly. Except for the fine speech of my friend the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon) last year in this House, I do not think the hon. members of this Legislature are perfectly aware of the existing situation.

For over a century, with a provincial university charter since 1866, the University of Ottawa has been training generation after generation of young men and women of this province, both English and French, Catholic and non-Catholic, in the different fields of intellectual endeavour. Day after day, dedicated men have engraved the distinctive character of this institution which today is acknowledged as one of the greatest and one of the best universities in this province.

The rector of this university has been elected and re-elected by his colleagues, the presidents of Canadian universities and colleges, as chairman of their board. Her teaching staff—lay as well as in greater numbers as clerics, non-Catholic as well as Catholic—her teaching staff is as qualified as that of any other university and enjoys an excellent reputation among its peers in the different learned societies in which its members have occupied responsible posts and contributed remarkable works of research. Her students come from the common stock as those of other universities, and participate on an equal footing with

the provincial and national student unions. Her graduates are immediately hired by provincial and federal civil service commissions, as well as by industry, commerce and business; or they practise the different professions for which they were trained at the university. I am sure that they are as good teachers, as good psychologists, as good librarians, as good lawyers, as good philosophers, as the graduates of other universities.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that this could be said of any other university in this province. And I am proud of all our institutions of higher learning. What I said of Ottawa in no way should be interpreted as disparaging any other institution. My only point is this: the University of Ottawa is doing for this province exactly the same job as the other universities, in a way which is not inferior to that found in similar institutions. For that same service to the province of Ontario, what are the appropriations in the Budget presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer?

In operating grants, for 44,000 students in this province — \$47,696,000, an average of \$1,000 per student; in capital construction fund, for the same number of students—\$53.6 million, an average of \$1,200 per student.

If we turn to the University of Ottawa, we realize that for the 3,800 students actually registered—this figure will increase next year—the Budget appropriates an average of \$335 per student for operating grants and \$315 per student in capital construction. This is one-third and one-fourth of what is appropriated for the average student in this province.

Therefore, how can we reasonably expect the members of my constituency, and in general the families and the taxpayers of this province who choose to send their sons and daughters to this institution, to be satisfied? How can we expect the French Canadians of this province to be satisfied when such treatment is given to the only university already operating in all fields where they can qualify according to their own mentality and culture?

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) had wonderful words about French culture in this province. He has earned the respect of the Franco-Ontarians—as well as of all those who believe in the bilingual and bicultural nature of our country. I would like to quote something that has been said under the signature of the hon. Prime Minister in French and I will give you the translation after a while.

L'interêt de la population de l'Ontario pour un bon enseignement du français n'a jamais été si grand.

I will translate the foregoing.

The interest of the population of Ontario for good teaching in French has never been so great.

The hon. Prime Minister made this statement at the Chateau Frontenac in Quebec City, in a speech which has been largely circulated in French in my constituency and I am sure in the province at large. Here is another quotation from that pamphlet:

La population de l'Ontario est fière de ses institutions bilingues, telles que l'Université d'Ottawa et l'Université Laurentienne de Sudbury. Elle est fière de notre école normale bilingue — à l'Université d'Ottawa—et de nos 400 commissions scolaires bilingues. Ces institutions sont les moyens par lesquels nous établirions des contacts plus étroits et des moyens de communication qui nous permettraient de vraiment nous connaître et nous comprendre.

Now I will give you the translation of these words, these wonderful words of the hon. Prime Minister.

The population of Ontario is proud of its bilingual institutions such as Ottawa University and Laurentian University in Sudbury. It is proud of its bilingual normal school—at Ottawa University—and of its 400 bilingual school commissions. The institutions are the means by which we shall establish closer contacts, and means of communications which will permit us to really know and understand one another better.

For such a statement, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister deserves the highest praise. May I submit that the time has come for us to provide help to this bilingual institution of which we are so proud? Such help would carry even greater conviction than words.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that we are already helping this university. In fact, since 1949, this Legislature has given grants to the University of Ottawa for its work in the sciences and medicine which, to quote the hon. Prime Minister in his statement on Ontario university affairs on March 21 last year.

—although within a denominational university, were rated as nondenominational facets of this institution. The bilingual nature of this institution made it desirable that these nondenominational activities should be the subject of grants.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to understand in what respect nursing, psychology, civil and common law, library science, arts, commerce and philosophy are in any

way more denominational than science and medicine. Theology, I suppose, could be called denominational—or is it? Whatever may be the case, the training of priests and ministers surely does not come under the jurisdiction of the state. But the training of nurses, psychologists, lawyers and librarians, does come under the responsibility of the state. At least this is what we do for all other universities.

Of course, science and medicine are the most costly faculties in any university. But the grants we give to the University of Ottawa do not even cover operating costs of these two faculties. This means that in order to continue to produce medical doctors, scientists and engineers for the benefit of this province, the university must tap the other faculties and institutes of part of their actual revenues and cramp their overdue developments. Is this fair when we proclaim our need for a greater number of professors of French, for a greater number of librarians, nurses and psychologists? As one of my friends told me one day, the actual grants from the government of Ontario to the University of Ottawa appear like “golden chains” which gradually could bring the institution to the verge of bankruptcy.

This is unquestionably an embarrassing situation. At a time when we are spending millions after millions of dollars for the construction of new universities which are absolutely needed if we want this province to prosper, we are hampering an existing university, which has a century-old tradition of service to this province, in the accomplishment of its maximum for the benefit of all.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the crux of the problem lies in the character of the institution. But I would like to suggest that we have solved a similar problem in a way which no one deems at variance with our convictions on the separation of church and state. I am thinking of The Hospital Tax Act. In accord with the Ontario Human Rights Code, hospital problems are solved according to hospital norms established by the civil authorities, regardless of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin. No one has ever thought of excluding any hospital from the benefits derived from this Act because it was operated and controlled by a board of nuns, Catholic or otherwise. Even less has anyone dared suggest that the only patients qualifying for the benefits of this Act should be those with a heart condition or kidney trouble.

May I submit that, in the field of education, and especially of higher education, the

ruling principles should be norms of excellence determined by The Department of Education. Those who qualify according to these norms should be entitled to grants. In point of fact, any question concerning the personal religious convictions of those who are accomplishing a job for the benefit of the province should be ruled out as not pertinent and against the code of human rights. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that all are forbidden by the law of this province to ask such questions of anybody in the practice of his profession? Why should we, the law-makers, be the only ones to do so? Is it because the legislator is above the law? We can call it what we may, but as long as we refuse grants for the only reason that the institution is denominational, we are discriminating.

Should we not rather follow the example of other countries, of other provinces, of the federal government, whose grants are available to all university students, regardless of creed, race or nationality? Or do we consider England, Ottawa, Quebec and New Brunswick as betraying the principles of the separation of church and state? Could we not be blamed for our actual policy on the ground that, after a long battle, having finally won the victory over an "established church", we have fallen into the other extreme of an "established no-church"?

May I be permitted at this point, Mr. Chairman, to quote again the hon. Prime Minister who said, a month ago, or just a few weeks ago, on the occasion of the visit of Premier Jean Lesage of Quebec:

As far as our constitution is concerned, I said last week, Mr. Premier, while we were debating some of these matters, that I did not approach the fact of changing our constitution with any fear or with any trepidation. If it needs to be changed, we will change it. If it is not functioning we must examine it and we must see where it needs to be changed. I do not think we should be fearful of it.

Those are the words of our hon. Prime Minister. Words of a great man. Words far more reaching than my humble plea for a great institution in my constituency, which is not receiving the government support it is entitled to for what it does for the province.

This, Mr. Chairman, is my point of view on a thorny question. I know that I have not solved the problem. I do hope, though, that my contribution shall not be found lacking in sincerity and dedication to the welfare of the province.

Vote 512 agreed to.

On vote 513:

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I just wanted to make one comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa East, a copy of which he has given me.

Perhaps I should point out once again that traditionally in this province we have not, over the whole history of the universities in the province, supported with provincial funds denominational universities. The University of Ottawa is not the only university in the province in this position. Waterloo Lutheran in Waterloo is operated by the Lutheran Church and we do not make grants to that university either. This has been a government policy for many years, extending right back into the beginning of universities. McMaster, for instance, was a Baptist institution and in order to qualify for government grants, it created a nondenominational university and then that portion of it, of course, which teaches theology remained on the campus but it did bring itself within the policy that we have in the province. The same is true with Assumption University in Windsor, which became the University of Windsor. The same is true of Queen's University at the beginning. Many of our educational institutions and our universities had their beginnings in the churches of our province.

This really is the reason why part of the complex at the University of Ottawa is not given grants, because it is a denominational college. This is not directed at the denomination which happens to operate this particular university. This is the policy, as I say, which applies to the Lutherans in Waterloo, which did apply to the Baptists at McMaster, and it applied to the Presbyterians at Queen's in those days of long ago; the Jesuits in Sudbury; the Basilian Fathers at Assumption University. We are examining the whole situation. I can tell the hon. member that I have had many discussions and conversations with Monseigneur Legaré, the president of Ottawa University, and no doubt the hon. member has had conversations with him as well. He will tell you that he and I have spent considerable time discussing this problem and I have no doubt that I will spend time with him in the future.

But that is the policy of the government and that has been the policy of successive governments for many, many years.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Is the member on 513?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, 513.

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the member for Halton.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, under this vote I think it is appropriate to ask the hon. Minister a question about the proposed department of youth announced some months ago. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the main purpose of this new branch is to assist students, particularly in technical and vocational schools where we are to have counsellors to encourage them to stay in school and to assist them in taking courses compatible with their desires and ability. Possibly the hon. Minister could inform us of some of the details of this programme, approximate number of counsellors who would be assisting, and other particulars of the branch.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I gave a fairly full explanation in the introduction of my estimates on the youth branch, and actually I think the area that the hon. member is referring to is really not the area that we are attempting to cover with the youth branch. The youth branch started out as sort of a nebulous idea, quite frankly; it came from the realization or at least the thought that there was a large segment of our younger population, many of whom had left school at an early age, who had inadequate education and insufficient motivation to accomplish anything. One paper has estimated the number to be close to half a million. Whether this is accurate or not time alone will tell. But it is the young people who have had insufficient schooling that we are attempting to reach. Dr. Koerber, who is on loan to The Department of Education from the Scarborough board, has been trying to delineate those areas that we might successfully tackle. He has been conducting a survey throughout the entire province determining the number of agencies that are interested in this problem, whether they be private, voluntary or even from municipal or governmental agencies. The new branch is still in the realm of development, quite frankly, and is deciding upon those areas where we might be effective in tackling this problem.

Among these are the problems that we will be facing with automation, with increased leisure time, and with the development of urbanization. It is difficult for me to tell you specifically what the youth branch will accomplish within the next few months. I think it is an acknowledgment primarily of a momentous problem that we face.

There will be some who will say this is

not the responsibility of The Department of Education and yet I feel quite frankly that it is and that it is one that we will consider very seriously. I hope that the select committee, when it is appointed by this House will avail itself of some of the studies conducted by Dr. Koerber in exploring this whole problem. It is one of great importance as I see it, in society today and while I do not pretend for one moment that this branch is going to solve all these problems, at least we hope it will delineate some of them for us so that we may take some effective action.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the youth division which is covered by this vote, was the product of an election campaign, I think it would be fair to say. The announcement came either during, or shortly before the election was called.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it was no such thing. The speech was prepared and the decision was made some time in July. The announcement was made on Youth Day at the CNE and it was related in no way whatsoever to election campaigns or politics. Quite frankly I fail to see, at this point, any political significance involved.

Mr. Bryden: Well, we can agree on this much: if it was made on Youth Day at CNE—which is a fact, I remember that—then it was made during the course of an election campaign.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can tell you the speech was prepared well in advance of the election campaign.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I think a lot of the series of announcements the government made prior to and during the election campaign had been prepared prior to the actual calling of the election. We over here did not know when the election was going to come, but you over there did know. No doubt you had your ammunition prepared. It was a useful device in the election campaign. The hon. Minister, with a naivety which does not become him, said that he does not see that it had any connection with the election at all. Well, it certainly got him a big headline. In fact, I could even see the fellows in grey flannel suits in the smoke-filled rooms mapping out a programme as to how to get headlines to maintain momentum during the election campaign. I have no doubt that, at some stage or other—whether it was during the campaign or before it is immaterial—one of them said, "Let us set up a youth branch." That made a good headline for one day anyway; it made a very good headline.

It is actually a good idea, but now we are coming down to the practical realities of the thing and the money that is being voted—\$50,000—is being voted mainly to provide the branch, or division as it is now called, with the funds to undertake research to find out what it is going to do. In that enterprise it is also to receive the assistance, I understand, of a select committee of the Legislature. Whether that assistance will be useful or not remains to be seen. But the select committee of the Legislature is also being established—so we were told in the Speech from the Throne and confirmed in the hon. Minister's speech of a day or two ago.

I am not now interested in making a complaint about the manner in which it came into being—perhaps it was a demonstration of the marvels of democracy at work—I do not know. I am happy to see that at least a tentative beginning is being made in this field. I will concede the hon. Minister's point that it is a very difficult field, difficult I suppose for the department to decide just how much of the problem it should attempt to tackle at any one time. It is quite obvious that if the division is to do a job, it is going to have to extend well beyond the area that would narrowly be regarded as the field of education. In fact, one of the major problems from my observation and from what little I have read in the field, relates to the placement of young people in employment.

I can see even in my own constituency—I will not go so far as to say alarming trends, but rather discouraging trends. Young people who have quit school are unable to get anything that could be described as continuous employment and are showing a disposition to congregate in street gangs. I do not think that in my section of the city at any rate, gangs have reached the highly developed proportions that they have in some other cities and perhaps in some other parts of this city, where they have developed themselves into little factions almost at war with society. But the problem is manifesting itself of the young person who has not found an adjustment to our society as it exists and will continue to exist; of his developing basically anti-social attitudes that will make his adaptation to society more and more difficult as time progresses. There has been a great deal of concern about school dropouts, legitimate concern, and I think the situation in many ways is improving as far as school dropouts are concerned. Many young people have been observing what is going on in the world around them and realize that they are not going to be able to establish themselves in the new world as it is developing with inade-

quate education. More and more of them are staying at school. This is desirable and the department and local boards of education and school boards have been doing a good deal of good work in devising courses of study that will be attractive to as many of the young people as possible and will meet their various needs and purposes. All these things are happening and they are good.

We still have the problem of the school dropouts, however, and there are some individuals to whom it is impossible at this stage at any rate to make an appeal on the basis that he should stay in school, it is good for him. From his point of view he has no interest in school; there is nothing there for him that he can see and so he leaves school. This is the person who is particularly a matter of concern. Such young people should not be written off just because we have not found out ways of appealing to them. The problem is to know what to do about them.

One small area where I think, Mr. Chairman, we could improve the existing facilities, relates to formal education of people who are somewhat past school age. I think we will always have a situation where some young people at a particular stage in their development, will simply be unable to adjust to the schooling system that we provide for them, no matter how flexible we make it. They will drop out. They will get such employment as they can for a few years and they will learn in the school of experience that it would be preferable if they could improve their basic qualifications. They will want to go back to school. But of course it is very difficult for a person of 20 to 25 years of age to go back to school with children of 14, 15 or 16 years of age. I know that such pupils are eligible for admission to our secondary schools and I believe that a few of them do actually go back to school, to the regular schools. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it takes a lot of courage to do so. I think we should be developing more facilities than we have to this stage, for giving regular school training at the secondary level to young adults, the people who missed their opportunity when they were in the appropriate age group for reasons that do not have to be considered when they have reached the age of 20 or so and who now wish to continue and go back to school on a full-time basis. I would like to see a development of that sort of facility and programme and no doubt this is one of the matters that the youth service division may be prepared to consider.

There is also the other problem of employment opportunities for young people, not only

those who have dropped out of school, but those who have completed their school work. The problem is not particularly acute at this time because we have, at the moment, quite a high level of employment in the province or to state the obverse, quite a low level of unemployment. But when there is fairly significant unemployment I think it is a fact that young people suffer more than others. The first thing an employer usually asks for, if he has a choice of employees, is: "What experience have you had?" I do not know how he expects a person to acquire experience if he himself will only take on experienced people. Even the reasonably well trained youth in a situation of relatively high unemployment has difficulty finding employment. The one with no training at all, or with inadequate training, is pretty well out in the cold. Even, indeed, in this period of relatively high employment there are a lot of youngsters of 16, 17 and 18 who cannot get anything but casual work of the lowest possible type.

This creates a bitterness in them, a sense of alienation from society which is going to make the problem of adapting them to society more acute. I hate to see some of them standing in the middle of the day on street corners with nothing to do. I know some myself who have combed employment opportunities and cannot get jobs. I do not want to be too critical, but I feel that the National Employment Service has, to an important degree, been a failure in this country. I do not think it has done the job it ought to do in this field or in many other fields. It has only limited value in finding jobs for people in special categories, and young people, particularly those with inadequate training, are in a special category.

The National Employment Service is a great hand at finding jobs for people at very low wages—in fact, until the minimum wage laws came into effect it regularly used to refer people, especially those who were drawing unemployment insurance benefits, to jobs at 75 cents and 85 cents an hour. It seems to be able to find lots of those jobs around. It does not seem to be able to do much to place people with more difficult problems. In fact, in my experience, certain agencies of this government have done a better job in placing certain categories of people with special problems than the National Employment Service has.

I do not suppose it is the function of The Department of Education to set up an employment service. I have no doubt that it intends to work, where appropriate, with

existing agencies in the field including the National Employment Service, but there does appear to be a tremendous area here for both counselling and for helping in finding employment. I have no doubt that the expert whom the hon. Minister has already brought into his department on a temporary basis has this under consideration. I would appreciate it, if the hon. Minister is in a position to do so, if he could give us an indication of anything that he may have in mind along that line at the present time, along the line of giving counselling services to some of these young people who have dropped out of school and assisting them in finding employment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member has very capably demonstrated the need for some type of organization or study of this nature. He has covered many fields and there are still many others that I think have to be pursued. As far as the question of guidance or counselling for employment is concerned, this is certainly one area that is being explored. I think, though, at the moment our emphasis has been primarily on trying to determine the areas of the greatest immediate need.

This may turn out to be one of them, but I think until our survey is concluded, I will not be in a position to tell the hon. member those fields that we are going to emphasize first. This could be one of them, quite conceivably, but until we have completed an overall assessment of the many problems that are facing these young people, I am not in a position to tell the House specifically which areas we will tackle first.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, since this department is just in its embryo and since, further, sir, we are having a select committee on youth, and since the function of it at the present time is mostly surveys and investigations, I do not think that we are going to gain very much by debating this at any length tonight. I think we shall have to wait, as the hon. Minister pointed out, to find out just how they will proceed in making the surveys and investigations and see what the need is.

Vote 513 agreed to.

On vote 514:

Mr. Troy: On vote 514, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if, in vote number two, it is in regard to the additional vocational units for school boards.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister what can be done for those areas where the need

is greatest for some opportunity to gain vocational skills. There are in this province, small communities. I will refer to one in my own riding and there may be similar situations in other ridings in the province.

I will take the town of Mattawa with a population of between 3,000 and 4,000 people. The secondary education there is confined primarily to the academic side. There is no opportunity to get the advantages that larger areas have. In order to get a composite school you must have a school population of 600 or 700 and up. In these small towns young people have not got the opportunities for recreation or mental development as they have in larger cities. There also are not too many opportunities for employment in the areas. They drop out of school because they are not interested in the academic side at all. They quit school maybe after Grade 9 or at the most Grade 10, and then they are just a regular drug on the market.

What can be done for communities of that nature? Why is it that millions and millions are being spent by this government in co-operation with the federal government to give young people an opportunity of vocational training, and all of those in smaller areas have no opportunity at all of getting it except if they go to their parents who will provide them with transportation, say, to the city of North Bay—is it the nearest area? What can be done with those?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing this matter with the federal government. As you know, initially the thinking was that we should establish these schools with a student population in the neighbourhood of, say, 1,000 students. We have been exploring, and I think with some success, although I am not in a position to say definitely yet, the possibility of providing at least some limited vocational shops and facilities for the student population of a unit of roughly 400 to 600, which I think will cover to a degree at least those communities to which my hon. friend is referring. This is being done in co-operation with The Department of Labour and, as I say, it has been discussed by the federal authorities and we are encouraged to date by their reaction.

I have also discussed with the federal Minister of Labour some additional assistance by way of an operating grant to the province or to the boards of the province for the vocational-technical programme. As the hon. members are aware, we have received, I have not the exact figure in front of me, \$800,000 to \$900,000 a year for the secondary school

programme, which really does not go too far. We have suggested to the Minister of Labour that the federal government consider paying 50 per cent of the difference between the academic and the vocational costs, which, if the difference is, say, \$200, might be \$100 per student as the federal portion of the increase of the operating cost during the secondary school programme. To date we have had no indication from Ottawa, other than that they have suggested that it is under advisement, but we have gone this far with the federal authorities. I shall inform the hon. member and the House just as soon as we receive some further consideration or undertaking from Ottawa with respect to the smaller units of, say, 400 to 600 students. We are very well aware of the problem the hon. member raises and we are attempting to solve it.

Mr. Troy: If you cannot reach that agreement then I think there may be possibly some agreement where these youngsters can be transported to the nearest area where there are composite schools, because otherwise—

Hon. Mr. Davis: In many cases these are the areas that should have them.

Mr. Troy: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the acting House leader how long he plans to carry on tonight? The reason I ask is that there are a number of matters I would like to raise under this vote.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Certainly not beyond 11 o'clock.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this vote, I believe, covers the question of the re-training of workers—unemployed workers and others who may feel they need re-training. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), on more than one occasion, sir, has emphasized the importance of increasing the mobility of our labour force. Here is one of the key areas where one creates mobility. I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister, and to the federal government as well, since I think it puts up most of the money, that the programme is not succeeding insofar as it has that objective in mind.

To begin with, the allowances that are being paid to people undergoing re-training are simply inadequate. We will never have an adequate re-training programme as long as allowances continue in this form. I would like to read an item that appeared in the

Toronto *Daily Star* in January of this year, as follows:

Lloyd B. Jones is one of the more than a thousand men and women who have quit—

a thousand men and women, you will notice:—who have quit Toronto's adult re-training programme because they cannot afford the luxury of improving their education. Jones, 41, father of four children, left the Jones Avenue re-training centre because he found he could not live on the \$36 a week he got under the federal-provincial-municipal scheme.

A. W. Fair, the programme's co-ordinator yesterday shocked Toronto's welfare committee when he listed the number of people who dropped out of the scheme designed to teach skills to the unemployed, or give new skills to those replaced by automation.

After four months of dire financial hardship, Mr. Jones finally withdrew from his diesel mechanics course six months before graduation. Although he and his wife Cora figure it cost \$30 a week for food alone for the family, they were often forced to do it on \$9.

"I am not going back. I am not going to put my family through that again," the tall army veteran maintained. "It would have been all right if I could have gone through. I worked hard and got good marks."

The old grey school on Jones Avenue was opened in June, 1962, for the re-training programme. Mr. Jones, of Heale Avenue, Scarborough, was one of the more than 1,000 men and women who have withdrawn from the centre because they could not live on their allowances, A. W. Fair, co-ordinator of the programme, said.

And so on. There are further details about other people who found that they could not live on the allowances and so gave up the re-training.

I am not even getting into the question of the adequacy of the courses, whether they are training people for types of employment in which they will be able to find employment in the future. That is another question and an important question. I am just raising now the question of the adequacy of allowances.

The select committee on manpower training dealt with this subject at some length and it quite validly recommended that unemployed workers should not be compelled to undergo training or re-training. It said

that instead we should use the carrot approach rather than the stick.

Greater financial assistance relative to the payment due to an unemployed worker under the unemployment insurance system should be made available to unemployed workers who are willing to undergo training. I think this is the proper approach. We should try to encourage people to undergo re-training by giving them financial incentives. They are entitled, if they do nothing but simply try to find a job with their present skills, inadequate as they may be, to unemployment insurance for a period and supplementary benefits for a further period in most cases. If even those benefits are exhausted, they will get welfare. But what we are interested in is in giving them an incentive to take re-training of a type that is suitable for their particular aptitudes. I would suggest the way you do it is by paying them good money.

This may be a matter mainly for the federal government to consider. But the Minister is the man who deals with the federal government. I am going to suggest that we should be thinking in terms of payments that closely approximate full wages. I think we should consider the re-training of our work force as part of the overall employment situation. Especially as we move further and further into a period when greater and greater flexibility of our labour force is going to be required, we have to.

The person who is displaced by technological advances should not be regarded as an unfortunate casualty of our economic system, to whom we give certain minimum assistance plus opportunities for re-training if they care to avail themselves of it. We should regard him as part of our total work force, as a person whom we need for employment in some other area. We should be prepared to pay him to take the training that is necessary to fit him into employment elsewhere.

This is the sort of approach that is taken in Sweden. There are a great many other things they do in Sweden that we do not do in this country, but they are not relevant to the present vote so I will not refer to them. But this is the sort of thing they do there and they have a much higher degree of mobility of labour than we have here, although they are not satisfied with it. They have a substantially lower rate of unemployment than we have here, even under the best of circumstances. In fact, their rate of unemployment usually is about half of what ours is now and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) has

been congratulating himself on the fact that it is at such a low level at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, you just cannot ask people such as this Mr. Jones, 41 years of age with four children, who may very well have been making \$1.75 or \$2 or \$2.25 an hour, to come down to an allowance of \$6 or \$8 a day. I think it is per training day at that. It is not even per day in the week. Apparently he is only supposed to eat on the training days. You just cannot expect that he is going to do it. He cannot manage it. He has to go out and find some other job that will pay him at least more than the inadequate allowances that are now being considered.

I listened with great interest, Mr. Chairman, to the exhortations from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development concerning the need for increasing mobility of labour. But then, when I look at an integral part of this programme which comes under the jurisdiction of The Department of Education, I can only assume that the hon. Ministers are not in communication with each other, or that the importance of the problem has not been fully understood.

I would say that we should be thinking in terms of re-training not merely for people who are already unemployed. We should be trying to anticipate people being thrown out of work and start the re-training process before they are actually thrown out of work.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are doing that under programme four. We have two or three pilot projects under way now. One of the chief ones is in Leaside under programme four. I believe three industries are participating and the results, to date, have been very encouraging. It takes the participation, as the hon. members know, of industry. And I think after a limited period of time we will be satisfied enough with the results to extend the programme quite substantially.

The hon. member might also be interested to know the question of rates being paid to the unemployed is also under discussion with the federal government. The article the hon. member refers to was, I think, actually raised by his hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald) yesterday or the day before—I have lost track—at which time I indicated, I think, to him that the estimates of NES and the ones we have as well would indicate that close to 80 per cent of the 1,000 referred to in that article, found employment.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I do not think that is necessarily the answer to the question, Mr. Chairman. They found employment—

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is one reason they left.

Mr. Bryden: But did they find suitable employment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do not know whether it was suitable and they do not either.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I would assume they would not quit the course to go on relief.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I say, they are working.

Mr. Bryden: Obviously they quit in most cases in order to take other employment, but the point is that this may have been the wrong course of action both for them and for the community. It was desirable that they should improve their qualifications, but they could not because they could not live on the allowance they were getting. Therefore, they had to take whatever was available to them in the form of employment that probably carried low wages and had a low skill content, so we did little if anything to improve the quality of our labour force and certainly did not improve the position of these people.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, maybe they might be better off if they went on full relief, but I will bring you something right from the horse's mouth. It comes from Brigadier Michael Dunn. He is not given his rank here but that is what he was. He is the principal of the adult re-training centre on Jones Avenue. Jones is mentioned in this but it happens to be the name of a street and not the man.

The principal states in an article in the *Globe and Mail* of Friday, May 1—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is tomorrow.

Mr. Troy: Yes, and this is a very good day; Friday, May 1 is that historic day for labour.

Mr. MacDonald: This shows you how fast he is, no wonder he gets an award of merit; he is living in the future.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Dunn says in this article in the *Globe and Mail*, I will repeat, of the issue of Friday, May 1:

Unemployed men and women at classes in the Adult Re-training Centre on Jones Avenue have fainted from hunger. Mr. Dunn said many students do not have enough money to eat properly.

And I suppose he also means to get enough to eat. And then he refers to how they eat, but the important thing is what they get.

With married students, he said, most of the government allowance is going to keep dependants. The principal said some students suffer from malnutrition.

"This has been one of our biggest causes for dropouts in the retraining programme," he told the City Welfare and Legislation Committee.

Higher allowances and hot lunches each day for the students are advocated in a Toronto brief to the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities endorsed by the committee. With the endorsement of the federation the brief would be sent to the federal government for consideration.

I will just interject here that no doubt the federal government will be in touch with the provincial government after they get this brief, to discuss this matter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We may be in touch with them before they get the brief.

Mr. Troy: Well, I hope so, because we cannot have them fainting with hunger every day down on Jones Avenue.

Mr. Bryden: That is right across the road from my constituency.

Mr. Troy: Well, the hon. member had better take them over to his riding then and give them a hand-out.

Married men from other communities, attending the school, receive an \$8 daily living allowance. Married men in the city receive \$6 daily. The rate for out-of-town single men is \$5 and for city bachelors \$3 daily.

The brief, a copy of which will go to the Ontario Association of Mayors and Reeves, also proposes financial assistance to families of the unemployed taking re-training courses, to the extent of funds for emergency medical and dental services and prescription drugs. There is currently no provision for medical or dental services.

While not suggesting a definite amount for increased allowances to trainees, the city brief argues for payment to heads of families who are taking courses, on the basis of the number of dependants.

Which is again a factor that, I think, should be considered because I know that some of these chaps taking the re-training courses in my area have a lot of children.

The article finishes:

The identical amount is now paid to a man whether he has one or five children.

The same amount! So I suppose it is a case of each day: now, Johnny, you get it today and then Mary tomorrow, and finally poor little Allan gets it on the fifth day.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What is the date of that paper?

Mr. Troy: The date of the paper is Friday, May 1, 1964.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a fine thing to read in the *Hansard* of April 30.

Mr. Troy: This is Eastern daylight time; you see we are an hour ahead of standard time.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Just pass it around and we will all read it.

Mr. Troy: Well, that is the situation. It is a good job we are taking this somewhat humorously at this hour of the night, but nevertheless it is a very serious problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We recognize this.

Mr. Troy: I know that levity is a part of any debate—but it is a serious problem. In addition to a training problem, it is also a social problem. I hope that it will get not only serious consideration, but action.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has a very disarming way of saying that he is taking everything we mention under consideration. I have no doubt he is taking it under consideration. Obviously, he is going to have quite a few things to consider in the next little while. But I have heard the expression—I am not now suggesting that this applies at all to the hon. Minister—but I have heard the expression many, many times, and the expression "taking under advisement" or "taking under consideration" often means putting to the bottom of the file basket.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure of the exact phraseology I use, but I think that I said the question of payments to trainees was being discussed, and had been discussed with Ottawa. It was not a case of this department taking it under consideration. We have already discussed the problem with them.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister then that this is an urgent problem. My hon. leader made a suggestion across the floor a moment ago that since Ottawa has now taken over 90 per cent of the cost of these allowances up to the

approved level, the department might consider using the money they might otherwise save, to make an immediate increase in allowances. Then I think it could use that as a bargaining point with Ottawa to ante up some more.

I would suggest that we would have to consider a major revision in the nature of these allowances. Six dollars for a family man living in the city and \$8 for a family man from outside the city just does not meet the problem at all and we have had—my friend, the hon. member for Nipissing has read still another story that appears in a Toronto paper. These stories have been coming out from the administrators on the spot for a long time, for at least a year, and probably longer. I picked one of many. It happened to be one that my hon. leader had picked, too. I apologize for the repetition but I could have picked others that said the same thing in different words at different times.

The people on the spot are constantly saying that these allowances are not good enough and are seriously interfering with the programme. We hear from the higher levels that they are discussing the matter but surely at this stage it is time they did something about it and not in terms of adding another dollar or two. As I suggested earlier, they should be thinking in terms of approximating, if not actually paying, full wages to people undergoing re-training which is going to fit them for new forms of employment.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take up the next seven minutes. We are going to quit at 11 o'clock, I understand.

I have an article here out of the Niagara Falls *Evening Review*. When reading an article in last Friday's paper I came across the item, "Mayor Plans a Drive to Get More into Job Re-training." It quotes someone as saying:

This, sir, is a farce. Strong words, no doubt, but they are true. I know because we went through it. Never again. The courses themselves are grand and so is the big line-up by the unemployment insurance office.

But talk is all it is. After ten months in the upholstery course, we were elated when the big day came, the day my husband was handed a certificate. But alas, our joy was short-lived. He was offered a job for \$1.25 an hour.

He spent ten months—the man who got his certificate—lived for ten months on \$36 a week and they finally wound up, as the lady

said in this particular article, with the man making more money than that when he quit the job he had before. He felt that by learning a trade and becoming an upholsterer, he would make \$3 an hour—this is what he thought he would get—but can you imagine a man and his family living on \$36 a week for ten months? Mind you—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I cannot believe that, not in this province.

Mr. Bukator: No, they did not live on it. I imagine they did exist.

Anyhow, he was offered a job at \$1.25 in the city of Toronto. Now, mind you, he would leave the city of Niagara Falls! It is nice to see the hon. Minister of Mines back in the field again—

Mr. MacDonald: He is out of humour these days.

An hon. member: Maybe he got stuck in the market.

Mr. Nixon: He needs a longer holiday.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, it is quite all right. I am enjoying this, I usually do. And you might as well hear the rest of it because I am going to stay here. Maybe I can get through in three minutes if you let me continue.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would like to see this House sit until 5 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Bukator: Now, just to get on—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, please!

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: Just to get on that subject for a moment, Mr. Chairman, he has been in the House this day possibly about an hour and a half. He must have a couch in the back room.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: If you knew where I had been today, you would know I was looking after mining in this province.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister of Mines think he is helping us at this point?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No! I am sorry.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the truest answer of the day.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue this article.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: Thank you very much.

The vice-chairman of Hydro has made another contribution this year—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, after all this heckling, I am supposed to be in order. I think it is the silliest—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: Four minutes to go and I have not even started yet. That was just the preamble. The lady said:

Mad? Yes, I am mad. After all, this is not a project. This is people's lives that we are dealing with.

And I think that is true too. The people in good faith took these jobs believing they would learn a trade and naturally better themselves. They wind up with a trade, and as I said, they are driving taxis now, peddling milk and working in factories as common labourers after that course that the government spent so much money on.

I can only agree with the hon. Minister that this should not only be looked into but certainly these conditions should be remedied. If people are going to take a course in any particular trade where they find a shortage of that particular type of tradesman, then at least the government should find a job for them, even if they have nothing else to do but dig mines for diamonds—for the hon. Minister of Mines claims that in some place in Ontario there are diamonds and all we have to do is find them.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: That is correct.

Mr. Bukator: Apparently I have rubbed the hon. Minister the wrong way. It was not his hair that I was rubbing though. If I have aggravated the gentleman, that is what I intended to do, naturally.

Now, let us go on with the article:

All these months, nothing. It seems to me that the government is spending too much money to train these men. Why not go one step further and demand a decent wage before taking this course? My husband was making twice as much as he has been offered. If this is what the government is giving, I will go without, thank you.

This is only one person speaking and there are hundreds of similar cases. I know that the government means well. I know it may be on the right track but up to this point it has not proved too much. There is a lot of room for improvement and you can rest assured that I will wait for the hon. Minister's decision on the conference that he is having with Ottawa. It seems that Ottawa has treated this government pretty well. I have sat here for several days now and the government says that it has met with the people in Ottawa and they are going to give more. Now, if this is the case—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I never said that Ottawa was going to give anything. I never said it was. I would point out to the hon. member that while we certainly have some responsibility for the running of this programme, I think that as far as the securing of employment is concerned, the NES would have responsibility in this field.

Mr. Bukator: Apparently in this particular case it did not work quite that way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just referring to The Department of Education. Our responsibility is re-training and this we try to do. I am suggesting the question of finding employment surely is within the area of NES, which comes under the federal Department of Labour.

Mr. Bukator: I like this buck-passing bit. I thought this was a joint effort between the province and Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The re-training of the unemployed is a joint programme. We are providing the course material. We are doing our best to administer the programme. But the responsibility for finding employment afterwards, I suggest, rests with the NES, which is under the auspices of The Department of Labour in Ottawa.

Mr. Bukator: Let us look at it from the other side of the ledger then. If this government is going to train people for something that they cannot get the benefit of at all, then what in heaven's name are you accomplishing? That is a fair question. What are you accomplishing by this particular effort?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can tell the hon. member is that we have re-trained a very substantial number of people. Our figures indicate that something over 80 per cent of them have found gainful employment after completing these courses.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that there are others who would like to speak on this subject. I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Vote 514 agreed to.

On vote 515:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, before we deal with vote 515—

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I thought you were going to call it off when I sat down—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Carry on! The floor is yours.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to reopen vote 514 if the hon. member has something else to say.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. Prime Minister that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs may have misled my friend, the hon. member for Niagara Falls when he said we would not sit beyond 11 o'clock.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You mean 11 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 514 has been carried.

Mr. Bukator: They talk about hon. members in this House, they talk about procedure, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs said we would not go beyond 11 o'clock. This is what I understood so—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Now let us be reasonable. Usually if we say 11 o'clock, it could be ten minutes after 11 or perhaps ten minutes to 11.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Before we proceed with vote 515, I accept your ruling that vote 514 is carried.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: We will be on vote 515 when we return.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will proceed with these estimates and when they are complete there are various items on the order paper we can deal with.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 1, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Friday, May 1, 1964

Statement re appointment of Royal commission on human rights and civil liberties, Mr. Robarts	2694
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	2697
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	2703
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	2704
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2718

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 1, 1964

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, students from Deer Park Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to call to the attention of the hon. members of the Legislature that the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) is today celebrating his 60th birthday. I thought that the hon. members would be pleased to know that, and would be pleased to recall that he was first elected in 1937.

I believe that, second only to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), he has served the longest continuous term of any present hon. member now in the Legislature. He has brought distinction to his riding, and to himself, through his service as Speaker of the House and through service as a padre overseas. I know that all the hon. members will be pleased to join me in wishing him happy returns of the day.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, since this is a birthday party, I think I should inform the House that one of the freshmen members of the House, my colleague, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman), is also celebrating his birthday. His qualities so speak for themselves that I shall not attempt to elaborate on them.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps I might be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate both of the hon. members who are celebrating their birthdays

today, with particular reference, of course, to my younger colleague from Dufferin-Simcoe. I had not any idea until today just how much younger he was than I am. We have ridings alongside one another and the line between us is something like the 49th parallel between here and the States. We just do not know where it is exactly and we do not care very much.

I have always been very happy to be associated with my hon. friend from Dufferin-Simcoe and hope that he will remain in the House for many years. Of course, it carries with it the implicit hope that his older colleague is here as well to see that he conducts himself with dignity and in a manner that would do credit to both the ridings of Dufferin-Simcoe and of Grey South.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I could not let this moment pass without a word. There are times, you know, when one finds it very difficult to express our feelings, and this is one time for me. But I do want to express my personal thanks to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox, the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the NDP for their kind words and good wishes today.

You know, life is a never-ending struggle. A never-ending struggle to keep the money coming in and your hair and teeth from falling out. I want to say that I am losing on all counts.

I would like also to offer my good wishes to the hon. member for Fort William, to wish him happiness and many years in the public service of the province of Ontario. To me, politics is not a creed, not a set of fixed doctrines; but an attitude of mind and heart, a faith in man's ability through the experience of his reason, and the judgment of his mind, to increase for himself and his fellow men the amount of justice and freedom and brotherhood which all human life deserves. That has been my work during all my period in this House. I have been here for 27 years. I hope to be here for some years to come to further the interests of the ordinary man of the province of Ontario and

to make this province a better place in which to live. Thank you, very much.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman). Has the hon. Minister been invited to the special meeting of Branch 11 of the Civil Service Association in the Legion Hall in Guelph on Monday next, when certain problems of branch members will be discussed? If so, does he plan to attend?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is no. I have not been invited and, therefore, the second part of the question does not apply.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a statement that I would like to make to the House.

In recent weeks we in this Legislature have had to deal with the rights and privileges of individuals in our society, particularly in relationship to the needs of our society as a whole. We have had to consider ways and means of protecting ourselves not only from certain criminal elements, but from a host of other practices and procedures that have grown up in our increasingly complex community life. The examination of these relationships has brought into sharp focus many matters which have been of increasing concern to many people in these last few years.

Among other things, we have all become sharply aware of the ever-increasing role of the state in the evolution of our particular way of life. Those of us who sit in this Legislature are particularly aware of the continuous pressures that are placed upon government to assume a larger and ever-larger role in the affairs of our people. To put it another way, over the years in the development of our Canadian nation there has been a continuous evolution and growth of the traditional parliamentary powers of our legislative bodies, and a continuous expansion of the role of the state in our day-to-day living.

This growth has come about through constitutional developments; it has come about by the enlargement of administrative practices and has come about as a consequence of the constant expansion of the authority of governments. Changes have occurred as new precedents have been established to meet the needs of the day. New concepts and new relationships have arisen

between the individual and the state. These have led to many readjustments in the internal structure of the body politic; and to many changes and adjustments in our society itself. Perhaps the most marked of these have been the readjustments of the human rights and liberties of the individual in his relationships with the state and its emanations.

In carrying on the affairs of government here in Ontario within the bounds of the autonomy granted by The British North America Act, this province possesses authority — broad-based authority — on a very secure foundation. We have the authority to delegate certain powers to boards, agencies and tribunals created by this Legislature. Of course, interwoven with these functions is the traditional, time-honoured and, indeed, sacred position of our judiciary and the courts.

As our province grows and social change takes place, we must, in our wisdom, proceed in such a fashion that we do not impose limitations upon, or do not interfere with, the inherent rights of the individual citizen, with whose welfare we in this assembly are entrusted.

In the opinion of the government, the time has now arrived when we should pause to examine with the greatest of care, changes that may have taken place to increase the power of the state to the detriment of the individual and his basic liberties and freedoms. We must ask ourselves if we are providing adequate safeguards to protect the rights of our citizens, even as we seek to solve some of the very aggravating problems that face us. We must ask ourselves if we are extending the power of the state far beyond the point required to achieve the social purposes and requirements of our day. These very questions have been raised in other countries which share with us a common tradition of protecting personal liberties and freedoms.

In the debates of recent weeks concerning amendments to The Police Act, I assured the Legislature and the people of Ontario that I personally, and the government of which I have the honour to head, will not for one moment tolerate legislation which infringes upon or jeopardizes in any way the rights and freedoms of the individual. It seems timely, therefore, that we should examine and investigate the whole question of the relationship between the state and the individual, and the power of encroachment which may be contained in any existing legislation and which may be sought in any future legislation. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it is timely that we should look to the guarantees of civil liber-

ties and should look to the freedoms and the guarantee of the freedoms which are inherent in our citizenship and which are inherent in the great traditions from which these freedoms have evolved.

Among other things, we must concern ourselves with the authority granted to boards and commissions, both in their administrative functions and in their investigative powers. We must review the rights of appeal from the decisions of boards and commissions and we must also review the powers that may have been given to these boards and commissions by statute over a very long period of years.

We must examine very closely the various means that can be devised to strengthen and maintain these guarantees, such as the desirability of the creation of the position of a public defender, the possibility of the development of a comprehensive civil rights code which might be a further extension of our present human rights code in which we all take justifiable pride, or perhaps it might be the adaptation of the Canadian Bill of Rights in relation to the powers of the province. These matters must be looked into. Then, too, there is the whole question of safeguarding our people against the actions of future governments. In short, we may require a Magna Carta of our own based upon the principles of the original great charter. Any action along the lines I have indicated here will have a very far-reaching effect indeed upon the people of this province. I am confident that all hon. members will agree that these questions are far above party politics. They are not matters to be dealt with in the heat of political partisanship but should be brought under the close scrutiny and the cool judgment of the judicial mind.

To this end the government has decided to appoint a Royal commission to conduct an exhaustive inquiry into the matters I have mentioned. I am happy, therefore, to be able to inform the hon. members of the House that the hon. James Chalmers McRuer, Chief Justice of the High Court, has consented to undertake this inquiry.

Mr. Justice McRuer is a jurist of distinction, who has established an enviable reputation in the position he occupies, particularly with respect to judgments he has delivered from time to time emphasizing the importance of protecting and safeguarding human rights and civil liberties.

He was born in Oxford county, educated here in Toronto at the University of Toronto and Osgoode Hall. He was called to the Bar in 1914, created a King's Counsel in 1929 and he is a member of the bar of both British

Columbia and Alberta in addition to the bar of this province.

He has practised here prior to his being appointed to the Bench for some 30 years; he has been a lecturer at Osgoode Hall in criminal procedure; he has been a chairman as well as a member of several Royal commissions, appointed to inquire into other matters of public concern. In every way I would say that he is eminently equipped to conduct this present inquiry, and I can assure you that he will have at his disposal the full and complete resources of this government and such research assistance as he requires to assist him in his task, because there will be a great deal of research and study necessary.

From his studies and recommendations, it will be our hope and purpose to be able to draft, and to present to this House at as early a date as possible, the necessary legislation to ensure that within the statutory powers of this province, the rights, freedoms and the liberties of our people here will be protected for all time.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain the the hon. members will agree that a task of this magnitude cannot be carried through in haste. It will require careful deliberation. I think one of the important lessons we have all learned in recent weeks is the unwisdom of doing things in a hurry. Someone has said that we often discover what will do by finding out in good time what will not do. And I am the first to admit that we have, with the best of intentions, at times fallen into the error of haste in our zeal to solve a problem. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I think that we might agree that it is only an error in judgment to make a mistake but it is a defect in character to persist in it after it has been discovered. Perhaps the real achievement is not in never making a mistake but in correcting it in time. It is in this spirit that we are endeavouring to find the best possible answer for what all of us in this House agree is a most serious problem.

We are confident that the course we are following will meet with the approbation of all the hon. members of this assembly, as well as with the approval of the people of the province. The liberty we are seeking to defend is a fundamental necessity to the spiritual and the material development of our society, for liberty is not only the people's prerogative but it is a prerequisite of the abundant life we seek for them.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude these remarks by quoting some words spoken by an Englishman who knew his rights and dared to assert

them and these were spoken some three hundred years ago in 1663. He said:

For what is done to anyone may be done to everyone; besides being all of one body, one man should not suffer wrongfully but all should be sensible and endeavour his preservation. Otherwise they give way to an inlet of the sea of will and power upon their laws and liberties which are the boundaries to keep out tyranny and oppression. And who assists not in such cases betrays his own rights, and is overrun and of a free man made a slave when he thinks not of it or regards it not; and so incurs the guilt of treachery to the present and future generations.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, the announcement just made by the hon. Prime Minister is welcome so far as we are concerned and we shall move with him in whatever capacity lies within our power to see that what he has so boldly set out this morning, will be carried through to its fruition. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that what the hon. Prime Minister has said this morning comes I think, in the main, from the protestations and from the arguments and the appeals down through the years from those of us who sit on this side of the House. I am not distinguishing between one party or the other this morning. We have constantly, as the House will recall, made a plea that the rights of the individual should be safeguarded and his privileges maintained in this province; and that no government, through the strength that it has, should trample upon the rights of the individual in Ontario.

I have many times in this House argued that the emanations of government, such as those the hon. Prime Minister has suggested this morning, in the form of commissions and boards, although necessary to carry on the government in this day and age, nevertheless these boards and commissions have rights to interfere with the individual that the Legislature itself might not give. We have argued that the boards and commissions were too far removed from the Legislature; and that the right of appeal from the decisions of those boards was not as clear cut and definite as we would like it to be.

All these things we have argued over the years, and to hear from the lips of the hon. Prime Minister this morning that a complete and exhaustive investigation into all these matters is to be pursued is, I say, welcome news to us. We are, of course, happy in the choice of the one who is to conduct this investigation because we have complete confidence in his integrity and in his desire

to find a real solution to the problems that will be put before him.

And so in a word, Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the enumerated remarks of the hon. Prime Minister as he catalogued each one of the dangers that are inherent in the way we are carrying on. I thought perhaps that one thing he did not include was that I have always felt that government has too much power in the making of regulations and I think that is another field that should be exhaustively gone into. I know that regulations need to be made and that powers should be given to make regulations. But over the past few years, particularly, I think we have run a bit wild in giving Ministers power to make regulations in respect to Acts introduced in the House. I think a lot that has gone into regulations in the past number of years should be in the statute itself. Certainly it seems to me that is one theatre in which critical examination should be made.

I think, too, that before we leave the Legislature we should know what the terms of reference are in respect to this matter. We should have an opportunity to examine them and to see for ourselves whether, in our judgment, they are broad enough and embracing enough to do the job that so badly needs to be done in this province. We all wait with interest and concern the outcome of this examination because we believe it is long overdue.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. leader of the Opposition in saying that we welcome the appointment of this Royal commission, with just one reservation that I want to come to in a minute.

We welcome not only its appointment, but also the person who has been chosen to head it. I think Chief Justice McRuer has proven down through the years that he has the fearlessness to let the chips fall where they may in coping with issues that relate to the rights of the individual.

I think, however, that we should at least take cognizance of the fact that some of the work that is now being handed over to a Royal commission is very much in the nature of unfinished business. For example, there is one aspect of this threat to individual liberty relating to the question of whether or not there are adequate appeal procedures from boards and commissions, on which—let us face it, Mr. Speaker—we have had one Royal commission already.

The Gordon commission, in examining the whole operation of government, reviewed this

and brought back recommendations. We, in this House, in our wisdom some four years ago, also set up a select committee to review the recommendations and to bring back suggestions to this House that might be implemented. The tragedy of it is that the select committee never completed its work. This is the unfinished business that we, in effect, now are handing over to a second Royal commission.

However, I think this is justified in view of the fact that the hon. Prime Minister has indicated clearly that he is considering much broader terms of reference—the whole range of existing or potential threats to the rights of the individual.

I think I can make my point best, Mr. Speaker, by just saying that there stands on the order paper, in my name, a resolution in which I spelled out—and I do not pretend to suggest that this is necessarily an exhaustive list—these very areas in which there should be investigation. Indeed, one of them is precisely the point (b) in my resolution, that the hon. leader of the Opposition has just now raised. There has been a growing practice of passing a skeleton statute and then leaving the power with the Minister to make regulations and failing in this House, though we have discussed it many times, to establish a regular procedure for reviewing the regulations.

At a time when nobody knows anything about it, the regulation is often made. It is published in the *Ontario Gazette* and, I suppose, a small fraction of one per cent of the people of the province of Ontario see it. Yet the lives of human beings are vitally affected. They sometimes discover it has been affected without their knowledge; without anybody knowing about it.

There is a whole range of issues that I have spelled out in this resolution and, as the hon. leader of the Opposition also has indicated, I trust we are going to have an opportunity before the end of the session to examine the terms of reference that the government is proposing. I invite the government to examine, at least, the points I have included in this resolution for possible inclusion. Again I do not suggest that they are necessarily exhaustive for inclusion in the terms of reference of the Royal commission.

Mr. Speaker, my reservation is this: There may well be a point in the hon. Prime Minister's underlying assertion that we have now reached the stage in the growing complexity of our society when we need to examine the machinery that is now almost inevitably appearing more and more to see

that it does not represent an unnecessary threat to the rights of the individual. It may well be that we should send this off to a Royal commission to take a look at the whole range of existing and potential threats.

But, Mr. Speaker, the final guardian of the rights of the individual is this Legislature. Therefore, let us not think that we are going to solve the problem by sending it off to a Royal commission. In at least one instance we sent it to a Royal commission and we sent it to a select committee, yet they did nothing. We are, therefore, the architects of some of the folly and some of the disaster that we have run into. We look forward, as early as possible, to a report from the Royal commission so that we, who are the guardians of the rights of the individual, can assume our responsibility here, because in the final analysis it is going to rest with us.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would take into account, when he is drafting the terms of reference, that there may be some boards and commissions which cannot be properly called provincial boards or commissions, but which are set up under the jurisdiction of this Legislature, and that the question of appeals from these should be looked at by this commission? For example, one that comes to mind is the Metropolitan Toronto Licensing Commission.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, as a lowly backbencher I would like to, if I may—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member just take his seat for a moment? In the matter of a statement of this kind I think it is the privilege perhaps for only one member of the Opposition party to speak to it and one of the other party.

Mr. Sargent: I think the personnel of this commission is very important.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but it is not up for debate at this time, and if the member has some remarks to make perhaps there will be occasion again when the terms of reference are submitted to the House.

Orders of the day.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments in a general way in connection with this bill. The first part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, provides that the consent of the committee of adjustments would be substituted for the consent of the planning board and also where an area of subdivision control is designated by order of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, consent to be given by the Minister.

Some of the background of the problem which has existed and which has caused me to bring in this amendment goes back to the year 1960. In that year a case came before the Supreme Court of Ontario in which it appeared that the township of Scarborough had given a conditional consent to a severance, the condition being the payment of \$205. The case was reported under the name *Lauff V. Cooney*, and is reported in the *Ontario Weekly Notes*. The court held that the municipality had no right to impose such a condition and spoke in somewhat strong terms of the action of the municipality in this regard. Following this an amendment was introduced in the 1960-61 session which permitted the Minister and the planning board to impose conditions by reference to section 28 of The Planning Act.

In my view this did not include the right to impose as a condition the requirement of a cash contribution. This was accomplished by the Minister and the Minister only under subsection 5 of section 28 under which the Minister could require the subdivider to enter into an agreement with a municipality.

One of the municipalities in this province, namely, the township of Brantford, in March 1961, passed a by-law which purported to impose a cash contribution on consents to severances under section 26 of The Planning Act.

A copy of this by-law was sent to The Department of Municipal Affairs in September 1962, more than a year after it had been passed by the municipality, and a letter was written to the clerk of the township advising the township that in the opinion of the law officers of this department, sir, this by-law was *ultra vires* of the municipality. Despite these instructions the township apparently continued to act under the by-law until the matter was brought before the courts on a motion by a land owner to quash the by-law. This case came before Mr. Justice Donnelly and is reported in the *Ontario Reports*, 1963. In his judgment Mr. Justice Donnelly quashed the by-law as being *ultra vires* of the town-

ship and in his judgment he states and, I quote:

The Planning Act does not authorize the municipality to pass a by-law requiring an owner of land to enter into an agreement and pay a severance fee as provided in the by-law.

Throughout the reasons for judgment it appears that Mr. Justice Donnelly had reached the same conclusion as had been reached by the department's legal branch who had advised the municipality.

After the judgment in this case the township council then endeavoured to have the planning board impose the cash contributions instead of the council as had been their previous practice. They either did this or they persuaded the planning board to refuse all severances as being premature and not in the interests of the municipality. In any event, in 1963 the same land owner applied to the planning board for consent to a severance and he was refused by the planning board. This land owner then took an appeal to the municipal board and, as I understand it, on this appeal the township said that unless it could impose a cash contribution, such severances were premature, whereupon the board took the view that while the planning board did not have this power the municipal board did, and it consented to the severance on condition that a cash contribution of \$400 be made.

This owner then appealed to the court of appeal which held that the municipal board was wrong and had no greater power than a planning board. It then examined the question of the powers of the planning board to impose such a condition and concluded that in the case before it the planning board had no such power and so allowed the appeal.

Now, following this I prepared this legislation and introduced it some time ago with the purpose of transferring the jurisdiction to give consent to severances from the planning board to the committee of adjustment, and at the same time I believe that this legislation is quite clear that the committee of adjustment is to have the power to impose these cash contributions in a proper case.

Now, this transfer of jurisdiction also carries with it the right of any interested person, including the Minister, to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. Under the previous legislation only the person applying for consent to severance could appeal if it were refused or if he were dissatisfied with the conditions imposed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, basically, committees of

adjustment are established to administer the zoning by-laws in the municipality. The zoning by-laws implement an official plan, if there be one, and otherwise are the only direct application of planning principles within a municipality. It seems to me that committees of adjustment which are directly and immediately concerned in the planning processes in a municipality are at least in a better position to consider severances than the planning boards, even with the members of the council constituting a part of the planning board. It should be remembered that the prime function of a planning board is to prepare an official plan, and under the previous legislation the only administrative act as such which a planning board performed was the granting of consents to severances.

There is no indication in my studies of this subject that the committees of adjustment would grant indiscriminate consents of severances any more than the planning boards would have. The existing function of the committee of adjustment is closely related to handling consents to severances. The administration of zoning by-laws is the direct application of planning principles whether these are propounded in an official plan, or otherwise.

The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is not to give more jurisdiction to a committee of adjustment, but is to assign to them a function which fits into a framework of these committees ideally, as under existing legislation for committees of adjustment, the entire procedure is provided, including the procedure for an appeal.

It is significant that this appeal could be taken by the Minister, if committees of adjustment attempt to usurp the Minister's function in approving plans of subdivision or by the municipality, if the council feels that the committee has not acted properly.

There is no reason to assume that the committee is going to act improperly or that the committee knows nothing of plans of subdivision any more than there is any reason to suppose that members of council are going to act improperly or that they know nothing about subdivision. So I recommended these amendments to the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the next important amendment to The Planning Act is—and I might say before I leave this subject, sir, that another amendment relative to subdivision control will provide that where the Minister makes an order designating an area of subdivision control, he will have all the powers of the committee of adjustment to allow minor variations. This is to provide for

cases where there is no planning board or official plan, but where an area of subdivision control has been set up by the Minister.

The next important amendment contained in this bill, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the maintenance of dwellings.

Hon. members may remember that in June, 1962, which is almost two years ago, The Department of Municipal Affairs published a very important report entitled "A Better Place to Live." This was a study on minimum standards of occupancy and maintenance of dwellings and was jointly sponsored by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and The Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs. Copies of this report were very widely distributed throughout the province to interested municipalities, planning boards, community planning associations and other similar organizations interested in this very important subject.

During the course of the study, some 360 individuals in 225 agencies were contacted, many through personal interview. Ideas and suggestions and interests were forthcoming from individuals and agencies even outside of Canada, as well as those from within the ten provinces.

This report, Mr. Speaker, is based upon the belief that housing of all forms is a valuable social and economic asset. It is both a physical and a social resource and like all resources, it is limited while the demands upon it are many. It occupies the largest proportion of built-up land area in all urban communities. It is subject, unfortunately, to many deteriorating influences and it is difficult to replace. Because it is both a resource and an important influence in shaping the lives of citizens, the conservation of it should be one of the prime objectives of every community.

For many people the investment in a dwelling is the largest investment they ever make. Usually the investor wants to protect his investment by taking good care of the house. Negative influences, however, may hinder his good intentions. The original owner may move away, or he may be short of funds. There may be changes in neighbourhood environment which discourage maintenance of the individual home, sir, such as overcrowding, lack of sufficient open space, heavy traffic, and the point of view that money will be saved if the house is neither maintained nor improved.

A house also represents a social or a community asset. As a social asset, it is the primary physical environment in which an individual grows and lives. As a community

asset it is a place to live; it produces revenue and its appearance adds to or detracts from the physical environment.

Mr. Speaker, in all levels of society, there are standards by which individuals conduct themselves. Such standards may be customary or based on law, but to deviate to something less than the accepted standard is not regarded with favour. However, standards change with society and new situations create new standards and different ways, depending on the traditions of any given group. What was standard 25 years ago, may be substandard tomorrow.

Because of the importance of housing to the individual and to the community, the requirement for standards is immediate. A house must be safe from collapse or fire, hence there are standards of construction and fire prevention. There are also other standards for dwellings, such as standards regulating the size, kind and relationship of one dwelling to another. There are standards that minimize and control the incidence and spread of disease.

In spite of the fact that standards have increased in number and in quality, the deterioration of housing in some instances has been of such magnitude that expensive redevelopment projects have been necessary. Redevelopment of this type inevitably requires large public expenditures. However, the interest in preventing the spread of blight in deteriorating neighbourhoods has increased substantially in the last decade and many of the reasons for blight have been identified. One of the principal reasons is the lack of minimum standards of occupancy and maintenance for dwellings, while another is the lack of enforcement, if there are such standards.

Mr. Speaker, the completion of this report entitled "A Better Place to Live" is a comprehensive three-year study on bylaws and other regulations having a bearing upon maintaining minimum housing standards. I do not wish to quote further from this report because I know that hon. members have already read it. It has received wide acclaim from all those interested in this subject. Therefore this year, Mr. Speaker, I have provided in Bill No. 132 the necessary amendments which would authorize the municipalities, where an official plan includes provisions relating to housing conditions, to pass bylaws prescribing standards for the maintenance and occupancy of residential property and for requiring residential property below the prescribed standards to be repaired and maintained to comply with the standards.

There must be an official plan in effect and the official plan of course has to be amended if it does not already carry these provisions relating to housing conditions. Then the municipal council would pass the bylaw, but no part of any bylaw in any municipality would come into force without the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board. I consider that to be reasonable protection for the individual, and of course, Mr. Speaker, the bylaw would also set out the area in which it is to apply within the respective municipalities.

Then every bylaw under this section of the Act, Mr. Speaker, would provide for the establishment in the local municipality of an organization known as a housing standards committee which would be composed of three ratepayers of the municipality who should hold office for the term prescribed in the bylaw. This housing standards committee would be, should I call it, the court of appeal in using the facilities and the conditions in the bylaw once it is approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

I might say to hon. members also, sir, that it is my intention to propose an amendment in the committee to subsection two of section seven which deals with the date on which this amendment is to come into force and I am doing that at the request of a number of municipalities.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if this bill could be placed on the committee agenda for the next sitting of the committee and at that time I will be prepared to discuss the bill completely.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, starting at the second portion of the bill, and I will move in a few moments to the first portion, I want to compliment the hon. Minister on having discovered the book, "A Better Place to Live." It is some two years now, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member is wrong.

Mr. Singer: Oh I know, I know, but it is some two years now, Mr. Speaker, since I read into the record great portions of that bill talking about housing. It is some two years now since I urged upon the hon. Minister and his colleagues that something should be done about this. It is not insignificant, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago and even as recently as this session, the government did not see fit in dealing with the main estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs to indicate that it had paid any great attention to what was in the book. So, in the spirit of

good faith, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the hon. Minister for having discovered it, albeit a bit late, and having taken some action on it. I think the action he has indicated in the bill makes some good sense and I have no great quarrel with that.

However, dealing with the first section of the bill—this idea of giving additional powers to the committee of adjustment insofar as severances are concerned—I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I fail to follow the hon. Minister's reasoning. We have just listened this morning to a speech from the hon. Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Roberts) expressing his concern about the preservation of civil rights and liberties, and hardly had the hon. Prime Minister sat down when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs stands up and says that we are going to take away from the elected officials of a municipality, the rights to determine things that properly should be determined by the people who are responsible to the electors. I grant to the hon. Minister that he has had difficulty in getting across to the various authorities and to the courts what he meant in his legislation, but I suggest that this is no one's fault but the hon. Minister's.

If the hon. Minister wants, and I see no great harm in it, to allow severances to take place and conditions to be extracted, which conditions can be reviewed perhaps by the hon. Minister and perhaps by the municipal board, in principle there is nothing wrong with this at all. But what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, about this approach, is that the hon. Minister is telling us that there is greater intelligence or greater integrity or more facilities in allowing a group of people appointed by the politicians, to make decisions that he does not want the politicians to make. I object very strongly to this continued taking away from the elected people, whether it is provincial or municipal, the powers that they should have to exercise. I can see no point whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in giving this power to the committee of adjustment, which, once it has been appointed, he has removed from the control of the municipal people who appoint them. I fail to understand completely, Mr. Speaker, what intelligence there is in the fact that the people whom politicians appoint have greater intelligence than the politicians who appoint them, and that more power should be given to the people whom politicians appoint, and removed from political control.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that committees of adjustment are deliberately going to violate powers that are given to

them, but I say it is possible that a committee of adjustment could tear apart any municipal planning scheme and not be subject to the control of the municipal council that brought in that planning scheme. If there is necessity for this power, I think the Supreme Court cases the hon. Minister has referred to indicate that it is high time the legislation was cleared up. If there is a necessity for this power, I think the power should rest with the elected representatives of the people, with the local council. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why Ministers are constantly nibbling away at the rights given to those elected officials, nor why it follows in the minds of some of those hon. gentlemen that there is greater virtue in the people these horrible politicians appoint than there is in the politicians themselves. If this power is needed, and I say, Mr. Speaker, I think it is, then it should be left with the municipal councils. I see nothing that is going to be achieved by giving this additional power to the committee of adjustment.

The hon. Minister says they are aware of subdivisions. But they do not plan subdivisions and they do not make subdivision decisions. Nor is it their job. They are set up as an administrative adjunct to deal with matters minor in their natures. Now, these matters, these severances, could be major in their nature. By their very form they could destroy all of the planning control that a municipality wants to exert. After all, under our present scheme of things, this is where the planning is done in the local areas, by the municipal council. The planning board is an advisory board and its only use is to advise the council.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no point whatsoever in nibbling and continuing to nibble away at the rights given to these elected people and saying that the people that the elected people appoint have greater virtue. I think that the hon. Minister should very seriously reconsider where this power should lie and I would hope he would give it back to the elected representatives. After all, there is always another municipal election or provincial election coming on and if the people do not like the decisions made by their elected representatives, in due course they can replace them.

But they cannot replace the committee of adjustment. And the committee of adjustment can go on making this sort of decision without being subject to any control other than the control of an appeal. The hon. Minister is going to tell us the appeal is always there. But appeals are expensive and

the ordinary citizen-ratepayer is not anxious to get into an appeal and to involve himself in inconvenience of appearing some distance away from his home, the expense of hiring solicitors to represent him, or the challenge of having to take on an organization that has unlimited funds to disagree with him. So that the appeal safeguard, while it is important, is not as good a safeguard as leaving this power with the elected representatives.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister should take another careful look at this before it comes before the committee.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question and perhaps make some remarks. Could I ask the hon. Minister: did I understand him to say that this will provide for conditions to be attached by the committee of adjustment in the case of land division?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is right. The problem has been in the past that the planning board has no right to enforce a cash payment that has been one of the considerations for severance. Of course, the hon. member must remember that severances occur only where there is no subdivision plan in effect, usually.

Mr. Young: Well, would this condition then, Mr. Speaker, allow a committee of adjustment to demand certain lands or certain grant of lands adjacent to a highway or a road or a street, if it not be cash, it be in kind?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I would doubt that, because this is dealing with the subdivision of existing lots that are ten acres or less in area, and I do not think it would involve the dedication of land. The hon. member is speaking of the five per cent lands in the case of a subdivision.

Mr. Young: No, I am thinking in terms of lands adjacent to streets. For example, at the present time Metro Toronto and the municipalities are acquiring for Metro Toronto along the major arterial roads, widenings. Wherever subdivisions occur, those widenings are sought and demanded and achieved. Now in the case of land separation, can that same road widening be achieved under this legislation? This is what I am getting at.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to delve into the intricate details of this legislation. We will deal with that in committee, if you do not mind. I will have my officials there to take care of it.

Mr. Young: Well then, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I was going to inform the member the question-and-answer parts on the bill would perhaps be better taken up in the standing committee.

Mr. Young: Thank you, sir. I think I will just make a few remarks here and then will continue in the committee because I think what I wanted to say has been fairly well covered by the hon. member for Downsview. But it seems to me that this bill in transferring this right from the elected representatives to the appointed board is a dangerous bit of legislation.

I say this because of what has already been said, that the planning board and council deal with the overall planning of a township. The committee of adjustment deals with minor variances and the committee of adjustment, unless in other places they are wiser than they are in some jurisdictions that I am familiar with, is not cognizant of the overall planning needs of the municipality. And they are perhaps never aware of reasons which led councils and planning boards to make certain moves and to lay down certain conditions. I think, for example, of a recent incident where a certain density was allowed on an apartment block and so the apartment builder simply left the first floor vacant, put it up on pillars and then went to the committee of adjustment and got his extra suites from them. This kind of thing is an illustration, I think, of what can happen because of the lack of understanding of the overall kind of planning that must be done. And so when it comes to giving a committee of adjustment this kind of power, which can seriously affect the overall planning, and can allow landowners, in effect, to subdivide without meeting the conditions which the community and which the municipality wants to lay down for that process—so I think this is legislation that should be looked at very, very carefully and certainly when it comes to committee stage some of us will be looking at the various suggestions that are put forward there.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I may say that the comments made by the hon. member for Downsview are not unknown to me. I would suggest that when in committee we will go through all the intricate details of the amendment.

But I am concerned with the relative position as he refers to them as regards the local politicians against the committee of adjustment. In my experience—and I have been in this field for many years, not just

since I have been in The Department of Municipal Affairs—it is sometimes very difficult for the local politicians to resist certain pressures, whereas if they were there as the guiding light and had the right of appeal of any decisions reached by the committee of adjustment, I would be inclined to think that the community generally would be better served in that way. However, we can go into the details of that during the committee hearing.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I might inform the members of the House that Bill No. 132 will go to the committee on labour, legal and municipal bills on Monday.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill No. 142, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there are three principles involved in this bill and I have very little to add to what was stated on first reading of the bill.

But the first point has to do with the transfer of the power to grant conciliation from the labour relations board to the department itself. This is designed to relieve the labour relations board of certain routine procedures, with a view to speeding up the conciliation process.

The second matter has to do with voluntary recognition in certain circumstances and with safeguards provided against so-called "sweetheart" deals.

The third point is of some great importance. It has to do with the preservation of the whole conciliation process and its very nature. Any effort to abrogate the immunity which the officials of the department or members of conciliation boards have with respect to information which has been conveyed to them in the course of their duties to conciliate or mediate a dispute—any attempt to abrogate that protection or indeed, any threat to that protection—would undermine and quickly destroy the entire conciliation procedure. It is for that reason that this section is in the bill.

It is our view that with respect to the actual operations of the proposed three principles, the senior officials of the board and the department will be available at committee to deal with them.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this bill is a great disappointment.

I would judge from the fact that it has been brought in so late in the session that it has received mature consideration from the hon. Minister and the department. I would judge that they have been considering amendments that they think are appropriate to The Labour Relations Act for a long time. The result of their consideration is not very startling, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker.

I would not object to the proposed changes in the Act. I think they are useful changes, and they will be useful in the future development of labour relations in this province. It is unfortunate, however, that after such lengthy consideration the hon. Minister or the department apparently has not seen fit to deal with a great many other matters that I think are urgent and more important.

We still have no proposal from the hon. Minister on the matter of the check-off of union dues. We have no suggestion that the disability on certain classes of employees employed by municipal governments and municipal boards will be removed. These people are to continue apparently for another year to be second-class citizens under The Labour Relations Act of this province.

No further consideration, I take it, has been given to the whole question of trusteeships. There has been a rather important use of the power of trusteeship in the Toronto area during the past year. I think that it raises some fundamental questions. I regret that the government has not seen fit to reconsider its legislation in the light of what has happened in this particular instance. I am referring to the carpenters' union in this city, where a trusteeship has been imposed from on high with very little redress apparently available to the people affected. I would have thought that that incident might have given rise to further consideration of the provisions of the Act relating to trusteeships.

None of these matters is dealt with. One wonders why it took the hon. Minister so long to bring in this rather insignificant bill. However, this is what we have to consider since this is all that is placed before us. I think it can be said that we in this group will support the bill for the little bit that it does do. We regret that once again some much more important issues have been evaded.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I have been asked to announce this bill will also go to the standing committee on Monday.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 515:

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might just suggest this, not that it makes too much difference: I was wondering if we might consider 515, 516 and 517, and then just for some order of procedure, if we might then go to 519, 520 and 521, if this would be agreeable to the hon. members opposite. I am just trying to relate all the votes that directly affect the department. This leaves the whole question of universities until the final vote, if this would be appropriate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the hon. Minister in vote 515 about the money that is provided for scholarships for foreign students coming to Ontario, and also the money for residents of this province who wish to study outside the province, listed in items four and five.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister how the scholarships are awarded. Do the applications come to his department and, if so, who deals with them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: On the question of the African students, Mr. Chairman, the recommendations come through the African Student Foundation. We accept these recommendations and pay the money in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the scholarships, these are awarded on the basis of \$2,000 annually as a rule. They are authorized under section seven of The Department of Education Act. The recipients in 1963-64, and they are secondary school teachers as a rule, are: Miss Marion Cornwall, assistant supervisor of the kindergarten and primary department schools in London, and she is to study at the University of Boston; Mr. John Futhey who is from Fort Frances and who will study at the University of Illinois; Mr. Simons, who is at David and Mary Thomson Collegiate in Scarborough and who has his BPHE and I assume is going to take further study in this field at the University of Leeds in England; and Mr. Tomkinson, the art

supervisor in Etobicoke, who is going to study at the University of London in England.

Mr. Nixon: I am very interested to hear who the recipients are, but what I wanted to know was how are the awards made. Are they made on the recommendations of the committee of the secondary people?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, there is one item here, item number four, relating to scholarships for African students. My understanding from the information given to us in the public accounts committee is that two or three years ago an arrangement was made with a private organization whereby this department would help that organization in bringing certain African students to Canada for study and would assist in providing scholarships for them. I think this was a good idea. The only reason I raise the matter now is to suggest to the hon. Minister that he might consider continuing and extending the plan. The answers given to us in the public accounts committee indicated that this was a one-shot affair, shall we say, lasting for approximately four years, applying to a limited number of students who are being assisted to complete their education in this country.

Now, the problem of assisting underdeveloped countries throughout the world in improving the education of their people, is a monumental problem. I am not going to suggest that the Ontario government can solve it, but I would like to put before the hon. Minister and the government a proposal that we might assist in our own small way by developing a regular programme with regard to the students or the young people of one or two countries. I would think the vast continent of Africa is an appropriate area where we could consider giving assistance. I would like to see this province, with all the many advantages that it has, doing something in this field by working out a plan whereby an increasing number and substantial number of scholarships would be awarded to African students to enable them to come to this country for either undergraduate or post-graduate training.

I would not want to imply anything that might be discriminatory, I am not suggesting that Asian students from many countries are not also worthy of assistance. It is just that we cannot solve the whole problem. Perhaps we could make a contribution by selecting one area to which we would give assistance. My understanding is that the programme of scholarships for African students, which was quite modest, is coming to an end. I would

hope that the government might consider a proposal to build upon this very useful, even though modest, start, and develop a full-fledged programme whereby we might provide, say, \$100,000 in another year, and \$500,000 two or three years hence to assist such students. I think this would be a very modest contribution indeed on our part, out of our relatively opulent resources to assist human beings in other parts of the world to solve their own problems.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, without delaying this, I think there is some merit in what the hon. member suggests. My thought was that this matter might be referred to the new Ministry of University Affairs and with some consultation with The Department of External Affairs in Ottawa to see whether there could be some overall policy established for the Dominion. There would be no point in the province of Ontario—say we were to continue this programme—to concentrate on one or two areas that were being duplicated by one or two of the sister provinces or by the federal department itself, and I certainly intend to suggest to the Ministry that they discuss this with The Department of External Affairs to see just in what areas we might be helpful.

Vote 515 agreed to.

On vote 516:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into all the complexities of the new system of legislative grants. I will frankly confess I do not understand all the ins and outs anyway. I am prepared to rely on the fact that the officers of the department understand them and will administer them in accordance with the law as embodied in the regulations.

I am somewhat concerned, however, about some of the policy implications of the hon. Minister's original statement on the new foundation tax plan, as he called it, as set forth in his statement of January 27 to this House. He stated on page 4 of the mimeographed version of that statement that the government has for the first year of operation of the new plan deliberately set the level in terms of the average. Later, at the bottom of page 10 and the top of page 11, he said:

In order to smooth the transition from the previous grant system to the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan 1964, the percentage that the 1964 grant is of the 1963 cost of operating is not to be more than 20 per cent higher than the percentage the 1963 grants were to the 1962 cost of operating, nor is this to be more than five per cent

less. The general effect of this provision will be to spread over a number of years unusually large increases or decreases in grant.

Mr. Chairman, that statement created a certain alarm in my mind at the time I heard it. I would like to probe a little further as to what exactly it means. On the face of it, there appears to be a possibility that under the new plan some school boards will actually suffer decreases in grant. No? What does it mean then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a floor, Mr. Chairman, so that no board will have a decrease in grant. There is also some stability at the top level—dictated by the limitation to 20 per cent increase over the 1963-64 grant situation. Otherwise, because of the complicating problems, a board might receive substantially more, not only than it would need, but than it could actually spend. This, quite frankly, is in the areas of the perhaps lower assessed separate schools. A floor level and also an upper limit have been established, at least for the time being—until we have an opportunity to see what the results of the new plan will be.

As I pointed out to hon. members the other day, \$210 is the average which we have taken—and you will be interested to know, I think, the provincial average, because you mentioned this before. It is \$235, I believe, for elementary, and for the separate school system I believe it is around \$185 or \$190. So the figure of \$210 is in between the two levels that presently exist throughout the province. These stabilizing factors have been built into the plan, at least for a period of time.

Mr. Bryden: What did the hon. Minister mean then, when he said that the 1964 grant will not under any circumstances be more than five per cent less of—let me read the whole thing. I am not interested in his upper stabilizing factor, I am trying to isolate the lower one:

The percentage that the 1964 grant is of the 1963 cost of operating, is not to be more than five per cent less than the percentage the 1963 grants were of the 1962 cost of operating.

That is a rephrasing of the hon. Minister's statement to focus attention purely on the lower limit—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): In other words, it can go down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is very involved and I am not sure that I can

give the appropriate explanation. It has to do with the equalization of the assessment and where the assessment of the board has been held at 60 per cent of the full equalization. This is a very technical subject and I would be quite prepared to have this explained at some length with either Mr. Rideout or Dr. Jackson. This is a very important ingredient in the plan. The intent is to build into it a base, or a floor, to see that none of these boards that are affected by this jump in equalization suffers anything from the new grant regulation. This is the purpose of it.

Mr. Bryden: Going back to the earlier statement of the hon. Minister that I quoted where he said that this year, at any rate, we have deliberately set the levels in terms of the average. Now that means, I take it, that he hopes to bring the boards now below the average up toward the average.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, if a separate school board, or any board, is at \$185 and we have set the rate at \$210, then it is going to come up \$25, if my mathematics is correct, as far as the basic grant is concerned. We have established it at \$210, using the elementary figure. The approximate average in the separate school system, I believe, is around \$185 to \$190.

Mr. Bryden: But it would not be envisaged that any board now above the average would be dragged down toward it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are not dragging it down. This is just the figure we have determined as the base from which we begin the calculations.

Mr. Bryden: I have here an excerpt from a story that appeared in the *Toronto Telegram* on February 24, 1964, and I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would comment on it. It is as follows:

A new Ontario grant programme designed to equalize education across the province, may be responsible for hiking Toronto's education taxes this year.

Board of education finance committee heard yesterday that Toronto now faces an increase of 2.71 mills because of more students, higher salaries and a loss in provincial grants.

Toronto, said finance comptroller, G. D. Spry, lost \$2 million in grants re-routed to Metro school boards. This money might be returned in some form by Metro, which would carve one mill off the increase.

But two board of education members, trustees William P. Ross and Barry Coutts, said they will suggest to the board later this week that a delegation or a brief present Toronto's problems to Queen's Park.

If the increase in Toronto's education tax is 1.71 mills, this would mean an increase of \$18.55 in the school and property tax bill for the taxpayer with a home assessed at \$5,000.

The problem, officials admitted later, is that no Metro municipality will know its tax situation until Metro adjusts its own balance sheets. Toronto's share could mount even higher.

And so on. Partly the concern that was expressed at that time was no doubt a reflection of insufficient information at the time. But there seems to be some concern in the Toronto board of education, or there was at that time at any rate, that they were going to have to increase the mill rate, not because of the normal sort of increase in demands but also because of what was described here as a loss in provincial grants. Has the hon. Minister any explanation of this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, but as I recall it the grant to Toronto this year—and this is all involved with Metro which further complicates it—is substantially the same at the elementary level. There has not been a decrease, but Toronto as you know is perhaps one of the wealthiest boards, assessment-wise, in the province. From the information we have there has actually been an increase in the grant at the secondary level. One of the problems you would face in what has been referred to as a pure foundation plan is that if we had established a pure foundation plan with, say, the \$210 and with the 11 mills and with no stabilizing factors in it, it is quite possible that the city of Toronto would have received a negative grant. That is, there would have been no grant.

Mr. Bryden: If you use the average, yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, but this is the problem. From the information we have, the city of Toronto is not receiving anything less for the elementary level, and is probably receiving an increase at the secondary level under the new scheme.

Mr. Bryden: Did the meeting suggested take place?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Bryden: They did not come to see the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I think they found out just what the implications were and we did not have a gathering.

Vote 516 agreed to.

On vote 517:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I believe that some weeks ago the Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada approached the government with regard to assistance for their rather encouraging outline of survey and study work to assist, in stages, Indians in various parts of the province. The information, when I raised this question with another department some weeks ago, was that it came under The Department of Education. I am now hoping that I can get a reply.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is true. It comes out of the miscellaneous grants. The request has come through to our department. We are considering it and I anticipate that we shall probably pay at least a portion. I cannot recall off hand the exact amount of the request, but I anticipate we shall meet a portion, at least, of the request.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, is the miscellaneous section at the end of this list, amounting to \$125,400 designed to accommodate requests that come in after the estimates are made up?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is designed to handle requests that come in after the estimates are made up, as well. We will have requests now from who knows what group. We may feel that they are justified in their request. This is the fund from which come these particular monies.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of the hon. Minister and refer him to the public accounts, page 32. This is in reference to the miscellaneous grants, as directed by the hon. Minister. There was \$1,000 to the Collegiate Institute of Ottawa. That is the one I am mainly interested in at this point. And there was \$875 to the Canadian Legion, Waterloo branch. I understand that as set out in the estimates these grants are given under the direction of the hon. Minister for the various reasons he has just mentioned in answer to the hon. member for Brant. Would he tell me—I have a special interest in the \$1,000 to the college institute at Ottawa—just what that was for?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will get the specific information, but it has something to do with the band attending some—

An hon. member: Musical function!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I think actually they went outside the jurisdiction to perform. But it was something to do with either their band or their orchestra. The request came in and there was no other source—you cannot do it through regular grants to the school system—and this was paid through the miscellaneous fund to enable this group of young people to travel to some area to perform.

I cannot tell the hon. member the exact location, but I will find that out. And the Kitchener-Waterloo Legion grant, I believe, was paid for their athletic meet that was held in Kitchener-Waterloo. This was the first regional meet they had. They had been having it for several years but it was the first time actually they brought competitors, I believe, from other provinces as well. This was for the track meet that was held up in Kitchener. I was there myself but I cannot tell you whether it was last June or July.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister for his answer. I have done some research on that particular \$1,000. It was for the technical school band to make a tour of Europe. There was a write-up in the *Globe and Mail* of January 8, 1964. How I came to refer to it was that the Saltfleet high school students have a 67-piece band and they made a tour of Europe in 1962, the same year, I believe, as the Ottawa technical school band. I am sure that both bands did a splendid job as ambassadors of goodwill in those countries. I know the Saltfleet high school band travelled for six weeks and it is recognized as one of the finest bands on the North American continent. It was highly commended by the well-known Harry Mortimer, best-known band consultant and enthusiast in Great Britain.

Why I referred to this particular \$1,000 is because the Saltfleet students' band attempted to get a grant from the various departments. The press release referred to the \$1,000 as coming from The Department of Travel and Publicity, so we approached that department and it knew nothing about it at all. We could not trace where the band got it. We contacted the people in Ottawa and they would not tell us or did not know where it came from. We tried to get some recognition and a donation from the Ontario Arts Council but apparently it had not established its policy as yet. It felt it would not recognize

this kind of tour because of its leaving the country, and that this would likely be a federal problem and we should apply to the federal arts council.

I am pleased to get the answer and I am sure I will be approaching the hon. Minister's office to see if we cannot receive some consideration for a small grant on behalf of the Saltfleet high school students' tour of this year. They have been asked by their English friends to repeat their tour to Britain and they immediately made their plans and did their budgeting to go this year. They thought that they had reached the amount of their budget necessary, but apparently because of some changes in the international airline rates, they find now that they have a substantial deficit and they are trying to make all possible efforts to raise a little more money. So, based on the answer from the hon. Minister, I will be approaching his office to see if I cannot get something done on their behalf.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we will be very happy to have the hon. member approach the office, although we have, as I recall, many requests for school bands and orchestras and groups to do summer activities or Easter holiday activities of this kind. I think we shall arrive at a policy very shortly, so I suggest the hon. member come soon. We may just decide that these matters perhaps should be handled more at the local level because of the many complicating factors. But if the hon. member wants to make this request very shortly, we will certainly take a look at it.

Vote 517 agreed to.

Vote 519 agreed to.

On vote 520:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, having to do with teachers' superannuation, the difficulties associated with this fund have already been expressed on several succeeding years by the provincial auditor. The importance of the fact that the government has not taken action to set this fund up on a proper basis has been emphasized by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) on several occasions.

But with the possibility in the next few months of the advent of a federal pension plan that will be supported by this province, I would like the hon. Minister to comment on how this would affect the present superannuation position of the teachers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot tell the hon. member. I had a meeting with the OTF. I have conveyed to the government the queries

that the federation has as far as the fund is concerned but we do not know the answers as yet. I told the federation that this matter concerned the government, and that several questions had been raised in the House about the actuarial deficit. I gave it an undertaking that this matter would be very closely studied, and that it would have an opportunity to discuss it with the pension committee of the government to see how its superannuation fund may fit in.

As you know, the federation would like to consider the possibility of operating outside The Canada Pension Act, or any provincial plan. I believe the hon. members have been circularized with its brief on this matter. But we had a meeting with the executive of the OTF a few days ago, before the amendments to The Teachers' Superannuation Act were brought here to the House yesterday, and it has been told that the government is quite prepared to sit down with it and see how this can best be resolved. I cannot answer the hon. member. We do not know yet what effect the new pension legislation will have on the fund. But we do realize the position of the fund and it is quite conceivable that through the implementation of the new pension arrangements, this will be resolved within itself.

I also told the OTF when we were considering this—and it may come up, say, on second reading of The Teachers' Superannuation Act—that under this amendment, and the hon. member will be interested to know, because I believe he did raise this, that a person now with ten years' experience after age 45 will be able to participate in the teachers' superannuation fund.

This is quite a departure, Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, and I think it will at least to a degree look after the situation that the hon. member referred to with respect to these vocational teachers who come in at a more senior level. This is actually the principal amendment to The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Whenever I am in a position, Mr. Chairman, to enlighten the House further on exactly the implications of The Pension Act on the teachers' superannuation fund and what we intend to do with it, I shall do so. But I have told the OTF that it certainly will have every opportunity to make its views known as far as any dealings with its fund is concerned.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, item 1 of vote 520 is for compassionate allowances for ex-teachers, and so on, to be paid as may be directed by the Lieutenant-Governor in

council. The compassion demonstrated is something less than overwhelming. It involves a figure of \$4,000, which is about one 100th of one per cent of the total amount of money that The Department of Education is asking for. I take it that it provides for grants to a quite limited number of teachers who cannot—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who cannot qualify under—

Mr. Bryden: —who cannot qualify in one way or another and are in penurious circumstances. I certainly have no objection to the vote. I think that compassion is in order in such circumstances.

I am, however, discouraged, shall I say, by the apparent continuing lack of compassion of the government for a much larger group of people—two groups to be specific. One group is those who are represented by the Ontario Association of Superannuated Women Teachers and the other group is the widows of men who were teaching before 1949. These people are also human beings. They like to eat and to have shelter and heat in their premises and clothes to wear. Because of the way in which our superannuation system has developed many of them are living on very inadequate allowances.

These people have been before this House as long as I have been here and for years before that, I believe. During my period here they came before what used to be the committee on education, I believe, and year after year the committee on education expressed unanimous support for their point of view. It expressed great sympathy with their demands and considered them to be reasonable. I can remember one year when I moved a motion and the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) seconded the motion saying that we agreed in principle with what these people were saying and asked the government to look into it right away with a view to doing something about it. That is the last we heard of it for that year.

Similar things happened in other years. The private members, when left by themselves, were invariably impressed with the justice of the claims of these people, but never could we get the government to move. The committee would do as much as it could, which would be to recommend consideration, and it would be considered right into the wastepaper basket.

I received a letter from a Miss Laura O. Cook, dated January 22, 1964, saying that the Ontario Association of Superannuated Women Teachers was once again requesting

the privilege of coming before the committee on education. I do not know if in our reorganization of the committee system they sort of got shuffled out of the picture. I do not know that they have, in fact, appeared before any committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Has the hon. member had any communication from this group since this letter?

Mr. Bryden: No.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Because I think I explained to the House two or three weeks ago that both Miss Cook's group from London and the widows' group have met with the committee. I think the last group was there some two and a half or three weeks ago and this committee is making a report to the treasurer, and of course it will come to me. But both these groups have met with the pension committee and I explained this to the House some months ago that this was the procedure we were following. It was suggested to the superannuated women teachers and they did make their presentation. I cannot give you the exact date, but it was some three or four weeks ago. I think I can recall telling the House this on that occasion.

Mr. Bryden: That would explain why they have not appeared before any committee of the Legislature, and frankly I do not see any point in their appearing before a committee of the Legislature. Committees of the Legislature year after year have gone as far as they can go. I do not know if going to another committee more directly involved, an administrative committee, will be of any value to them. I would merely say to the hon. Minister that this matter has been reported to death. I can hardly believe that there can be anything more to discover about it. It is simply a matter of the government making up its mind. Is it going to do anything, or is it not going to do anything? If it is not going to do anything—I hope that is not true, but if it is not—then in all fairness why does it not tell these ladies that it has a deaf ear to their pleas and plans to do nothing for them.

I would hope that it would take the more constructive position, but we do not surely need any more reports or investigations. I do not know what the pension committee has to do with it. This is a straight matter of a grant from the government, to provide some sort of pension for these people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this is through The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Mr. Bryden: I do not think it has to be through The Teachers' Superannuation Act—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, this is where they are getting it now. They are not getting this money under item one.

Mr. Bryden: No, I know they are not. Well, I do not care about the procedure, but the money is going to have to come from the government. It is not going to come from the contributions of the existing teachers in the field I would not think.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are not involved, I can tell you that.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The teachers' superannuation fund representatives are not enthused about this.

Mr. Bryden: I am sure they are not, but I do not really think they are involved. It is the government that is involved with these superannuated teachers and the widows of certain teachers. They are the people who are involved. When we looked into this matter a couple of years ago, it appeared to me that an expenditure of about a million dollars—just a straight payment to them, through what machinery is immaterial so far as I am concerned—would meet all of the demands they made and would pay them the supplements they asked for. Of course, this amount will decline year by year because these people are like all the rest of us. They are mortal and most of them have now reached fairly advanced years. The mortality rate among them is high, so that to grant all of their demands would as far as I can see, cost the government about a million dollars and I am not talking about the superannuation fund, I am saying the government—a straight subsidy would cost about a million dollars in the first year and that would decline year by year.

I have no doubt that in ten years it would not cost the government anything. The account would be completely wound up. Well now, why cannot we do that? A million dollars is a million dollars admittedly, but there is also a matter of real hardship involved. I think that I speak for most of the private members when I say that we would have sufficient compassion to see a million dollars worth of the funds of this province made available to these people. I just cannot understand why the government is so lacking in compassion that for years it has done nothing but give these people the

run-around. The letter from Miss Cook says that "every year for the past eight years, members of this association have brought this problem to the attention of the government. For the past three years, the committee on education has given our request unanimous support and has recommended that action be taken by the government but postponement has followed postponement."

So now they go to another committee. I do not know if the other committee will be sympathetic to them, but I think the views of this House are quite well known.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member must be also aware of this. As far as I am concerned, I meet with these ladies. I see them far more regularly than the hon. member and I think we are all sympathetic to them. But certainly with the one group at least, it does involve certain considerations of the public service or the civil service fund as well, because they are asking for, if you check their brief carefully, perhaps minimums that would exceed some of those presently within the civil service. This is why they met with this committee to determine what circumstances might be considered as on a par with the existing public service fund and this is the report we anticipate we will have very shortly.

Mr. Bryden: Well, then, are you going to do something?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this occasion pass without adding a word to the situation. The other evening I was complimenting the hon. Minister on having, in at least one aspect, carried his views as a private member into the Cabinet and acting on them. I can recall the hon. Minister in days gone by, being present at meetings of superannuated teachers as a private member and expressing quite—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, I want to make this very clear. During my first two years here—and I cannot give the reason and I must apologize—but I was not at the education committee when these ladies appeared. I did meet them last year of course as Minister when they appeared before the education committee. Now the hon. member is quite free to suggest that maybe we should be doing more, but I want to make it very clear that, as a private member, I never made any statements in the committee on education, with respect to the superannuated women teachers, because I was not there. This matter was brought to my attention last year by one of the ladies who happens to live in my riding and she said, "My, I am pleased to

see you here. You were not with us the last two years."

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has been referring to the enthusiasm of the Ontario Teachers' Federation with regard to certain possible changes in this pension plan, and his reference was to the fact that they did not favour the making available of certain funds for the support of the two groups that are presently under discussion. I cannot for the life of me see why they should express an opinion on this at all. The responsibility, surely is with the government to look after a case of stated need.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think, Mr. Chairman, that if this were to be paid, for the sake of argument, out of the fund, I certainly would want at least to contact the teachers' federation to get their views on what payments are made out of the fund when they are one of the chief contributors.

Mr. Nixon: That is very true, and I am sure that the hon. Minister is aware of the fact that the OTF is in no way enthusiastic about the province taking part in a federal pension plan. They stated this publicly and their reasons were that in their view the federal authority was incompetent of administering this fund and it demonstrated this in the use of the unemployment insurance fund during the past eight or ten years. I thought that they really stepped over the boundary of their jurisdiction in stating this, but I suppose they have the freedom to this opinion if they so desire. I would be very interested in what they said to the hon. Minister with respect to the provision of a special pension for those with only ten years' experience, for example.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to be fair and I do not want to be inaccurately quoted, but I think they were sympathetic to this provided that there was some consideration given to what this would do to the actuarial deficit. I think this was their prime concern. I do not think really they opposed this as a matter of principle.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I did want to pursue this. Undoubtedly my memory is faulty, but I thought I had recalled the hon. Minister as a private member being in this Chamber one day when that committee was sitting and making those remarks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was not even there.

Mr. Singer: However, his memory on this is probably better than mine and I accept

him at his word. The fact remains that I do not think it is so complicated a matter to help out these people if the government wants to help them. It does not necessarily involve at all the upsetting of whatever balance you have, and the auditor has some doubts as to whether there is a balance or not in this teachers' superannuation fund. If you want to do it, and if you feel that these ladies have been inequitably treated, and I think we all agree that they have been, then I suggest that you can do it.

As the hon. member for Woodbine pointed out, this is a programme you are only going to have to wrestle with for a few years, because all these ladies will have vanished from the scene. I think in the cause of equity, justice and good commonsense the OTF will be out looking for excuses not to do it. If you made up your minds you wanted to do it you could do it and do it very quickly with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to shift the ground a bit to the proposition that this is the government's responsibility. I agree that it is the government's responsibility. Obviously you can confer with the Ontario Teachers' Federation, but the proposition that the Ontario Teachers' Federation should be opposing this and that the government—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. One of the hon. members, I believe it was the hon. member for Woodbine, wondered what the attitude might be. The decision of the government as far as these two groups of women are concerned will not be based on the views of the OTF. I think in fairness that the OTF would not want to take any real position on this. I happen to know it is not enthused about anything that is going to affect the actuarial position of the fund, and this would affect it. The hon. member observed that if anything is done, it might be that it would be done outside this, and I want to be quite fair to the OTF.

Mr. MacDonald: I just wanted to make the point that it seems to me that many changes have been made—as related in the letter that I, too, got a month or so back—with regard to payments made out of the fund. For example, there were the payments to widows, which must have upset the actuarial basis of the fund to some extent. I am suggesting one more change now, to meet a need that is so obvious; a need that would seem to me should be met by a group that has any compassion.

I want to join with the hon. member for Brant in saying that I think the Ontario Teachers' Federation might examine with some care the public image it is going to create if it takes a firm stand on an issue like this or if it takes the kind of stand beyond its jurisdiction that it did—by jumping very readily into the picture against a national pension plan that would provide pensions for everybody, because it might affect the teachers'. There is a manifestation of selfishness, that "we are going to guard ours no matter what happens to the rest of the community" which in the long run is not going to be in the interests of the teachers.

Vote 520 agreed to.

Vote 521 agreed to.

On vote 518:

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks about our university, which I am sure the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) would be interested in.

I rise on this occasion to recall one of the most pleasant duties it has been my privilege to be associated with since becoming a member of the Legislature. The members of this House know that the establishment of Brock University in the Niagara peninsula is one of the most important events that has occurred in the peninsula in the last century, and it was my honour to be able to sponsor the bill known as An Act to incorporate Brock University on behalf of the people who reside in the area.

I would like to remind the members that some unique features were evident as the grass roots interest in, and repeated requests for, the establishment of an institution of higher education spread throughout the peninsula. The first official action was taken by the Allanburg Women's Institute on February 6, 1957, when they requested by resolution that "the provincial government favourably consider the placing of a university in the Niagara peninsula."

This resolution was sustained by the Welland District Women's Institute annual meeting in May, the Hamilton Area Women's Institute convention in October, the Federated Women's Institutes of Ontario in November and presented to the late hon. W. J. Dunlop, then Minister of Education for Ontario, by myself on behalf of the Women's Institutes. The time was not yet ripe and the policy of the day was stated in the reply of the Minister when he wrote "that we

should not proceed with the establishment of colleges at the present time but should provide, as far as possible and desirable, more buildings for the existing universities."

The next official action was taken by the Welland county council on November 19, 1957 when at its regular session it requested the provincial and federal governments to:

1. Sharply expand the facilities for training technicians and university students;
2. Abolish university fees and make it possible for all deserving students to obtain a university or higher technical education regardless of the financial status of their parents or guardians; and
3. Establish a higher institution of learning in a central location in the Niagara peninsula.

At the session on January 23, 1958, the Welland county council further requested "that the education committee take further steps toward encouraging the establishment of a university or higher technical school located centrally in the Niagara peninsula. Such steps to include preparation and presentation of briefs."

The members of the Welland county committee felt very strongly that the project should be proceeded with as a peninsula project and extended invitations to representatives of the women's institutes, the Lincoln county council and the councils of the separated cities of Niagara Falls, St. Catharines and Welland to appoint members to a joint committee to carry the project forward. This later led to the establishment of the Niagara Peninsula Joint Committee on Higher Education which held its first meeting October 2, 1958 with its membership constituted as follows: women's institutes, one; Lincoln county council, two; Welland county council, two; the councils of the cities of Niagara Falls, St. Catharines and Welland, one each—this was increased to two each after merger had occurred in the three cities.

The committee met with the hon. Messrs. W. J. Dunlop and J. P. Robarts, as Ministers of Education, the presidents of several Ontario universities, studied population and school population trends and the destination of students at the post-secondary level. Several reports were published on the findings and some of the data found its way into the report of the presidents of the universities of Ontario to the advisory committee on university affairs, entitled "Post-Secondary Education in Ontario 1962-1970" published May, 1962 and revised January, 1963.

The Niagara Peninsula Joint Committee on Higher Education had recommended the establishment of a citizens' committee selected from names of outstanding community-minded people submitted by the various councils. The new citizens' committee met on July 11, 1962 and chose an executive with power to add to its numbers. Eight days later a delegation met with the advisory committee on university affairs. The advisory committee gave strong encouragement to the delegation indicating that the Niagara peninsula was perhaps the most critical area in Ontario that would next need university facilities. The first significant decision was the selection of Brock University as the name of the fledgling institution. It met with universal endorsement and the group became known as Brock University Founders' Committee. By means of letters patent granted by Her Majesty the Queen in the right of Ontario, Brock University became incorporated October 31, 1962.

Another unique feature that indicated the broad base of acceptance of Brock University by the people of the Niagara peninsula was the method of raising the funds required for the organization and development activities. A solicitation dinner was held on November 22, 1962 at which representatives of the municipalities and the larger industries of Lincoln and Welland counties were asked to share, on a 50-50 basis, an \$80,000 budget.

With the industries contributing on the basis of \$2 per employee and every municipality contributing on the basis of 14 cents per capita, the sum of \$82,833.84 had been raised by June 30, 1963. On May 14, 1963 the choice of the DeCew Falls site located in that part of Lincoln county, formerly Grantham township, now part of the city of St. Catharines, and in that part of Welland county contiguous to the above and being in the township of Thorold, was announced by the late Dr. Arthur A. Schmon, chairman of Brock University Founders' Committee. Phase one consists of 325 acres and phase two containing an additional 200 acres will be incorporated later. The city of St. Catharines has made a grant of \$400,000 towards the purchase of the site and will provide the services.

Twenty-nine sites in all had been studied, six of them presented on behalf of municipalities or groups of municipalities. Fort Erie-Bertie township, Niagara Falls and Welland had all offered to purchase a site and provide the services necessary. The St. Catharines, Niagara-on-the-Lake and Thorold township offers varied. Although disappointment was expressed by the unsuccessful municipalities,

continued support for Brock University as an area project was pledged by all on the site which straddles the boundaries of Lincoln and Welland counties. On June 4, 1963, the hon. Leslie M. Frost, QC, and the members of the advisory committee on university affairs visited the site and later that evening, at a Brock University founders' dinner in Niagara Falls, Premier John Robarts announced the appropriation of grants totalling \$393,000 to the university for the fiscal year July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1964.

Later in the year, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Education announced the approval of grants that would provide the necessary funds for the purchase, renovation and equipping of the lands and buildings of the former Frozenaire Cooler Co. Ltd. as temporary accommodation for up to 500 Brock University students. This is significant because it will provide accommodation at a cost of \$1,500 per student compared with an average of \$7,000 to \$7,500 for new construction. Every effort is now being made by the board and staff of Brock University to provide for a scheduled registering of 150 students in September, 1965, and to provide for a significant proportion of the 6,000 students who will be attending universities from the Niagara peninsula by 1970.

The current and future budgets are now under discussion with the advisory committee on university affairs and it is the opinion of those associated with Brock University that mutually satisfactory arrangements in this regard will be agreed upon that will permit Brock University to progress through the following three-phase evolution envisaged by Dr. James A. Gibson, president, and the members of the founders' committee:

Phase 1: three consecutive years in arts, followed by a fourth (Honours) year in selected areas.

Phase 2: a graduate studies programme to be undertaken in conjunction with other neighbouring universities—to avoid duplication of research areas and research facilities—only after the undergraduate programme is firmly established.

Phase 3: the establishment of professional schools, e.g., architecture, medicine, social work, and an institute of land use and conservation.

In conclusion may I state that the next step in the establishment of Brock University as a degree-granting institution is the provision of a statutory charter which is the purpose of this Act to incorporate Brock University.

When we recall that:

1. The Women's Institute in Allanburg initiated the move to establish a university, in February 1957;

2. The Welland county council took its first action to further the project on November 19, 1957, and later invited representatives of the Women's Institutes and the councils of Lincoln County and the cities of Niagara Falls, St. Catharines and Welland to participate;

3. The Niagara Peninsula Joint Committee on Higher Education, consisting of representatives of the above groups, worked unceasingly in providing the research necessary to prove the need for a university and gain support for it;

4. A citizens' committee was established on July 11, 1963, which became the Brock University Founders' Committee and carried the area project forward;

5. The name Brock University has received universal endorsement;

6. The municipalities and industries raised \$82,000 for organizational and development funds;

7. That a site was chosen that is situated partially in Lincoln County and partially in Welland County, that has met with approval, and to which the city of St. Catharines contributed a grant of \$400,000; and

8. The provincial government approved appropriations of \$393,000 for the fiscal year 1963-64; it is evident that the movement to establish Brock University was a grass roots movement and has received support and endorsement at all levels including the encouraging support of the advisory committee on university affairs.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that without the enthusiastic and wholehearted support of our hon. Prime Minister it would not have been possible for this great project to have come about. And further, Mr. Chairman, it is the support of the hon. Prime Minister which has made it possible for Brock University to advance its starting date by one year. The original schedule was to commence with enrollment of 100 students in September 1965. I am now happy to be able to report that Brock University will be able to start with 100 students this coming September. The credit for this earlier start must go to our government, the people's government, the government of all the people, which made it financially possible for the university to acquire a temporary building and thus establish Glen Ridge campus, immediately below the main campus which will be in

operation in time for the start of the 1964-65 university year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member—does he want to make some remarks about Brock?

Mr. Bukator: I want to follow up on Brock.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us get it in the papers before the weekend.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, all right.

Mr. Bukator: I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, whether the press will publish anything I say, but I would like hon. members of the Legislature to know that I sat in county council when that first group met with the county of Welland to discuss this project, this university, and I might say that this is one project that we did not consider on party lines at all. I recall that one of the most active workers on that committee was Melvin Swart, and the only fault I could find with him was that he was a member of the New Democratic Party, and he is still active in that particular project.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Welland pressed this thing from the Conservative side and I did not hear anybody in the Liberal group object to it. I feel that I should say this for them. There was splendid co-operation among all people and they did an excellent job.

I recall when this first came about in the county of Welland. I did not believe that it would progress as quickly as it did. Much more quickly I might say, Mr. Chairman, than the superannuated teachers when they came to us three years ago, when we were all unanimous, I thought, that in a matter of months they would get a little bit more by way of pension. But here was a project that looked as though it was insurmountable and yet with the co-operation of the people of that area—I might find a little bit more fault with it since I come from Niagara Falls; we had a site as good, almost, in Niagara Falls but it was good that the people at that time thought that DeCew Falls of Lincoln county and Welland county were sharing this particular honour and doing this job was a wonderful thing. I might say that some two or three years ago the hon. member for Welland discussed the teachers' college you were going to build in Lincoln county. Since that time we have talked about the possibility

of bringing that teachers' college into the area of your college now near Brock University. You purchased the land quite some time ago, when you, Mr. Prime Minister, were the Minister of Education.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Before me!

Mr. Bukator: Before the hon. Prime Minister, yes. I believe that this would be worth looking into. I do believe that land could be resold and you could bring the teachers' college establishment closer to the Brock.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I mentioned to the House either yesterday or the day before that this is exactly what we are now exploring. We have already had some negotiations with Brock University to locate the new teachers' college in that area upon the Brock campus.

Mr. Bukator: This has been a rather trying time for the hon. Minister—the last two or three days of discussions. I naturally did not sit throughout the whole debate or discussions, but I think you are on the right track. Maybe someone has persuaded you to come to the right area with your teachers' college. At that time the city of Welland would have given you land for nothing, so you would have been that much ahead of the game. But I would like to add to what has already been said by the hon. member for Welland. As he outlined the history or related the history to us, I recalled every step of the way. I think this is definitely a step in the right direction and I hope there is more to come.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I discussed this matter with the educational experts on the other side of the House, at which time it was agreed that we would take the departmental estimates proper. We have completed these now, and the estimates concerning the universities are included, I think for obvious reasons, up to this point under the departmental estimates. I would assume that in the future they will come under the new Department of University Affairs. I want to explain to the House that the estimates as set out here are the results of the work of the advisory committee on university affairs and that these were presented to the government and were accepted by the government, both last year and, of course, this year as well.

It was also suggested to the hon. members with whom I discussed this that we could debate throughout this general discussion, the principles of the bill to establish The Department of University Affairs and also,

of course, the Crown corporation. I thought I would lead off—and I shall have more to say, and I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will and others on this whole question—with a few general remarks and then of course the hon. members opposite will be able to make their contribution.

We arranged some few days ago to have the report of the advisory committee on university affairs available to the hon. members of the House for the purpose of this debate. This report gives a comprehensive review of the work of the committee, but also indicates that the recommendations made to the government had been implemented in almost every respect. I commend the report to the hon. members of the House and trust that each member will examine it in some detail.

Insofar as financial support to our institutions of higher learning is concerned, it is worth noting that the operating grants for 1964-65 in the amount of \$46,621,000 represent an increase of \$11,308,000. This increase alone is 1.5 times the total operating grants for all our universities just ten years ago. In the provision of capital funds to be made available, the figure of \$54,675,000 represents an increase this year of almost \$20 million, and this increase is just under the total grant only two years ago. The total sum to be provided by the government in 1964-65 is \$101,296,000. The increase of \$31 million this year represents a rise of 44 per cent over the grants for 1963-64.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, I need point out to the hon. members of the House the necessity to see that these funds are spent wisely and that full value is secured for the monies that are expended. This is a commitment that I believe every hon. member will want to have, and I believe it is only on such assurance that our people will be willing to support higher education in this province to the extent that I believe is required if the problems we face are to be met and to be resolved.

While I have no intention of going over the ground covered in the report of the advisory committee, I believe it would be useful to cite just some examples to show the essential programmes and how they are moving forward, and that they are meeting, in fact, with success.

First, I should like to refer to the Ontario graduate fellowship programme in the humanities and social sciences. Last year \$1.5 million was included in the estimates for this project. The number of awards was slightly in excess of 800. This means that one quarter of all the graduate students in

our universities were recipients of these awards. Many other students receive awards from other agencies and from the scholarship, bursary and loan funds of the universities themselves. For the summer of 1964 some 900 awards have been made. These have just been announced, as the hon. members are aware, along with 1,200 awards for the academic session 1964-65.

I think it is quite fair to say, Mr. Chairman, this programme has been a tremendous success. It gives every promise of making a most significant contribution to the provision of university teachers to meet the demands in the years ahead. Inquiries about the programme have been received from a great many other jurisdictions in Canada and throughout the world.

During the current academic session 4,165 graduate students are enrolled in our provincially assisted universities. The universities indicate that the maximum number which can be accommodated in 1964-65 is 5,733, an increase of 1,568 or 37 per cent in one year alone. The special grants paid to the universities for the expanded graduate programmes have enabled our well-established institutions to realize this essential expansion.

In the area of the provision of accommodation I can report that the anticipated number of first-year students seeking admission to our provincially assisted universities in September, 1964, will be approximately 11,650. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, these are approximate figures. They come from the universities, and of course there will be some degree of flexibility. This represents about 45 per cent of the student body enrolled in Grade 13 in September, 1963. A survey of the universities indicates that they will have accommodation for approximately 12,700 first-year students, or potentially 1,050 places in excess of what the demand is estimated to be.

I should point out that these are cumulative figures for the whole province and that a student who wishes to go to a particular university may have to attend an institution other than the one of his first choice. Nevertheless, any student who can meet the admission requirements should be able to find a place with an institution of higher learning this year.

A second point to be made here is that because of the number of students who submit several applications for admission to different universities, the usual artificial shortage of space is likely to occur during June and July. When all applications submitted to all the universities are added together the figure is

quite obviously somewhat misleading. Experience has shown that the anticipated figure in total for 1964-65 is likely to be close to the actual demand for places.

Reference should also be made to the total enrolment expected since the figures I have just given you are for the first-year students. In September, 1964, it is anticipated that the total number of students in the provincially assisted universities will be about 38,100. This figure does not include enrolments at OCE, students in pre-admission courses, or students in technology courses at the Lakehead College. The maximum accommodation available could provide for approximately 40,750 students or 2,650 perhaps more than predicted. I stress that the latter two figures are maximum figures and that it would be desirable if the actual enrolment did not exceed 39,500, which would still provide for approximately 1,400 more than is presently expected.

It is also interesting to note that our universities have expanded at the rates they set themselves two years ago and that several of them will attain in 1964 the goals they originally set themselves for 1965.

During the year, substantial progress has been made in the development of the newer institutions. Trent University will open in September of this year with a class of roughly 100 students. It will begin operation in quarters in downtown Peterborough, which it has purchased with funds provided by the province. Plans are proceeding for the first buildings on the new campus and it is expected that facilities at both locations will be utilized for some time.

Brock University, as the hon. member for Welland and the hon. member for Niagara Falls pointed out, has made remarkable progress in this past year.

Originally, Mr. Chairman, it was expected that the university would accept its first class in September, 1965. The purchase and renovation of a building on what is known as the Glen Ridge campus, adjoining the main site, has permitted the institution to move its plans forward so that it too will begin operation with 100 students in September of this year. The provision of funds by the Legislature for the securing of temporary accommodation has made it possible for the university to purchase the space necessary to permit the earlier opening of Brock. Planning consultants have been working on a design for the main campus at Brock and this work is now well advanced.

It is, of course, essential to the long-term development of a new institution that it pro-

ceed on the best possible advice available to it. The board of governors and the administration at Brock are fully aware of this necessity and are illustrating once again the importance of strong local interest and initiative in the development of a new institution.

As you are aware, the University of Guelph is now ready with the passing of this bill, to proceed with the development of its expanded campus. Some preliminary discussions on the nature of the planning to be undertaken have already been held so that as soon as the new board of governors is organized, it can proceed with its work without any delay.

York University has completed development of its Bayview campus and is now hard at work on the main campus in North York. A large complex of buildings is to be erected between now and September, 1965, when several of these buildings will be ready to receive students.

Scarborough College has been fully planned and will take its first 500 students in September of 1965. And I can recall the hon. member for York South, perhaps, having some doubts as to whether this date might be met.

Mr. MacDonald: Not so much that as at Erindale; now what about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Erindale College is also being developed and I think the hon. member will note that there are monies provided in the estimates. It will be expected to open in September, 1966, with extension students in 1965. I have referred specifically to the newest institutions but the established universities have also been expanding at unprecedented rates. Their well developed organizations have made it possible for them to proceed to the point where it is possible to provide the accommodation to which I referred earlier. They are, Mr. Chairman, I believe, to be strongly commended for their acceptance of the responsibility to see that capable students have the opportunity to secure the best education available anywhere.

One other reference has to do with the Ontario new universities library project. This project is unique in that it provides for the co-operation of five new institutions in the development of a basic library for each. Under the plan, the University of Toronto has undertaken to select, purchase, index, catalogue and deliver to each of the five some 35,000 volumes between now and June 30, 1967, when the project will be completed. This will permit the new institutions to develop their library facilities and to engage

staff in an orderly manner and without some of the pressures which would otherwise prevail.

During the past year, the University of Waterloo was assisted by a special grant of \$25,000 to conduct a detailed study into the possibility of expanding its co-operative engineering programme into the areas of the humanities and social sciences. As a result, the university has decided to establish a new course in mathematics for actuaries and other workers in this field. A special sum to permit this programme to proceed is included in the operating grants for this year. Response to this extension of the co-operative plan has been excellent and more than 100 applications have been received for admission to this particular course.

Mr. Chairman, while I have not tried to cover all developments in the areas where the government is directly involved in higher education, I think the highlights that I have described here would be of some particular interest to the hon. members of House. The matters of the principle of the bill, the principle of the corporation, Mr. Chairman—I shall have remarks, as others will, at some other stage, but I suggest that this would be the opportunity for the hon. members opposite to make some general observations on the grants recommended to this government by the advisory committee to the universities of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, we will continue this discussion another time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Education might indicate if copies of that are available so we could have the most up-to-date information when we come to it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I shall have copies of this available for the hon. members first thing Monday morning.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not going to help me over the weekend.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I might even make an effort to get this to the hon. member so that he can peruse it over the weekend, and to the hon. member for Brant as well.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will continue with these estimates and then it will be my attempt, when we have completed this discussion on universities, to move second reading of the university bills that are on the order paper, so that the discussion can take place one place or the other.

We will have a night session Monday night and a night session Tuesday night. We will meet at three o'clock on Monday afternoon and I believe there are some presentations here on Tuesday, so we will have a motion on Monday to postpone the sitting until three on Tuesday, so these presentations can take place at two o'clock.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Can we assume that the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General will not be up on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I do not think you can make any such assumption.

Mr. Oliver: Well, I want to know.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is the next estimate to come up. We are going to complete the estimates of this department, we are going to sit in the afternoon and the evening and if we clear up the work as indicated, the next item will be the estimates of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). They may be reached on Monday, but I am unable to say how long the Opposition is going to talk on these estimates.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Are there going to be Wednesday and Thursday evening sittings?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I leave that until later in the week? We will sit Monday and Tuesday and I will tell the hon. member later. But there is a possibility that we shall sit both Wednesday and Thursday because I believe the committee work will then be completed.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 4, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Monday, May 4, 1964

Ninth report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans ..	2721
Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart	2722
Recess, 6 o'clock	2753

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1964

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We welcome to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from Lynedoch Public School and Vittoria Public School; and in the Speaker's gallery, a group of tour operators from the United Kingdom, France and Western Germany.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre) from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's ninth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 142, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 72, An Act to amend the Credit Unions Act.

Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Collection Agencies Act.

Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): **Mr. Speaker,** before the orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (**Mr. Simonett**), notice of which I have given to him, as follows:

In view of the explosion today of a propane gas tank in a house under construction in Scarborough, which is reported to have resulted in serious injury to two workmen, what steps does The Department of Energy and Resources Management plan to take to

improve its regulations and the enforcement thereof to prevent such occurrences in the future?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): **Mr. Speaker,** I would like to thank the hon. member for giving notice of the question.

The hon. member refers to an incident which occurred at 40 Greenbrae Crescent, Scarborough at 8.05 this morning. Preliminary investigation indicates that a salamander heater that is not listed with Canadian Gas Association was being fired with liquefied propane gas. Two workmen were seriously injured. They are presently being treated at Scarborough Hospital. The property damage is estimated at \$10,000. This installation appears to violate subsection two of section seven of The Energy Act. Further investigation will determine whether charges will be laid and against whom.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): **Mr. Speaker,** I do not want to appear to be picking on the same hon. Minister, but my question is addressed to him also.

Is the hon. Minister aware that the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority has refused to meet with a committee of the property owners regarding acceptance of offers for the property required to construct the Gordon Pittcock dam? If so, will the hon. Minister intervene to restore negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: **Mr. Speaker,** I again would wish to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question.

The answer is yes, I understand that the Thames River Conservation Authority has broken off negotiations with the committee of property owners, but the executive committee feels that, for the best results, they will negotiate only with the individual property owners concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order. House in committee of supply. **Mr. W. G. Noden** in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): It is my privilege at this time, Mr. Chairman, to present to the House the 1964-65 estimates for The Department of the Attorney General. In the short interval during which I have had the responsibility for this respected portfolio there have been many matters which have demanded my attention. Prominent among these have been the estimates which I will shortly place before you.

It would be presumptuous for me to suggest that in the past few weeks I have completely mastered all phases of the department's operations. However, Mr. Chairman, I do most earnestly assure this House that insofar as my modest abilities will permit, I have endeavoured to prepare myself and these estimates so that full and complete information may be available to all of the hon. members.

This information is due to the House and I would offer it nothing less. You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the form of the estimates differs substantially from that which they took last year.

The ten votes, that is numbers 201 to 210, inclusive, which will demand your scrutiny, now represent the divisions of the department and include the Ontario provincial police. These votes are then broken down into the individual items which represent the operating expenditures proposed for these divisions.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that this revised form will not only permit of a clearer and easier understanding of the department, but also that it will assist the hon. members in following a brief description of the organization of the department, which I think may be of interest to you.

I have recently had the distinct privilege, Mr. Chairman, of realizing just how numerous and varied the duties of the Attorney General are in this vigorous and expanding province of Ontario. The historical duties of law enforcement and the administration of justice have become furnished with various responsibilities that reflect the social progress of our country.

Thus, I bring before this House, our respectful request for the financial support and I will maintain such varied public services as fire protection, securities protection, probation officers, laboratory sciences, together with many other services that operate continually to ensure the protection which now accompanies the administration of justice and law enforcement.

The hon. members recognize, even better than I, perhaps, that the function of the department is to serve this House, the courts and the public. In providing legal opinions for the departments of government and in representing the Crown before our courts, the necessary counsel must be our servants. In the administration of the court officers and those of the Crown attorneys we must carry out that responsibility to the courts which is placed upon the province by the constitution.

I would note that the creation of the office of Chief Magistrate as set out in The Magistrates Amendment Act of 1964, indicates the approach that must be taken between the judiciary and the administration of justice, to ensure that justice may flourish in the modern environment so as to best serve our rapidly growing populace.

The service to the public—which is one of our greatest concerns—must be axiomatic if we are to truly serve the courts and this House. For in each of these forums do we find the democracy which is the people.

Through the co-ordination and supervision of police, fire and emergency measures services, we find the practical field of public order and safety upon which we all rely for the maintenance of our personal safety.

In order that these many responsibilities may be adequately provided, divisions have been established within the department which bring together those functions which have a similar purpose and staff engaged in a common service. In this way the legal officers and other specialists may realize their widest potential, while at the same time ensuring a uniform approach and policy in the particular field of endeavour. Such an organization also permits the consolidation in one area of all those services which have hitherto required duplication of staff and equipment.

A brief analysis of these divisions, as set out in the estimates, will demonstrate to hon. members our intention to work toward that system which will best serve the interests of our people. In drawing this reorganization to your attention, I must say that it is one of several new conceptions which were introduced by my predecessor, the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass). I am indebted to him for having started this and many other creditable things which I hope I will be permitted to carry through to a successful conclusion.

I would not suggest, Mr. Chairman, that any proposed organization would be perfect but I am certain you will agree with me that methods must be undertaken which will

permit us most effectively to fulfill our responsibilities.

In the course of presenting the estimates, I hope that I may be able to answer any questions that may be raised, but if I must, in the interest of accuracy, undertake to provide an answer at a later date, perhaps the hon. members will grant me that indulgence.

With these remarks, Mr. Chairman, may I invite this House to review the 1964-65 estimates of The Department of the Attorney General?

On vote 201:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, the introduction of the estimates of the hon. Attorney General is a little out of context this afternoon. Perhaps it is somewhat in line with the confusion that has existed on the government benches in so far as the role of The Attorney General's Department is concerned.

I do not attach any particular condemnation to the present holder of that office. He was called on in an emergency to take over, and from his performance since he has been assigned that portfolio, I find him a reasonable man who is trying, under very serious handicap, to do the best job he is able.

Some of us have had the opportunity to listen to his views in committee. He comes to the various committees with good will and with an effort to convince us that the government is taking reasonable steps to overcome some of the serious errors that it had embarked upon not too many weeks ago. But some of the things that are being done, perhaps in the name of expediency, cause one to wonder whether or not the government should have paused another week or two before bringing in these new bills and before allowing to be made some of the statements that were made.

For instance, this morning, when a series of bills came before the labour, legal and some other—municipal—committee it was difficult enough as a member of the Opposition to reasonably arm oneself with the ammunition to cope with some six bills, four of which had never been seen by members of the Opposition in the amended form. We knew we had to proceed with them, but in addition to that, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) came along and he got a bill in, too.

I do not know that there was anything wrong with the bill that the hon. Minister of Labour brought in, or with the consideration that the committee gave to it, but I do

know as one member of the Opposition, and as a lawyer, I found it a most awesome and difficult task to be there this morning and to deal with The Collection Agencies Act in the substantially amended form in which it was brought before us.

We know full well, Mr. Chairman, that the contents of that bill, together with The Police Act and three other Acts, have been the subject of very much criticism and much self-analysis on the part of government. We also know that the government has available to it not only the intelligence of the hon. Attorney General, but the intelligence and abilities of all his legal advisers. They were able to draft and redraft sections and to come forward with expositions on the legal significance of these matters and were prepared, no doubt, to answer all of the questions that we in the Opposition might have raised.

An issue was made earlier in the session to the referral to committee of these bills without debate in the House on second reading. It is my submission that the ruling made at that time was a wrong one, and that the precedents quoted were not in fact applicable; and that those bills had no right to be referred to the committee until there had been a full and proper debate on second reading. There should have been unanimous consent of the House to this unusual procedure. Had it been made clear, or had there been an opportunity given to carefully examine this, I am sure that the traditional rights of the House would have been upheld and that the second reading would have taken place.

But in fact, Mr. Chairman, what happened was this: the procedures were set aside in an effort to allow the government to save face. We went into committee and were presented with a reprinted bill. I complimented the hon. Attorney General this morning for at least bringing the new text before us in a form that we were able to hold in our hands. But certainly it is beyond the capacity at least of myself, and I would suggest most of the other hon. members of the committee who were there this morning, to properly understand or comprehend or analyze the sections in a bill as complicated as that in the space of a few hours.

We did not have the advantage of seeing the printed text of these bills several days in advance, as is the usual custom. The usual custom makes all the more sense as we could see this morning when we got into such serious difficulty. Not having the advantage that the government always has of having its legal advisers there to tell the hon. Attorney

General what the significance of a particular word or a particular phrase is, I suggest that the government in its panic to correct its error has ridden roughshod over the normal procedures of this Legislature. These procedures were set there for just these very purposes, to protect the members of the Opposition and to protect members of the public so that they could reasonably analyze and criticize government provisions.

These safeguards were thrown aside this morning. I sincerely hope that no real error was made—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I really cannot accept that. The procedure was decided upon and—

Mr. Singer: With great respect, unless the hon. Prime Minister is rising on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do rise to speak to a point of order. These bills will come back to this House. They will be debated here in exactly the same manner every other piece of legislation that goes through this House is debated. They were sent down so that hon. members could see them. If hon. members do not have time, I shall leave them on the order paper as long as they may wish them to be there before the debates are called so that hon. members may completely understand them.

Mr. Singer: Well, the hon. Prime Minister may not care to—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I make a point, Mr. Chairman? I would accept, in large part, the statements of the hon. member for Downsview that it is very difficult for hon. members to find a bill largely amended, not having seen it before they come to consider it for the first time. This, I think we may say, is something perhaps not likely to recur. But I would say this, that we only found time this morning—perhaps that was fortuitous to consider one of those reprinted bills.

My hon. friend will realize and recall that when it was asked we adjourn I was quite happy to accept the adjournment so that three of those bills will be in your hands until at least tomorrow for study. While I accept to some extent what the hon. member has said, he has not altogether been denied the opportunity of giving at least three of them very thorough study for a day.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I accept both points of order if you can call them that.

But the fact remains, in answer first to the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister, once the bill has been considered clause by clause in the committee it is just an exercise in futility to come back here into the House and debate the so-called principle, because the principle has already been decided in committee. The committee has considered and voted upon each individual section. To suggest in any seriousness that the bill can be brought back after each section has been decided upon and then debate it in principle, is just an exercise in frustration.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: These bills will come back and be debated here. That bill will have to go through the committee of the whole House. It will be considered by this House sitting in the committee stage clause by clause, as is every other bill and some principles of those bills are argued right down to where people have views opposite those of the government, those clauses are argued and those points of view are very often put in the committee stage, and sometimes even argued on the third reading. So that I just cannot see how my hon. friend was cut off.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Prime Minister does not understand the point I am making, or else he is prepared to discard out of hand the whole principle of second reading. I am suggesting to him, and I think it is a very simple hypothesis, that these traditions of parliamentary procedure have been established over the years, and they follow one after the other, as night follows day. We have the first reading, which is the introduction of the bill; the second reading, which is the debate in principle. Now the government has seen fit to short-circuit the second reading procedure and to discard, in effect, the debate in principle. I suggest to hon. members that by having done that, then getting the bill into committee and doing it clause by clause, the principle has been decided in little pieces down in the committee and the debate back in the House on principle is of no meaning whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This was all done by unanimous consent.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was not in the House at the time that was done, but I had occasion to read the *Hansard* record very closely and I noted my hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) made violent protests about the abortion of that principle. They continued in that objection and Mr. Speaker had

some substantial doubt in his mind. There was a different ruling on the crucial Monday, the Monday that Bill No. 99 was debated, and if you will remember I raised the question of unanimous consent and Mr. Speaker overruled me. The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden), as I recall, reported some precedents which backed up the position I had taken and he was overruled by Mr. Speaker.

In face of these things, unless you expect us to challenge each successive ruling of Mr. Speaker, where do we get to? On each challenge we know we can talk just as well as the hon. members of the government; and in each challenge we make and in each position we take, we know that the government has more votes and that it is going to win. We have taken our position, and it is abundantly clear and sensible.

What I am suggesting this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, is this. The government, having put itself into a corner, having made a very serious error, then tries to short-circuit it by cutting away some of these parliamentary procedures. The government thrust an unreasonable, an unfair and illogical burden on the Opposition when it asked members of the Opposition to come before that committee and examine, with intelligence, the amendments that they had only had a few minutes to see.

I suggest that this is no way, in fairness or in equity, to expect an Opposition to do its job in the House. It is as much in the interest of the government for the Opposition to be provided with proper methods of carrying on its job as it is for the government to be allowed to carry on the job assigned to it. And so, Mr. Chairman, I say very strongly, and in serious criticism, that this procedure, resulting from panic, cuts across the traditional safeguards that are established in our parliamentary procedure, and should never be allowed to happen again.

It is my sincere hope that what we were able to pick up this morning, on just a few minutes' notice, was sufficient to properly safeguard all of the rights of the people of Ontario. I have some doubt about that. They were not only my views, they were the views of the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). They were the views of a few other hon. members there.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That bill will be in committee until—

Mr. Singer: This bill would be in committee, certainly. But it has approval now, and we hear other hon. members in the

House, including Mr. Chairman, saying "section carried, section carried." We hear a couple of the back-bench members, who get a little bored by these procedures, saying "carried, carried." They are not going to talk any longer. These are things, I would think, Mr. Chairman—certainly I would hope a stranger would think—that should not happen.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say, on a point of order, that at no time has there been any discussion the Opposition wanted in this House, on any matter coming before it, that they have not had. I have stood in the House before and watched the attempts of the Opposition—and they have been trying as long as I have been standing here leading the government—to leave the impression that I am limiting them and not permitting them to talk.

I think you will have to admit—and I think any impartial observer will recognize—that in this House the procedure we follow, in the way the business of the House is conducted, is that hon. members have a full opportunity to express themselves on any matter coming before the House. That is the way it has always been and that is the way it will always be.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, at the moment the hon. Prime Minister has a larger section to applaud than I have. The facts speak for themselves. I suggest that we short-circuited the parliamentary rules of procedure, that there was no excuse for it, that there should have been a debate on second reading of Bill No. 99 and of these other bills before they went to committee, and that in so doing the government aborted the rules of the House that were set down for the protection of the democratic process.

I was interested too, Mr. Chairman, in the observations that the hon. Attorney General had to make in connection with the original Bill No. 99. I was very surprised, really, to hear the defence of the original form of Bill No. 99 and I have noticed that the press and the hon. Attorney General have disagreed on what he really meant.

As I recall, he said that the criticisms were broadcast and rebroadcast and that nobody bothered to get up and defend the provisions of the original Bill No. 99. When the press took up the phrase "broadcast and rebroadcast" and perhaps interpreted it as applying to themselves, and to radio and television stations, the hon. Attorney General jumped in quickly to say; "Oh I did not mean all the news media. I merely meant the

members of the Opposition, whose apparent duty it is, or who see their role cast, to harass and criticize government and to do it unfairly."

I would merely say this, Mr. Chairman, in connection with Bill No. 99 and those other four bills which were equal abortions of the democratic process: I do not think they needed any defence. I think they spoke for themselves and the sooner they were dead and buried the better. If the government had possessed the good sense and the intelligence to say, at the beginning; "We are sorry we made a mistake, let us forget about it and we will start over again"; the whole issue would have disappeared.

I would have hoped that that would have been done, but the government did not do it. It dragged through all that Monday until finally, retreating step by step, it was forced into the position where in effect it did withdraw the noxious sections of Bill No. 99 and subsequently the noxious sections of the other bills have been somewhat similarly treated. But when the new hon. Attorney General comes into his seat and makes a purported defence of the old bill, saying that the charges and insinuations were unfounded and were broadcast and rebroadcast, whether by the gentlemen of the news media or whether by the Opposition, as though to say we really did not understand what was in Bill No. 99 and really, if people had understood it properly it was right, then I say that this hon. Attorney General, by making those remarks, is no better than the one who went before him.

There is no excuse whatsoever for any defence of those sections of Bill No. 99. If there is any criticism being levelled at the Opposition, or at the Liberal Party for the role we played in bringing those sections to the attention of the public, we graciously and thankfully accept it, because we see our role in bringing this to the attention of the public as the real role of an Opposition in the Legislature. I am surprised and disappointed in the hon. Attorney General that he tried to defend those sections.

There was no need for anyone to get up and say what was right about those sections, after his predecessor and one of his senior advisors had spent over an hour with the press saying that these bills meant exactly what the newspapers, the radio, the television and the Opposition members said they meant. The hon. Prime Minister himself said they were indefensible.

In face of all of that, in face of the appearance of the previous Attorney Gen-

eral before the press, before the television cameras and on radio and his statements which were reported in the newspapers in detail, in face of the remarks by one of the previous Attorney General's senior advisors that these bills meant exactly what they said they did, how can it possibly lie in the mouth of the hon. Attorney General to say: "Well, they really were not properly understood and the broadcasting and rebroadcasting that went on was only done to harass this fine government."

Surely to goodness, Mr. Chairman, the time has come in the public life of this country when a government which makes a mistake—and no government is perfect, nor will any government ever be perfect—should be man enough to get up and say: "We made a mistake, we are sorry, and we will try not to make the same mistake again."

That was all that was required, but the hon. Attorney General could not resist taking an unnecessary slam at the Opposition. I say again, Mr. Chairman, that what we did in Opposition in connection with Bill No. 99 was the role that I envisaged that Oppositions will always carry out. They will attack with all the strength they have available to them, with all the force that they can muster, any government action that takes away an individual's rights and destroys part of our democratic system.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other things that I wanted to deal with at some length.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): I hope the hon. member will talk about something else instead of that all the time. It is pretty tiresome after a while.

Mr. Singer: Yes, it is pretty tiresome after a while. But with great respect to the hon. member, when the government does not seem to learn its lesson and when it continues to stand up and say: "Yes, we were right"; then we are just going to keep on repeating it. In the words of the hon. Attorney General, we will broadcast and rebroadcast and rebroadcast until the idea gets across even to such people as the hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Walker: That is what happened to Mr. Wintermeyer, he kept repeating it too.

Mr. Singer: It is rather interesting that the hon. member should mention Mr. Wintermeyer, our previous leader. If that needs saying again, Mr. Chairman, I will repeat that one, too.

The previous Attorney General denied—I am sorry he is not here at the moment—that

there was any such thing in this province as organized crime. It took two commission investigations to finally get across the idea that there was. Our leader Mr. Wintermeyer said—and said very bravely in carrying out as I have said in a previous debate, his real role as the leader of the Opposition—that there were these matters that demanded government investigation.

Therefore, I would again say that there is no one on the government benches who can say he was wrong in what he said. What he said has resulted in very serious changes on the front benches, as it should have. The charges that he made were in substance, proved to be correct and the result of those charges is that the province of Ontario will have in future a better system in the administration of justice.

Mr. Walker: The Opposition has a new leader now.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, to get on to another matter, a great Attorney General, the Rt. hon. Sir Douglas Hogg, had this to say:

Whenever therefore the rights of the Sovereign as the guardian of the interests of the public are affected, they must find their protection in the presence of the Attorney General. It has been said of that office that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. It is the business of the Attorney General. Guardian of the public interests, I say, defender of civil rights, and so he should be identified.

That was the real sin of the amendment to The Police Act; that it should be the Attorney General himself who should have come into the House and asked for the awesome and terrible powers, the unusual and depressive measures, and that was the unforgivable blow to all those who loved the very name of liberty.

It creates in the breasts of men who know the meaning of freedom under the British parliamentary system and the common law the emotion of disappointment bordering on anguish. Let us look upon and cogitate about the manner in which he came to ask for this special measure.

He held in his hand this document, which was dripping with the poisonous potion of tyranny and reeked of the offensive odour of oppression, as he stood there. He hurried through, for he was a man always in a rush. This is what he had to say, and I quote from *Hansard*. He moved the first reading of the bill, An Act to amend The Police Act. The

motion was agreed to; first reading of the bill. The Attorney General then said:

Mr. Speaker, this is a series of amendments to The Police Act to define more particularly the powers of The Ontario Police Commission and to give to it certain additional powers, particularly with respect to determining the adequacy of policing and the designation of areas under The Police Act where municipalities are required to have their own police force.

Now, why did he do this? Why did he say this? Why did he gloss over this serious matter in such a cursory way? Worse still, why did the Executive Council and the man who heads the government permit him to do it?

All of them to whom the people of this province pay a handsome stipend for their labours are at this moment responsible for the degradation of the office of the Attorney General. Not a one of them can escape. We in this party have no intention of letting them escape, even if it means broadcasting and rebroadcasting the things that we have talked about. The people of this province feel that we have done our job well. I am satisfied with that. And this is the sort of job that we are sent here to do.

The hon. Attorney General's department should be all of the law in government. That is to say, in purely legal matters, there ought to be no freedom of action among members of the Cabinet without the collaboration, consent and approval of the hon. Attorney General. This, Mr. Chairman, is a proposition so obvious that it needs no further elaboration. If the government is in the courts, then the hon. Attorney General or the senior counsel of his department—I emphasize these words—of his department—should be in the courts.

I have spoken in this House before about the need to staff The Department of the Attorney General with a band of lawyers trained as counsel under the direction of a senior, experienced man. These lawyers should be at the beck and call of all departments of government. On the other hand, that part of the practice of law which is purely solicitors' work ought to be exclusively done by a body of persons practised in the art and on the staff of The Department of the Attorney General.

Emphatically, I just mention that they ought to pay them something more than the pittance the lawyers now on the staff receive by way of remuneration. For if a government needs to hire 50 lawyers, then I say, Mr. Chairman, that they should be hired.

Not only would it be money well spent, but it would mean a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars that is now paid out of the coffers of this province for legal services. What licence, I ask of you, Mr. Chairman, has a government department to go to a law firm outside the government and pay that firm \$11,000 to revise a statute of this Legislature? Why should not the law officers of the Crown and The Department of the Attorney General do that job of work? Why should we hire special outside counsel to prosecute lawbreakers and pay them \$21,815? I am referring to a specific case and I am sure the hon. Attorney General, if he is not aware of the case to which I am referring, can very quickly find it in the records of his department. We could hire a good full-time man and get a full year's work out of him and pay him less than that. The malefactors in another case have been sent to jail for lengthy periods of servitude, and it took two years to do so and it cost us \$82,416 to prosecute. It is another particular case I am making reference to. I do not know precisely how difficult these cases were, but I say with a certain sureness that they were not \$82,000 difficult.

There is evidence accumulated that the government of Ontario, so far as lawyers' accounts are concerned, is to use the vernacular, a real mark. That is to say, there is no doubt of its tremendous largesse when it comes to dispensing public money to the legal profession. They appear, in the returns I have asked for over the years, never once to have taxed a lawyer's bill. At Ottawa, in The Department of Justice, there is employed a full-time taxing officer whose task is to review lawyers' accounts. He works with a very sharp pencil.

The Department of Justice goes further, Mr. Chairman.

When the brief is placed in the lawyer's hands, he is told what rate his charges will be. At this point he may accept or decline the brief. But here with this government, we have the evidence. It is all in sessional paper 88 of the Third Session of the Twenty-Sixth Parliament. That is the exact reference, if the hon. Attorney General wants to know the record to which I am referring. What the lawyers working for this government ask for in their account, they get in the overwhelming majority of cases. In fact, I cannot recall one where the government had a bill taxed.

I say to the new hon. Attorney General, as a member of this House and as a taxpayer, that this careless and extravagant practice has got to stop, and should stop

immediately. The hon. Attorney General should be all of the law.

I turn to this business of expropriation by government. Tens of thousands of dollars are paid out annually to law firms. Why cannot solicitors, whom the government wants to retain, be hired on an annual basis? Or better still, they should be brought into the department to work full time at good salaries which will attract capable men. The superficial will say that it needs to be done by local solicitors. The answer to that, in one word, is: rubbish.

The Ontario Hydro recently paid for the services of counsel in a certain case the grand sum of \$77,098.05. I sincerely hope that they won that case. One would not need many cases like that in the year to pay the rent. Common sense would impel an enlightened government to tell the Ontario Hydro that if they wanted counsel, then there was a staff of them available in The Department of the Attorney General because the hon. Attorney General is all of the law.

I could go on, Mr. Chairman, and cite numerous examples, but it would only serve to elaborate the obvious. It would not distend the trivial, for hundreds of thousands of dollars in public money are involved here. Here is a good place, I say to the new Attorney General, to use a new broom. Here is a good place to raise the prestige of this department and to resuscitate and restore its vigour.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to go on at some length and talk about a code of civil rights, a code that would protect citizens appearing before administrative bodies of this province. On Friday, the hon. Prime Minister made an announcement and I commend him for this. He made an announcement appointing Chief Justice McRuer to carry on the sort of investigation that was envisaged in the next several suggestions that I had intended to make. I think this is a very sound way of approaching this serious problem of generally protecting a citizen's rights and of avoiding the dangers of encroachment by various administrative authorities.

We do not know what this will result in. We do feel very strongly that the appointment of Mr. Chief Justice McRuer was a good appointment. We will hope that the terms of reference granted to him will be wide enough to allow a real examination of the problems that face the people of this province. We feel certain that if Chief Justice McRuer is given these wide terms of reference the recommendations he will bring forward will be of substantial help to the

government and to allow translation into legislation the ideas which will once and for all chart a course as to how far government must go to protect human rights.

The sort of things that I would hope would concern the Chief Justice would be matters such as the following: Perhaps there could be an administrative appeal tribunal, or court to which a citizen could appeal, from the exercise of discretion of the administrative branch of government from the Minister right on down; or appeal against an alleged abuse of, or unreasonable use of, power. This body, in short, would have the right at the instance of a citizen to review every administrative action against particular citizens.

Perhaps the Chief Justice could recommend that there would be created a branch of the office of the Attorney General which would be required to review all regulations made under the authority of statutes, in order to ascertain that they are a valid exercise of the power granted to make regulations. The whole question of regulations was touched on by my hon. leader following the announcement made by the hon. Prime Minister the other day.

Every board and commission and tribunal should be required, in my opinion, to publish every delegation of final authority to any official, and a statement of the general course and method by which its functions are carried out. Every agency of government should be required, in my suggestion, to publish within a period not exceeding 60 days all final opinions or orders in the adjudication of cases before it, except those for good and sufficient cause required to be held confidential.

Generally speaking, there would have to be exceptions. Matters of official record would be made available to persons properly and directly concerned. Certainly the recommendations of the Chief Justice could include procedure whereby, in regard to every agency interested, affected persons could petition for the issuance of an amendment or the appeal of a regulation. In every case of the adjudication of an agency of a person's rights, there would be stipulated proper notice of adjudication. This would set out the time and place, the names of the officials who were to adjudicate, the statute under which the adjudication was to be held, and the matters of fact and of law to be determined in the instance where private persons are the moving parties. Then the agency would be required to give prompt notice of the issues to be contraverted in fact, or in law, the names and addresses of the witnesses proposed to be

called, and the right of the individual represented by counsel, and so on.

There are several other suggestions along these lines. I am certain that the Chief Justice will be listening to many representations in connection with the final recommendations that he might bring in. I am certain that when this report comes in, as I have said, that there will be a guide set down to government as to what legislation they should bring in to protect these very important rights.

I did want to comment just for a moment on one of the statutes that the hon. Attorney General's predecessor brought in. I did comment to some extent on second reading. But it is the statute that purports to create the law reform commission. The hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, sir, who brought it in, is a man who, when it suits his purpose, is given to the laconic and cryptic statement. He did not give us very much enlightenment about the law reform commission, except that it is going to have something to do with reforming the law. What law? Which part of the law? All of the law, or none of it? We are not told if the system of priorities is going to be established in law reform. No one has said that some part of the law needs more reform than other parts.

In this regard, a good argument could be made in any one of the various fields. Someone could say that the law of real property in this province, encrusted as it has upon it archaic notions and rules developed two or three centuries ago, is badly in need of reform. Is the law reform commission going to take under consideration such questions as to whether or not we give our married women sufficient protection that we might abolish the dower right? The United Kingdom who I fear are a much more progressive society than ours, reformed their law of real property a whole generation ago. They got rid of old and useless trappings that came to us with the British conquest.

I have no fixed ideas on this subject, and readily admit that perhaps as good a case could be made if the law reform commission should be directed to look through the public statutes of the province to determine which of them may no longer be needed.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) wandered in here some days ago and presented a bill to repeal The Vaccination Act, while at the same time musing that it was out of keeping with the times.

I glanced through the public statutes of this province and wondered how many more we have in that category. At the same time my attention was caught by the numerous

statutes that deal with the matter of debt and credit: The Absconding Debtors Act, The Absentees Act, The Fraudulent Conveyances Act, The Assignment and Preferences Act, The Cost of Distress Act, The Warehousemen's Lien Act, The Woodsmen's Lien Act, and so on. I wonder whether the time has not come to consolidate these into one Creditors' Rights Act. Would this be a worthy pursuit for the law reform commission?

In fact, we were left wondering what direction the law reform commission was going to get at all from the Attorney General. And we were not even told who the hon. gentlemen were going to be who are going to make up the law reform commission. Some day soon, I presume, we are going to be told that A, B and C, who are estimable citizens of the province of Ontario, have been appointed to make up the law reform commission.

We would hope that there will be some direction given by the hon. Attorney General as to what direction this important commission should and could take. It might be put to work immediately to bring about some order out of the chaos in The Municipal Act, and all the Acts that surround that Act. I made the point before that I do not think a select committee is adequately staffed to be able to take on this important job. It may well be that the law reform commission, with the assistance of the select committee, could do a job in this regard. But again we have had no direction.

Or perhaps our reform commission could be put to work to consider how many statutes are in the category stipulated by the hon. Minister of Health in reference to The Vaccination Act.

Do we really need such Acts as The Bees Act, The Egress from Public Buildings Act, The Escheats Act, The Estreats Act, The Fish Inspection Act, The Gold Causes Act, The Lightning Rods Act, The Pawnbrokers Act, The Stallions Act, The Replevin Act, The Snow Roads and Fences Act, The Steam Threshing Engines Act, The Ticket Speculation Act, The Trees Act, The Vicious Dogs Act, The Wild Rice Harvesting Act, The Warble Fly Act? We must not forget The Warble Fly Act.

If we need all of them or any of them, might they not be better consolidated with other statutes and the irrelevant material left out?

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have some 550 public statutes in force in this province. Maybe this is too many. In 1950 we had about 425. It will not be too long, at that rate, until we

reach 1,000. Then how, Mr. Chairman, is the citizen or the lawyer in the Opposition or even the hon. Attorney General, going to be able to find what the law is in relation to any one facet of government at all?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I imagine they would all have to ask you.

Mr. Singer: We have the hon. Minister of Mines into this and I am sure that even he would agree with me on this point: That if something can be done to simplify our statutes, it could and should be done.

Now we have a statute before this House that presents a real challenge to the government. If they are going to take advantage of it, and I would hope that before this House prorogues that we will get some indication from government as to who the personnel on this law reform commission are going to be, and in what general direction they are going to be pointed. This does not mean that they have to be tied within the four walls of a very tight series of references. But surely, with all of the difficulties that we have; with this great number of statutes and apparently with hundreds of words on our statute books that nobody wants to pay any attention to any more; some group or some body should be set to work to put these statutes in more readable and understandable form so that, together, the hon. Minister of Mines and I will be able to find out what the law is a little more readily.

I want to make some general remarks, Mr. Chairman, about the coroners' courts. In recent days, weeks and months, we have seen a great deal of publicity attached to the method by which coroners' courts have been carried on. We have watched—I do not know if the proper words are "with interest"—but we have watched with some sort of a horrified sense of duty the chief coroner of Ontario getting into violent disagreement with the gentleman who has the title of chief coroner for the city of Toronto.

We have watched a coroner's inquest in Sudbury carried on in a method that I think would raise the hackles on the back of any lawyer who has respect for legal processes. It is reasonably obvious, Mr. Chairman, without berating any particular individuals that much has to be done in dealing with our whole system of coroners and our whole system of inquests to bring sense and intelligence to this form of inquiry.

I do not know that I would want to condemn out of hand any of the things that were said in connection with the recent dispute in Metropolitan Toronto. It appears

that, as a result of this dispute, whether the charges that were made or the counter charges that answered them were right or wrong, as a result of that all of the discussion that took place certain facts that should have been made public were made public.

It would appear to me that somewhere along the lines there was not an over-anxiety to investigate some of these happenings with the zeal and carefulness with which they should have been investigated. I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to get into any discussion, as I said, about the personalities involved or the charges and the counter-charges. But anyone who followed the newspapers in regard to those inquests in Metropolitan Toronto, or in regard to the inquest up in Sudbury, will recognize that there is something very, very wrong with our system as it presently operates.

The coroner's court is a very old court. It was well-defined by the year 1215. Some stories have suggested that it goes back back as far as the reign of Alfred the Great who, I am sure every hon. member of this House—including the hon. Minister of Mines, is he here? Yes—would know that Alfred the Great was the king of England from 871 up until the year 901.

By the 13th century the coroner was an elected official by universal suffrage and his duties went beyond looking into cases of sudden or violent deaths. His activities extended through a wide range of criminal matters and his responsibility consisted, in part, of bringing criminals to justice. In fact, he arrested witnesses to a crime and saw that they appeared at the trial before itinerant justices.

The office of the coroner in Canada goes back to the very earliest days following upon the British conquest. There is a reference to them in 1780. By 1859 the proportion of medical men appointed to laymen was 3 to 1. By statute of 1836, it was provided that if a coroner's jury found a person guilty of murder or manslaughter, then the finding was the equivalent to that of a grand jury and no further proceeding by way of indictment was necessary to put the person on trial.

I think that observation is a most significant one in contrast to the procedure that we seem to have today. Because in the procedure that we seem to have today, there seems to be a system of double trial. There is a trial before the coroner's court. There is a trial in the newspapers and, sometimes, there follows thereafter a trial in the courts. I commend that particular observation to the hon. Attorney General's notice.

This was the law until 1892, when the new Criminal Code deprived the coroner's court of the power to indict anyone. Many people in the province over the years have wondered if the office ought to be abolished. In 1921 the Gregory Royal commission inquired into the office and in that commission's report it was revealed that several leading Crown attorneys, and many listening to me will be properly impressed when I say that R. H. Greer was among them, advocated the abolition of that office as serving no useful purpose.

If it was to be retained, many witnesses suggested that magistrates conduct inquests instead of doctors, and that the medical men be called as witnesses. It is too trite an argument to say that a man trained in the law is one most suitably qualified to conduct a judicial proceeding. Now, that commission's report was made some 43 years ago. Things move very slowly in this province, particularly with a Conservative government. I read one part of that report.

It frequently happens that a person suspected of committing a crime which is the subject of an investigation is refused the opportunity to appear before a coroner and examine witnesses. If he is heard at all he is told that he is heard only as a matter of courtesy. In our opinion anyone under suspicion or otherwise directly interested in the proceedings should have the right to be heard at the inquest and be given a reasonable opportunity to question the witness. If inquests were conducted by magistrates, fuller opportunity might be given than if they were conducted as at present by physicians.

These remarks, Mr. Chairman, and these recommendations are as true today as they were in 1921. They are as true when applied to the unfortunate events involving those two doctors from the East General Hospital, or they are as true when they involve the unfortunate events which took place in Sudbury a few weeks ago.

One inquest was described by a prominent Toronto lawyer as being an outrageous and shocking perversion of proper judicial procedure.

And with this description, I think the hon. Attorney General would agree. This particular lawyer said so because this inquest denied a person who was mentioned—the essential right of democratic justice—the opportunity to confront his accusers. The late and great Mr. Justice Riddell said one time that a trial which declined to allow the defendant even to cross-examine the witnesses

would be a disgraceful travesty not to be dignified by the name of a trial.

So we in this House, Mr. Chairman, must be concerned about the institution known as the coroner's court. We must approach it analytically and, if we determine that it is not suitable to our enlightened age, then either we must abolish it or improve it. In any event we must remove those characteristics which offend human conscience and dignity.

It needs no further word from me, Mr. Chairman, to put this case about coroners' courts before this government. The government should be aware that the present system is falling apart at the seams and is doing grave injustice to the people that it attempts to deal with. The time is long overdue when the hon. Attorney General should set very high on his agenda the task of reforming the whole coroner's inquest procedures. He should examine very carefully whether or not persons who are not legally trained should have the right to set themselves up as judge and jury and to condemn people who have no chance to defend themselves. This is the sort of job we envisage that the hon. Attorney General should be doing.

I want to turn to another topic, Mr. Chairman, the question of legal aid. There is a commission on which the deputy Attorney General serves and others, estimable gentlemen, with him. They have been going around the province and getting various ideas about what direction the province should take in connection with legal aid. They have been receiving some very interesting briefs. I do not want to prejudge the kind of report they are going to bring in. But let me say simply this in regard to legal aid. The problem of free legal aid services for the needy is basically a social problem. It is not a legal one. In the past the legal profession has taken unto itself the responsibility of attempting to solve it, but those attempts have fallen far short of any real solution.

When I say it is a social problem, Mr. Chairman, I mean it is the sort of a matter that any member of this Legislature should have an opinion on. It is a matter that we, in this Legislature, should have to determine on the basis of whether or not we believe justice is being done to the citizens of Ontario. If we believe justice is not being done to all of the citizens of Ontario, and there is a method whereby we can remedy this mistake even though that remedy costs some money, then this decision has to be made by the members of this Legislature. Now I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that

our system of legal aid in this province leaves a lot to be desired, and will continue to leave a lot to be desired until the day the government of Ontario is prepared to say we are responsible for seeing that anyone who comes before our courts has a reasonable defense and a reasonable representation whether or not he is able to afford it.

This is a decision, as I say, which does not affect just the lawyers. Nor should it affect just the lawyers. Until this decision is made, and until this government is prepared to say it is prepared to spend enough of the public money to ensure that these facts are going to pertain, then I say the people will not appear before the courts in this province and be given equal treatment.

The social group in need of free legal assistance is not only the indigent, but is also those of moderate means. The English experience indicates that about 75 per cent of those who seek legal advice need financial assistance, at least to some degree. Since the English experience is based largely on civil litigation, it is probable that as many as 90 per cent of those involved in litigation need wholly or partially subsidized legal services.

In my opinion the right solution to the problem is not charity by the legal profession to the needy group, either in whole or in part. The present system of charity in Ontario by the profession is supplemented by a grant of \$15,000. It escapes my memory how much the hon. Attorney General is asking for this year. I think it is a little more, but it is still nothing more than to supplement a charitable donation by the legal profession.

The problem I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is a social one. The expense of the solution must be borne by society as a whole, by all of the people of Ontario. There is no reason why the legal profession should subsidize a needy segment of the public, especially not, as at the present, the burden of subsidization is borne largely by the less affluent members of the bar.

In a form of criticism addressed to many of the members of my profession, I say that it is a fact of life that it is not the most affluent members of the bar, or the members of the biggest firms, who hasten to give legal aid. Unfortunately, in too many cases it is the young man who is just out of law school, and who is trying to make a name for himself, who happens to rush into this breach.

Obviously the only social body that can shoulder the cost is the state. Occasional suggestions that the United Appeal should take the responsibility can hardly be taken seriously. Further, charity by the profession

is disadvantageous to the public as well as to the profession. American studies show for example that the quality of legal services received by the needy under charitable schemes is most unsatisfactory. For the information of the hon. Attorney General, and I am sure he is interested in these things, there is a report to this effect contained in No. 76, *Harvard Law Review*, at page 579.

Of the two possible systems, there is the public defender system and the legal aid system on the English model, which does not there operate extensively in the criminal field but could be adapted to do so. I say that the better is the legal aid system, in which the government through the law society would pay lawyers on a fee-for-service basis. In the case of an indigent client the government would pay the whole fee, or possibly the great portion of the usual fee, such as the 80 per cent of the tariff that is paid in England. In the case of a client of moderate means, the government could pay half of the fee and the client could be expected to pay the rest.

Possibly special arrangements should be made in capital cases to ensure that an accused can not only afford a lawyer, but that he has available to him an outstanding one. The public defender system need not be sold short. Within its limits it does a reasonable job. It operates successfully in many parts of the United States and allows both for specialization on the part of the legal staff, the provision of an efficient secretariat and a trained staff of investigators.

But I have noted in some of the briefs that have been presented to Mr. Common and his committee, that there have been valid criticisms taken against the public defender system. Many of the criticisms, and I am not going to deal with them at length, I think are most valid. I think, for those reasons, the public defender system is not one which we should bring into this province. Perhaps its cheapness might recommend it but if we are going to get into this field—and it is my suggestion that we need to get into this field—I do not think we are going to achieve anything by taking a cheap and inferior solution.

Even if the public defender system were adopted, it takes care of only a part of the problem. It can provide free legal care for the indigent class, which admittedly is the most pressing problem, but it cannot help people of moderate means without destroying the criminal bar.

About 90 per cent of the criminal cases were handled by civil servant lawyers. There would not be enough work left to sustain

more than a handful of criminal lawyers in private practice.

Moreover, a legal aid system would allow an accused person to choose his own counsel from a panel of participating lawyers. Under a public defender system, he would be assigned counsel. Possibly this is an illusory advantage, since few accused persons have enough knowledge of the capabilities of members of the criminal bar to make an informed choice. But at least, it is psychologically reassuring for them to have the privilege of choosing.

Finally, sir, the leaders of the legal profession are determined not to have any government plan in the field of civil law except on a fee-for-service basis. And I think it would be a mistake in tactics for the members of the criminal bar to ask for anything less profitable to themselves.

I am not really concerned about the profits to the members of the profession. I am concerned about the serious social needs, and I think the government has to wrestle with the social needs, and it has to do it in a method whereby the profession is going to go along with the problem that is presented to it.

We have seen, in other provinces, the difficulties that have ensued when government tries to unload a scheme of its own on a particular profession. We saw in Belgium a little while ago some of the difficulties that might ensue. I do not think the government is going to get anywhere in coming to a particular profession, whether it be the medical profession or the legal profession, with a big stick and saying, "You must do so-and-so." The government, if it is going to get into this field—and it is my earnest suggestion it must get into this field—is going to have to do it through co-operation with the profession. And the hon. Attorney General, I know, is the last person who needs to be told this.

Without presuming to guess what the select committee or Royal commission—I have forgotten the title of Mr. Common's committee—is going to bring in, that is all I want to say at this time, except that when the report comes in, and I would anticipate it would be in, in not too long a time, that the government be prepared to come forward to this Legislature when it reconvenes after the end of the present session, with a scheme for legal aid, a scheme that will work, a scheme that will satisfy this social need.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say a few words too about the securities commission. In the Budget debate I did have a few things to say about what I thought the securities commission might be directing its attention to. Since

that time, the report of the Royal Commission on Banking and Commerce of the federal government has reported. It devotes a whole chapter to the securities trade or profession in this country with particular attention to what goes on in the province of Ontario. Some 70 per cent of the trading in securities and stocks take place in Ontario and, substantially, the tone for this particular industry is set by government action in this province.

I talked, for instance, about takeover codes and takeover ethics. Mr. Chairman, you will remember that about a year ago now, a committee was set up by trust companies, stock exchanges and investment dealers, to set out a code for takeover ethics. They came down with eight or ten ideas on how takeovers might be done and all those responsible for drafting the code commended these points seriously to the attention of those who were going to be involved in takeovers. Well, as one gentleman who writes on the financial page of the *Toronto Daily Star*, Allistair Dow, said:

Who cares about takeover ethics? Ethics smethics, you don't need any evidence—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What was the last name?

Mr. Singer: Dow, D-o-w.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was the expression?

Mr. Singer: "Ethics smethics!" That is what the man said. And he had this to say:—you don't need evidence provided by this week's bid for control of Burns and Company, a bid which violates several of the recommendations of the committee's code of procedures. Since the committee's recommendations on ethics were published last May, following a series of corporate mergers and acquisitions which reflected the need for more protection of minority shareholders, there has hardly been a takeover bid that has adhered completely to the committee's code. The problem is—and this is the Attorney General's problem—that the code is voluntary and that the law is silent on these matters. The bid for Burns and Company is the most flagrant breach of the takeover code. It doesn't identify the bidder. Shares will be accepted by the buyer on a first-come, first-served basis instead of being pro rated. Burns directors weren't given a chance to assess the adequacy of the \$11.25 share price.

And so on and so on.

These are the imponderables that face the estimated 3,000 shareholders of the Calgary

Meat Packers; each of these unknowns could have a bearing on their decision whether to sell Burns shares for \$11.25 each or to retain them. There are many other examples of how takeover codes have been contravened.

The ink was barely dry on the published code when in August a bid for the control of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company was made by the Toronto stock brokerage firm Midland Securities Limited on behalf of unnamed private investors. It was not until months later that the identity of the bidder became known and that bidder was Massachusetts Protective Association. The bids by Steel Company of Canada for Page-Hersey Tubes in February this year; by Charter Oil for Midwestern Industry in December; by the French-controlled Aquitain of Canada for Banff Oil Limited; by Anthes Imperial for John Wood Company; not one of these, Mr. Chairman, not one gave the shareholders much information about the probable future conduct of the companies, which is a quotation taken directly from the proposed takeover code.

This article goes on, at some length, saying that:

The code, as well-intentioned as it might have been, is hardly worth the paper it was written on because the government has not seen fit to make this takeover code a part of the securities regulations.

I wonder if the hon. Attorney General had a chance to read an article that appeared on the front page of the *Financial Post* on March 21, 1964, under the byline of Mr. Frank Kaplan. This is headed: "Looser Rein on Stock Pushers Hints at a Boom." This is what this very astute observer of the financial scene in the province of Ontario had to say:

Ground work for a major revival of sales of speculative mining stocks to the public have been laid out in the past year. Behind the revival, the general boom in profits of mining companies and a rapidly brightening outlook for producers of metal. This week's breakthrough in the price of copper is certain to spur speculative interests. At the same time in Ontario, long the leader in developing securities laws and practices—

As I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, Ontario must be the leader in developing securities practices in this country because some 70 per cent of the trading takes place in the Toronto Stock Exchange.

There appears to be in Ontario a lowering of the barriers in the business of selling shares. New legislation and new policies within the securities business and in the

Ontario government, reflect a changed attitude from tighter restrictions in recent years. What happens in Ontario is significant for the rest of Canada. Bay Street stock salesmen, given elbow room to operate, are acknowledged experts in inducing the public to take a flyer on a drill hole bet. And what has happened in the past week or ten days certainly confirms that last statement.

In the past, sections of the stock business using a long-distance telephone, have sold shares across Canada and in the United States. Why the barriers of sale of speculative stocks are being lowered whether unconsciously or deliberately, so far remains a puzzle.

It is known that more than a year ago a concerted effort was made to convince the Ontario government that securities legislation and the administration of the Ontario Securities Commission were too strict and should be eased. The argument used then and still being pressed is that Ontario's mining development has slowed because the Ontario Securities Commission and the Toronto Stock Exchange have reduced the flow of speculative mining in their efforts to protect the public.

This gentleman goes on at some length to develop the theme that I have already read to you, to point out the effects of changes that were made recently in the statute governing Ontario securities transactions and to not hint, but to ask bluntly, why the government has apparently opened the doors wide and allowed these abuses to come back. I think that before these estimates are over, the hon. Attorney General should be prepared to tell us this.

I referred earlier to the report of the Royal commission and there are some very fascinating observations made here. Chief Justice Dana Porter and his associates spent a considerable time investigating these problems. In the 20 or so pages where they deal with the Ontario Securities Commission they made a number of observations that certainly should commend themselves to the attention of the hon. Attorney General.

For instance, these are some notes that I made on reading through that chapter in the report of the Royal commission:

The capital requirements of the stock exchanges seem to protect the public adequately, although the minimum standards of the broker-dealers association appear to be unduly low, calling only for a minimum of \$5,000 in free capital. In our view—

that is in the view of the Royal commission:

—this should be raised and related to business liabilities. However, the broker-dealers association, which requires a broker's blanket bond or securities insurance in the minimum amount of only \$10,000 for members in the five major cities and of only \$2,000 elsewhere, are in our view, to relate the minimum more closely to the size and the nature of the risk.

The commission deals at some length with listing requirements and draws comparisons with what goes on at the New York exchange. It points out that in New York, for example, listed companies are required to demonstrate net profits of a million dollars annually under competitive conditions, and should have net tangibles of at least \$10 million. Toronto has no set of standards for industrial listings, but considers them on a basis of an earnings record.

Proof of consistent earnings is regarded as removing the security from the highly speculative field. Surely this is a field where there should be some legislation to set these things out.

The whole question of disclosure standards has been sadly neglected in this province and I commented upon that phase of it in my earlier remarks in the Budget debate.

New York requires high annual disclosure standards. Regular periodic reporting in connection with the solicitation of proxies, publication of all transactions by inside officers and controlling shareholders. No such requirements exist in this province at all. The very minimal standards disclosure really does not mean very much as a protection to the investor. The Toronto Stock Exchange a few years ago approached almost 400 listed companies, urging them to publish interim reports. Just over 50 agreed to do so and the majority did not even bother to answer the exchange. The question of qualifications for salesmen: There are certain very stringent requirements in other jurisdictions, but none here at all—or very minimal ones if they do exist.

I could go on, Mr. Chairman, at substantial length, talking about the securities regulations or lack of them. The fact is that there is no real control exercised by government over disclosure and related matters, over takeover bids, or over dealing by insiders and many other abuses that are set out in this very capable report just brought down by the Royal commission. At the time the estimate for the securities commission comes up, I am going to deal at some greater length with some of the remarks made in the report. For

the moment, however, I would urge upon the hon. Attorney General and upon the government, that its real attention to this very important field of economic activity in our province and ask the government why they have been so loath to step into a field that is crying out for a positive legislative supervision and direction.

In the course of the estimates, I am certain that my colleagues are going to address other criticism towards the government's policy generally. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, it perhaps is not too fair to criticize this hon. Attorney General personally.

But one point I do want to make, in closing, is this, Mr. Chairman: That the government, by changing its Cabinet officials from time to time, has not found a new way or a simple way to avoid criticism. It really does not matter which government member is sitting in a particular chair. He is responsible, together with his colleagues, for government action in connection with his particular department. He is the figure that has been put there by the hon. Prime Minister. He is the man that is responsible for government action in that department over the last 21 years. He is the man who is expected to account for this action. While we sympathize with the present incumbent, and we believe he is a fine gentleman and he is going to give us the best information available, it is not sufficient to say that he is new to the job and that a particular problem is going to require more investigation. These answers we seek are answers most urgently needed. These are answers that we in the Opposition insist we be given. We know that the people of Ontario insist that the government state its position.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, before I turn to the remarks that I had planned to make on the hon. Attorney General's estimates, there are a few introductory comments that I would like to make in light of what has happened so far in the estimates.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I would like to protest mildly—I say mildly because I happen to be prepared and therefore it does not make much difference to me—but on Friday we left the House here with a clear indication to us that what we were going to be dealing with first this afternoon was the estimates of The Department of University Affairs.

Following that, sir, we would then move to the hon. Attorney General. Somewhere over the weekend, the university estimates disappeared and, without any notification that

I was aware of at least, we are on the hon. Attorney General's estimates.

I would say to the hon. Prime Minister that along this line I would not want to drive the point as far perhaps, as the hon. member for Downsview has done; but in the orderly carrying out of the business of the House surely the Opposition is entitled to know what estimate is going to be coming up on what day. If there is going to be a switch for whatever reason, sometimes they are valid, they are entitled to be informed.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might speak to that. The only reason we did not continue with the education estimates was, that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) was not here and I did not know when he would be coming into the House. Now the situation is that I think it is at least three weeks since I set down the order in which the estimates were to be taken. Everyone in the House knew that the estimates of the Attorney General would follow upon the estimates of The Department of Education. We have finished all those, with the exception of the one item the hon. member has referred to, and certainly there was no plan in my mind, nor did I devise any scheme over the weekend to shift these things around. I am taking them in the order in which they come in an attempt to clear the business of the House.

Because of the length of time it has taken to deal with the estimates, we have had literally weeks of notice that the estimates of the Attorney General, if they did not come up at, say, quarter after three, then they might have been expected around four or five, or whenever the remnants of The Department of Education were completed.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not want to get into a lengthy argument with the hon. Prime Minister. But the fact still remains that we were told on Friday that first thing this afternoon we would be dealing with university estimates. There were people who were interested in university estimates who came to the House to hear the debate. Then when they arrived here we suddenly discovered that we have switched. However, I do not want to pursue the point. I just reiterate: if there is going to be a change, we are entitled to some indication of that change. Perhaps people who have learned, either from the press or from our information, that there is going to be a debate, would not then come here under a false impression.

The second point I wanted to make is a brief comment on the rather lengthy intro-

ductory comments of the hon. member for Downsview. The hon. member seems to be impelled to fight the battles that have been fought and won. On the issue of Bill No. 99, surely it has been fought and won in a fashion that was more humiliating than any government has experienced in this province for quite some time. On the issue of the other bills now before the committee, this was fought out here the other day. Both the hon. leader of the Opposition, his leader, and I made our protests with regard to this procedure to make it clear that in our view this procedure should not be followed in the future, and I, for one, am not going to re-fight these battles once again. It seems to me that once they have been fought and once the issue has been made clear enough, we can let the matter rest right there.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member did not bother to come into the committee this morning and sit for two-and-a-half hours and try to cope with those amendments.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of that committee. I attended only on the occasion when Bill No. 99 was there. But as the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, and after protest, as the hon. leader of the Opposition agreed the other day, we will have plenty of opportunity to discuss it here in the House. One is driven to the conclusion that the Liberal Party so seldom finds itself in real disagreement with the Conservatives that when they get an issue they really have to dig their teeth in and stay with it for days, threshing old straw.

Let there be no misunderstanding, lest my remarks might be interpreted in any wrong fashion. On the issue of whether or not a public bill brought in by this government should in our view have second reading, the House rules are very clear. Any exceptions, I want to suggest to the hon. Prime Minister and to you, Mr. Chairman, again, are exceptions which should not be our guide in the future.

Now the rule is clear as to what should be done, and if the government wants to revamp a bill then the procedure again is very clear: that they withdraw one bill and give notice of introducing another one—if it is going to be as seriously revamped as the bills we have had.

There are a number of other issues, Mr. Chairman, that fall within the jurisdiction of the hon. Attorney General's department, which are now out for study by a Royal commission that has just been established or by the committee of the Attorney General

looking into the whole reshaping of administrative procedure of legal aid.

Once again, I do not propose to deal with these at any great length this afternoon. It would seem to me that the appropriate time to deal with them is when we have reports. And when the House has the benefit of these studies, the government, presumably, is then going to be in a position to, and would be willing to, move and do something about it. Clearly, the government is not going to do anything about it until these committees have reported. So I do not intend to dwell at length on those items, Mr. Chairman, because there will be more appropriate times to do it. Let us get down to The Department of the Attorney General itself.

In attempting to come to grips with it this year, Mr. Chairman, I think we are faced with some rather serious difficulties. In the first place, the predecessor of the hon. Attorney General came into this department and made no secret of the fact that he was going to streamline it. He was going to reform it. There was going to be a great deal of administrative changes within the department and he was in the process of doing this. Indeed, he had achieved something of the role of trouble-shooter in government departments over the years; first in The Department of Highways, then in The Department of Municipal Affairs, and then in The Department of the Attorney General, he had achieved the accepted role of the trouble shooter who was put in to clean up the mess — once the hon. Prime Minister had come to the conclusion that some serious attention was required. He was in the process of doing this. Some of the things, we were able to see from the outside that got coverage in the press, were a bit troublesome, were a bit worrisome. This is something that I think we should review. This is something that I think the hon. Attorney General should spell out in some greater detail than he did to the House.

I want to say to the hon. Attorney General with all the fairness that I can summon for a man who has just been thrust into a very difficult position, that I think his introductory statement was most inadequate. He was operating on the basis that if you say nothing there is less for people to latch on to and be able to be critical of. But it seems to me that all that has happened, all the apparent confusion and uncertainty and conflict in The Attorney General's Department, and various agencies that come under its jurisdiction, would have made it advisable for the hon. Attorney General to come into this House and indicate the general lines of what he was

planning to do, instead of just coming in with the kind of statement that he did and then leaving us to sort of take off from that point.

As a matter of fact, I think the significant point to be acknowledged here, Mr. Chairman, is that the explosion which ultimately blew the hon. Attorney General's predecessor out of his position altogether, was really—and if I may switch my analogies here—the final straw that broke the camel's back. Public indignation had been mounting on a whole series of issues with regard to the Attorney General. If I may revert to the parlance of the baseball—now that the season has opened—what you had in the last three or four months was a case of three strikes and the hon. Attorney General's predecessor was out.

In December there was a great public furor over the issue of used cars; he opposed the idea of an investigation; he had to reverse his position. In January, and into February, there was a great public furor over the question of Dr. Shulman and related issues with regard to coroners; not only the hon. Attorney General but some of the top officials in the department opposed Dr. Shulman's position. They had to reverse their position or lapse into silence. I shall come back to that in a moment.

Then finally there was the whole issue of the so-called police state legislation. This was the third strike on which the hon. Attorney General had fanned and I think the kind of indignation that emerged, not only among government members but in the House as a whole, was an accumulative one that resulted in an explosion.

I want to go back for a moment, Mr. Chairman, and review each of these because there are some untidy tag ends lying around, that I hoped the new hon. Attorney General would at least have had some comment on this afternoon. For example, in the instance of the whole used car issue. The hon. members are aware of the fact that this issue had come into the hearings of the select committee on consumer credit. We recognized that, while this overlapped into what we were interested in, it was not four-square within our terms of reference. So, on my motion, seconded by the hon. member for St. George, it was referred to the Attorney General for investigation.

There were many very good precedents for this kind of thing. But the Attorney General refused to act. He refused to look into it. He made a number of public statements, to put it as kindly as I can, that simply did not square with the facts. Out-

wardly the public outcry was such that he had to change his tune. He appointed an investigation under the jurisdiction of Harry Bray, QC, and presumably this investigation is going on.

Perhaps the best proof of the fact that the Attorney General's action was a very belated eleventh-hour action, was that the government itself, even before it had received a report from this investigation, proceeded to bring in a bill on generally the same lines as the licensing of mortgage brokers. They are now going to licence car dealers.

Mr. Chairman, it may well be that this is the solution to the problem. Indeed, in the last of the series of releases I made to the press—when I decided that a fire would have to be lit under the previous Attorney General—after the actual appointment of Harry Bray had been made, I made a suggestion that—complicated as this problem may be, the answer is a relatively simple one—instead of just registering used car dealers, they should be licensed and there should be some sort of tribunal before whom they can be brought if there is an accumulation of protests with regard to their business ethics or their business practices. In this way they could be called to make some accounting of their actions and if they could not give some good explanation of what was happening, then their licence would be withdrawn. It is as simple as that. This, presumably, is what the government has done. We will have a chance later to examine this bill in some detail.

However, the untidy tag ends that are now lying around so to speak, Mr. Chairman, are: what about the investigation? The government has acted before it has had a report. I think it is appropriate to ask the hon. Attorney General if he expects a report from Harry S. Bray. If so, when does he expect this report to come? Does he contemplate that beyond that there will be further legislation or further action taken by the government? For example, does he contemplate that it will be possible to redress some of the filching of innocent people that has gone on in the racketeering and the used car fields for many years when the Attorney General turned a blind eye to it and claimed it was not his responsibility? I think these are a series of questions of which we are entitled to know the answers at the present time.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize one point. If the report has not been made to the hon. Attorney General, I hope that when it is made there will be some observations in one particular connection. If

they are not there, I suggest that he should solicit them when he gets the report.

When I was engaged in the public discussion, in the alerting of the public if you will, as to what had gone on in the used car field—admittedly, with the co-operation of the Better Business Bureau, whose files had been bulging with information available to the Attorney General for years but he chose to ignore it—I was honestly of the conclusion that the racketeering practices that have grown up in the used car field were restricted to certain fringe operators, some of these people, who were among the one thousand licensed or registered dealers in the Metropolitan area who have not even got car lots, who change their name and disappear almost as frequently as the months change.

However, Mr. Chairman, I became persuaded, as I was literally flooded with complaints by telephone and correspondence as to cases in which people had been victimized, that these racketeering tendencies were not restricted to certain fringe operators. Indeed, in the Metropolitan area, there are some established used car dealers, among the best known dealers in this city, who are as guilty as the fringe operators. I have passed on to the investigating officers, who were working with Harry Bray, cases involving them. Indeed, in correspondence I have had in the process of passing them on, I have had confirmation from the investigating officers that they had found these practices to be prevalent with established operators.

I think the government has neglected this field for so long that the disease had spread far more widely than we perhaps had believed to be the case. It exists not just among the fly-by-nighters, but among the established operators. Indeed, because of the very fact, it seems to me that the hon. Attorney General might well look into the whole question of redress.

Indeed, he might look into the question of whether charges should not be laid, and what action should be taken with regard to people who got away with things just as they pleased and for far too long. Indeed, in that connection, Mr. Chairman, there is one final point. I have received quite a number of communications from people who had originally been in touch with me and whose complaints I had passed on to the investigating officers. Let me illustrate what I mean. I have here a copy of a letter which was sent to me from Stanley G. Roberts of Hamilton. A copy also was sent to the hon. Attorney General. It reads as follows:

I am writing you regarding a complaint

I have filed concerning the purchase of an automobile. I completed the questionnaire and returned it to the above address—

This is to Mr. Eric Silk, QC, 175 Lakeshore Boulevard East—

I would like to be advised as to whether it is the intention of the Ontario government to appoint a judge in each city to hear these cases. If so, I feel that my particular case is worthy of consideration.

Thanking you for any information that you might give me in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What date is that?

Mr. MacDonald: April 18. Now, as the hon. Attorney General is undoubtedly aware, what happened when the investigation was set up was that people were asked to send in their complaints. I believe a standard form was prepared and it was sent back. This was filled out and sent in with the suggestion, in at least some cases, that there was also going to be a follow-up for further questioning of the person.

I have had quite a number. In fact, I took the precaution when I told people that this was the procedure, of saying that if nothing happens I would appreciate it if they would let me know. I was just wanting to know in advance how thorough this investigation was going to be. I have a few who have written back. The number of people who will do this is very few, but I have had a few who have written back and said nothing had happened. They had acquainted the authorities with the details of their case and nothing had happened. Here is one man who specifically asks what is being done about it.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Attorney General should report to this House what exactly is the stage that has been reached in this investigation, give some comments on the report and the role he anticipates that that report can, or may, play beyond the legislation that has already been brought in.

I turn now to a second item, the second in a series of three that blew the previous Attorney General out of his office altogether. That is the coroners' situation and, more particularly, the situation with regard to Dr. Shulman. I do not want to review at any great length and detail what happened back then, but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that too many serious—in fact incredibly serious—statements were made during that public altercation to be just ignored from that point forward. If there was half as much truth in some of the charges that were made

by the parties, one of them being the chief coroner and the others being top officials in The Attorney General's Department, then I do not think this whole thing can be swept under the rug and forgotten. Just to remind the House, I have here a Toronto *Telegram* story of March 11 which says:

Metro Chief Coroner Dr. Morton Shulman said last night his predecessor, Dr. Smirle Lawson, suppressed inquiries into deaths in hospitals.

I acknowledge that Dr. Lawson is now deceased. But is this the kind of thing that has been going on? Silence on the issue I do not think is good enough. Here is a clipping from the *Telegram* of February 4, entitled: "Inquests Whitewashed, Says a Lawyer." And it quotes Glen How and John J. Robinette, who were on the panel:

Coroners' inquests into hospital deaths frequently resemble whitewash, the Toronto lawyer charged.

Glen How, lawyer for the Jehovah's Witnesses, told the panel discussion at most hospital inquests the witnesses are doctors and no one is allowed to ask embarrassing questions. Any distinction between that and a whitewash is something that will have to be explained to me.

I have here a clipping from the *Telegram* of January 28 entitled: "Shulman Charges Deputy AG and Coroner with Interference." And this was repeated in the press charges of interference, beyond the legitimate right of interference, by top officials in The Attorney General's Department.

It seems to me that this is not the kind of charge that should be made by a responsible official and then just forgotten altogether. I continue: "Shulman Claims Political Pressure Used. Seeks Public Inquiry into the Coroner System," is the heading of a Toronto *Globe and Mail* story on January 28. And from the Toronto *Daily Star* of the same date, I quote: "Coroner Demands Political Interference Probe."

Here are a great number of very serious charges that have been made with reference to the role of The Attorney General's Department. I say to the hon. Attorney General this afternoon that I do not think that he can come into the House and give us as brief an introductory statement without at some point coming back to an explanation as to how much truth there was in some of these charges; and second, whether or not there is going to be any investigation along the line that was suggested by the hon. member for Downsview, into this whole issue.

Now, I want to come back a little later to the question of coroners' juries—another aspect of them.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is the question of the Ontario Police Commission with its many unresolved questions in the wake of Bill No. 99. It was rather interesting to note in the course of the debate that we had on Bill No. 99, and the subsequent debate on the crime report of the Ontario Police Commission, that the government in the course of the debate—without frankly stating so—indicated two rather significant shifts in policy.

The hon. Prime Minister intimated, or rather, I believe, it was the hon. Attorney General in this instance, who intimated that there was some kind of working relationship established now between the Ontario Police Commission and the Ontario Provincial Police.

We are all very aware of the titanic battle that went on behind the scenes; a battle that I think has been as graphically described in a story in the weekend magazine of the *Globe and Mail* a week or so ago—a struggle for power between the commission of the OPP and the chairman of the Ontario Police Commission, which was finally resolved in favour of the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police.

There was an intimation by the hon. Attorney General that, presumably, now that this issue had been resolved and since you have a new chairman to the Ontario Police Commission, thereby removing the rather serious personality clash that obviously played a very important role, that now, presumably, the OPP is going to report to the Ontario Police Commission and to the Attorney General. So that we are back a step or so from what appeared to be the position after the amendments a year ago, which reversed the original position established by the government when it brought in the legislation to establish the police commission.

Now, if you have been able to devise some sort of a working arrangement, it seems to me that this may serve the purpose of a co-ordinated approach of all of the law enforcement agencies through the Ontario Police Commission. This is a very desirable thing in the province of Ontario.

As one looks back and examines the areas of greatest threat of organized crime, it was out in the areas beyond the more efficient Metropolitan police forces of Toronto and Windsor and elsewhere. It was out in the smaller areas and areas where the OPP had jurisdiction back in the time when one of its branches was rather seriously crippled by

people within the branch who have since been found to have been working with the leaders of organized crime. In other words, there is clearly the need for some sort of a co-ordinating agency to bring together all of the law enforcement agencies, including the Ontario Provincial Police.

It always seemed to me from the outset, apart from the clash of personalities, that it was possible to get a working relationship there.

Now I assume from what the hon. Attorney General has said that there has been something of a shift from the adamant position taken by his predecessor and that now it has been achieved.

We also had an intimation from the hon. Prime Minister—rather slyly included in some remarks so that you had to be alert to spot it—to the effect that the amalgamation of the smaller police forces, which had been recommended by Judge MacDonald and which had been dismissed out of hand by the former Attorney General, was something which would take time to implement. Implicit in his comment was that this was something that we are going to work toward.

Once again, it seems to me that this is desirable if one is going to have a modern, striking force in our law enforcement agencies to deal with, not only organized crime, but with the normal law enforcement. This certainly cannot be done through some of the small and relatively inefficient police forces that we have, which simply have not the modern equipment which is required.

Now there is a second comment that I want to make in this connection, Mr. Chairman. That is that I was a little intrigued at the outburst once again last week, after we had had further debate in the House on the question of the revised Bill No. 99, as to who was responsible for this whole furor in the first instance. Indeed, the hon. Attorney General was quoted as saying in this House, and subsequently afterwards, that the responsibility really rests with the Opposition parties.

He was first quoted, I think somewhat unfairly, that the press had stirred up the storm. Then he was quoted as correcting it in saying that it rested with the Opposition parties, that none of them had at any time pointed out the fact that, for example, the original draft did not exclude the right to counsel. Let me say to the hon. Attorney General, and to the government and to all concerned, that I think the government might as well face the fact that the responsibility for the original Bill No. 99 rests with this

government and not with the press and not with the Opposition parties.

Indeed, if there ever was a man who was the architect of his own disaster, it was the previous Attorney General. If he had come into this House and had said to this House, as normally one would expect on a serious bill like this: "I have a bill here which is attempting to achieve a very difficult task of balancing the protection of individual rights and yet, at the same time, strengthening our investigating powers so that we can dig out the facts with regard to organized crime. I invite hon. members to examine this with the greatest of care to make certain that we are protecting the rights of the individual. I have the assurance of the law officers that we have done so, but I cannot drown my doubts."

If he had come into the House and made this kind of a statement, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that even with the original bill, there would not have been a political storm. Certainly we would have had arguments, because certainly when we took a look at the bill it would have been obvious to anybody that you had to protect the rights of the individual more; but we would not have had the political storm.

The political storm was created by the statements made by the Attorney General when he went out and revived once again his continuing vendetta with Judge MacDonald, even though Judge MacDonald had left the OPC. He forgot the basic principles of responsible government when he, under grueling by the press on the question of why this was necessary and why he should have such a dangerous bill, finally tried to dismiss the question by saying: "Well, ask Judge MacDonald", when clearly it was his responsibility, because he had brought in the bill.

Being a member of this government means the government must accept the blame. But if there ever was a man who was the architect of his own disaster, Mr. Cass was that man. I submit to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Attorney General that it is time to quit berating the press and berating the Opposition, and to accept the blame.

Now, once again getting on to other important tag ends that are lying around after this political storm, I want to ask the hon. Attorney General this: is it his intention to make certain that the Ontario Police Commission proceeds to complete the investigation into organized crime? I do not need to remind him that there are repeated references during the course of the report, which we

debated when we came back from the Easter recess, to the fact that this is a preliminary report and that they had gone as far as they could go. They had to get clarification as to their powers in coping with reluctant witnesses in *in-camera* sessions. It was clearly indicated that powers they felt they could get, and that they should get, had not yet been granted.

I do not think, after years of argument as to whether or not we have organized crime in this province, when the greatest obstacles to getting at the problem were the Attorneys General; that now, after the Roach commission, after this OPC report and some four or five years of inconclusive effort, we can let this matter rest when the Ontario Police Commission has indicated clearly they have not finished the job. I would like the hon. Attorney General to indicate to the House this afternoon whether it is his intention to instruct the Ontario Police Commission—with the powers that they will have in the revised Bill No. 99, providing all of the protection to the rights of the individual—if it is his intention to instruct them to proceed with all haste to complete this investigation so that we can have a report available for the next session of the Legislature and be in a position to deal with some degree of finality as to just how deeply organized crime has become rooted in the province of Ontario.

Now, related to this, there are one or two other tag ends that I want to draw to the attention of the hon. Attorney General. I was astounded to read in the *Globe and Mail* of March 26, a story that is entitled "Club Charters Still Being Held by Two Gamblers." Let me quote the first two or three paragraphs of this story, under the byline of Albert Warson and datelined Ottawa:

Gamblers Joseph McDermott and Vincent Feeley still hold two federal club charters despite a strong plea from Metropolitan Toronto police that at least one of them be cancelled.

The police, who feared that the charter might be used as a front for illegal gambling, asked The Department of the Secretary of State here to withdraw the Aram Equestrian and Breeding Association Inc. charter in late 1962.

Early last year, Louis Lesage, the department's companies and corporations branch director, replied by letter that it could not be done.

Now I would like some statement from the hon. Attorney General as to what in heaven's name is going on here?

For years we had these operators Feeley

and McDermott with clubs in operation with the Mafia on the outskirts of the Metropolitan area. Anybody who had eyes to see and ears to listen knew that things going on in these clubs were in violation of the law—barred windows, triple doors, hounds on the grounds, and so on. Yet the law was frustrated in coming to grips with it.

There was even a statement from the Attorney General that there were to be no further raids "except on complaint," so that for at least some period of time no more raids were made on the institution. When you have this kind of a situation, there is at least *prima facie* evidence that protection money is being used and something is frustrating the law in coming to grips with this kind of a situation.

I think the time has long since passed in the province of Ontario that people like Feeley and McDermott, whose record is now clear as operators in the field of organized crime, should be continuing to operate clubs. For some reason or other this government, or the police agencies in the province of Ontario, asked the federal government to do something about it and nothing happened. They say it cannot be done. I hope the hon. Attorney General—in fact I ask him now—can explain exactly what are the difficulties. What are the precise details as to the reason why he cannot have withdrawn a charter from a couple of operators? He does not have to necessarily answer now, unless the hon. Attorney General wants it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would like to answer now if the hon. member will permit. I have not seen the article to which you refer. I would like to get the date of it. But I would say this at the moment. McDermott and Feeley, as we all know, are in jail. That is the first thing I would answer. So they are not running the club.

The second thing that I take from the article that the hon. member read, is that these are federal charters that were granted and that we have asked to be cancelled. The federal authorities, the Secretary of State, says we cannot do it.

I have not had an opportunity to investigate this matter as yet, but I can assure my hon. friend that we will certainly follow it up and do so. But at least part of the answer is there; that the two principals have been put behind bars and that the charters are granted by the federal government and that I will follow it up.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I say to the hon. Attorney General it is in the

record already, but the story I have just referred to appeared on March 26. It was a front page story in the *Globe and Mail*. May I say to the hon. Attorney General that I hope he is not going to continue to be as naive as to make the kind of statement he has just made.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not being naive.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me explain why I am suggesting you are being naive, and perhaps you will have further reason to be critical of what I am saying.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps it might be better to say this: March 26 is the day I took over the office I now occupy. Since that time I have been quite busy, I think the hon. member will agree, with various important legislation which has been before this House. There had to be certain priorities given to that legislation, and to these estimates. Other matters are going forward, but they have not yet received my full personal attention. But I assure the hon. member they will.

Mr. MacDonald: I suggested to the hon. Minister that he was naive and I reiterate it when he says that because Feeley and McDermott are behind bars they are not operating a club for which they hold a charter. There are statements by people like Alan Phillips stating that Feeley and McDermott were operating in co-operation with the Mafia. Anybody who knows anything about what has happened in the United States, knows that one of the terrifying aspects of organized crime in the U.S. is that although they have locked up some of the leaders, they continue to operate their empire from Sing Sing and other prisons.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not from our institutions.

Mr. MacDonald: Don't you be too sure. Don't you be so smug and complacent about it, along with the other Ministers. Read the testimony of the report of the Ontario Police Commission and you will see that we have not gotten to the bottom of the operation. I just submit that whatever may be the operation, that if Feeley and McDermott are in jail it is an even more incredible proposition that any government, including a Liberal government in Ottawa and a party that is presumably interested in cleaning up this situation, should tolerate two men who have been convicted as professional gamblers and many other things, to be in jail yet continue to hold a charter.

I trust that the hon. Attorney General will

look into the situation and that he will come back to the House as quickly as possible, or that he will make a public statement on the issue if, perchance, the House has adjourned in the interval. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is an intolerable kind of situation. When you see men who are clearly categorized, as Feeley and McDermott are, continuing to hold club charters in view of the kind of thing that has happened on the North American continent, you can come to the conclusion that somewhere along the line the full implementation of the law is being frustrated.

If the full implementation of the law is being frustrated, somebody is being paid off. These people operate on protection money. This is the naiveté that I ask the hon. Attorney General to discard. If we are going to get at this issue, then when you see that kind of a situation do not come into the House and make excuses for it, because your second predecessor made excuses for four years until he began to look about as foolish as any man could be on this score. Now, let me proceed, Mr. Chairman, to another aspect of it.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): If the hon. member is making a statement about me I would say that we went ahead and did our best to knock out these people he is talking about. We succeeded in knocking them out and—

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. gentleman is going to intervene, there is one thing he has never learned, and that is to sit silently when he should. If the hon. gentleman is going to intervene I will remind him that he—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Have I got the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If I was as big a failure as you are I would resign and get out of here.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, just let me say this, as a parting shot to the hon. Minister: If he were an honourable man he would have resigned his seat long ago because he gave a commitment on the NONG affair that although we have not got the full details of it, he said he would

stake his office on it. It is about time he resigned. But resignations are not visual in the government. This is the one thing that I have said, that the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You will have lots of chance to say—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: My hon. friend has talked about resigning. I presented myself to the public in the light of all this, and I was redeemed and brought back again into this House. That is a lot better than this sort of rot.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if I might quote the hon. member for Downsview, his competition on the Liberal side was a young lawyer who obviously was, in his opinion, a little wet behind the ears. That was the intimation of the hon. member for Downsview. Maybe you did not have tough enough competition. I do not know.

That does not alter the facts with which I am dealing. Indeed, the old Frostian principle is that if you can settle issues that should be decided in the courts by going to the jury of the people, then no matter how many laws have been violated, if you are re-elected again, everything on the slate is wiped clean. I submit that it is about time that we got rid of that principle in the province of Ontario. You of the old guard operate on that principle.

Mr. Singer: Are you through with him? Because if you are going to quote me, quote me correctly. I did not say a word about his ears.

Mr. MacDonald: I said that was the implication of the comment.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is that since I have dealt with one aspect of a very strange reluctance to come to grips with one incidence of the operation of organized crime, these clubs are still chartered by Feeley and McDermott even though they are behind bars—the other aspect I want to come to is one that I have touched on already in this House, but I think that we have got to reiterate this and ask the hon. Attorney General what he is going to do about the recommendation of the Ontario Police Commission with regard to the collaboration in illegal gambling in the province of Ontario by radio, TV, and if I may add, the newspapers.

Just let me try to intimate to this House

how serious this situation is that the government has been winking at for quite some time. We have official figures that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) can confirm that \$90 million a year is bet legally in the province of Ontario through the pari-mutuel at the race track. We have the suggestion in the report of the Ontario Police Commission, their crime report, that for every dollar that is bet legally, anywhere from three to five dollars is bet illegally. This means that upwards of something like \$450 million a year is bet illegally in the province of Ontario.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Back it up!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if one accepts the pattern of organized crime, particularly in relationship to illegal gambling in the United States—a pattern that has been studied in the United States until we have full details of it—you will find that in the United States it is conservatively estimated that one-fifth of the illegal money that is bet goes into the treasury of the underworld.

The figures in the United States are \$47 billion in illegal betting, with \$9 billion going into the treasury of the underworld. If we bet upwards of \$450 million, sir, in the province of Ontario, and if approximately the same kind of thing is happening here, then this means that we have something approaching the sum of \$90 million, for which there is no income tax paid, going into the treasury of the underworld and to those who are organizing illegal gambling in the province of Ontario.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, and this is really the crux of the whole issue, in the United States it is estimated that 50 per cent of the \$9 billion that goes into the treasury of the underworld is used to corrupt police forces, judiciary and politicians—protection money to continue this sort of thing.

Once again I am only applying the American yardstick. If that is the case, then it means that in the province of Ontario there is something approaching \$45 million a year being used for protection money. Now, do not smile and laugh it off.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): How could you use it as a guide?

Mr. MacDonald: I can use it as a guide. The hon. member over here asks how can you use it as a guide? A lot of semantic argument is going on as to whether or not we have organized or syndicated crime in the province of Ontario. Let us cut out the verbal quibbling, Mr. Chairman. On the issue

of illegal gambling, Mr. Justice Roach stated that this is the one serious aspect of organized crime. On the issue of illegal gambling, the crime report stated explicitly that this is the one serious issue. If there is anybody, for example, for one minute who does not think we have syndicated crime—I do not care what words you use—we certainly have internationally organized crime—the race tracks close in the province of Ontario at the end of the season, does anybody suggest for one moment the betting quits? All you have to do is pick up the *Racing Form* which does not publish what is going on on the American tracks while our tracks are in operation here, but immediately starts to do so when the Canadian tracks close for the season, and, clearly, the bookies are in operation in the province of Ontario in the off-season.

The whole thing ties together. Where was this organized? Let us face it, Mr. Chairman, beyond any shadow of doubt, we have got a highly organized, efficient system of international organized crime on the level of illegal betting, of gambling. And if the American guide is an accurate one, one-half of the monies that go into the treasury of those who are running this operation, is being used for protection money. Then I submit that it is about time that this government ceased tolerating open violation of the law.

As I have already intimated in the House, you can get into pastoral rural areas of Ontario and hear stations like CJET down in Smiths Falls publishing the results every half hour throughout the whole afternoon while the races are going on.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I ask my hon. friend, if he honestly and sincerely believes that one-half of \$90 million in this province is being used to corrupt politicians and judiciary and the police force? Those are his words. Does he believe that?

Mr. MacDonald: I will say to the hon. Attorney General that I do not know, but I will say to the hon. Attorney General that no person who is conversant with the details of the picture of organized crime in the United States, will dispute seriously the fact that one-fifth of the money that is bet is going into the underworld, and that one-half of the money going into the underworld is being used for protection money. These are the studied and careful conclusions of the American Senate committee.

The hon. Attorney General cannot tell me that this is not the case in the province of Ontario. He does not know. I do not know. But certainly this is the pattern on which

they operate. Will the hon. Attorney General explain, where it says, for example, that you cannot have illegal betting? Will he explain why he, his department, the police force, could wink at the violation of the Criminal Code by open collaboration with those who are engaged in illegal betting, through the press, on radio and on TV?

Let us cut out any other argument in the issue. Will he explain why we have winked at this violation of the law? It is idle for the hon. Attorney General to say that organized crime is a serious matter, and then to tolerate illegal betting and gambling which is the basis of organized crime. It is idle for him to do that and then to wink at this open collaboration with the perpetuation of this system. And I submit to the hon. Attorney General that the time has come for him to rise and explain to the House why this continues to go on. When is he going to hearken to the recommendation of the crime report and enforce those sections of the Criminal Code?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I turn to one or two other items. The first one is some brief comment on the government's whole handling of the Northern Ontario Natural Gas report. The day after the conviction of Ralph Farris on the perjury charges, I asked the hon. Attorney General whether it was now his intention to release the report because it is obvious that, since it is going to be appealed, it will be in the courts for who knows how long, two or three years, before it gets to the highest court in the land. Therefore, if the government is going to persist in its previously announced policy that as long as this matter was still before the courts nothing more would be done, either in releasing reports or in laying further charges, in effect, what it is doing is just drifting with this issue for another two or three years.

I suggest to the hon. Attorney General that the Farris perjury charges are a side issue, and nothing more. The real issue of the original investigation into Northern Ontario Natural Gas in 1958 was because of charges made in this House with regard to the corruption of municipal officials by officials of Northern Ontario Natural Gas in their efforts to get the local franchises throughout the province of Ontario. This is the real issue.

Without going into details that have not yet been resolved, I say to the hon. Attorney General that enough evidence has come forward for there to be absolutely no excuse for the hon. Attorney General to fasten onto the side issue of the Farris perjury charges, and not get at the real issue. The real issue

is whether municipal officials were corrupted in the process of getting the local franchises for establishing the Northern Ontario Natural Gas distribution system in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, this becomes even more important since one of the people whose name has now seriously been brought into question happens to be a man who is a judge in the Ontario Supreme Court.

I say to the hon. Attorney General—and it has been said in many other places many times, there is nothing original in this—if Mr. Justice Landreville is not guilty then his name should be cleared. But if Mr. Justice Landreville is guilty, he should be removed from the bench without a moment's hesitation.

It is an intolerable proposition that a man should be sitting in the highest court in the province of Ontario with this kind of a cloud hanging over his head. The responsibility rests with this government and I find it absolutely incomprehensible that any government should be so insensitive to what is obviously a public need in not moving quickly to resolve this situation.

I repeat to the hon. Attorney General that the Farris perjury charges are a sideline issue that do not one bit stand in the way of such further action as the hon. Attorney General deems necessary on the NONG report.

This tactic, in the first instance, had all the earmarks of being a dodge to get the thing under the carpet for the purposes of the election. To persist in resorting to this kind of an excuse for drifting, for inactivity, when you have as important a personage as a man sitting as a judge in the Ontario Supreme Court with this kind of a cloud over his head, will mean that the blame is going to rest with the hon. Attorney General.

It is idle for the hon. Attorney General to go around this province, or for this government to go around this province, pleading for respect for the law, pleading for municipal officials not to be cutting corners; indeed not to violate the Criminal Code and The Municipal Act, if some of the charges that have been suggested with regard to Mr. Justice Landreville are at all accurate.

I would like the hon. Attorney General to explain, in a more convincing way than the excuses that have been given in the past, why he does not propose to move that the statement of a week or so ago is an accurate indication of government intentions.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to turn to the question of coroners' juries and how they operate in the province of Ontario—I do so partly because of the issue itself, but also

because of another strange instance of a government which has openly tolerated the violation of the law. From what I have been able to discover, it has done nothing about it at all.

Let me preface the statement I want to give to the House here, Mr. Chairman, by reading three brief sections from The Coroners Act, so that hon. members will be aware of exactly what the law is. The Coroners Act, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1960, Chapter 69, section 27, reads as follows:

A person shall not serve as a juror at an inquest unless he is named in the voters' list of the municipality and marked therein as qualified to serve as a juror, nor shall a person who has acted as a juror at an inquest act in a similar capacity within one year thereafter.

Section 31 reads as follows:

A summons to a juror or to a witness may be served by personal service or by sending it by registered mail addressed to the usual place of abode of the person summoned.

Section 34 reads as follows:

A coroner may appoint such persons as constables as he deems necessary for the purposes of assisting him in an inquest and before acting every such constable shall make oath that he will faithfully perform his duties.

That is the law. I have here, Mr. Chairman, the transcript of a programme that was carried on February 4 this year by "Toronto File." This programme in which Ed McGibbon brought before the cameras—with he himself contributing continuity by way of explaining the law and explaining some of the observations that were made—he brought before the cameras Dr. Cotnam, Dr. Shulman; a number of people who had been coroners' jurors; and Sergeant Cruickshank, who is the constable down on Lombard Street. The incredible thing, Mr. Chairman, is that when I saw this in the first instance I found it was absolutely unbelievable. When you read it—and I propose to read it into the record here—it is solid documentary evidence, testimony, by people indicating that the law has been violated.

As I shall show you in a moment, they would bring Dr. Shulman and Dr. Cotnam on and say "What is the law?" Dr. Shulman and Dr. Cotnam would spell out what the law is. Then Mr. McGibbon would flash on the TV screen some jurors, who explained how they were chosen and what they did. What they were saying was in complete violation of the law.

I want to come back to this point in a moment, but this is the key point that I draw to the attention of the hon. Attorney General: this was aired three months ago, a clear and solid documentation of blatant violations of the law.

The question I want to ask the hon. Attorney General after I have let the House in on the picture a bit, is: What has been done in the interval? Just what does one have to do to draw attention to violations of the law? What has one to do to get action from the government to see that the law is lived up to? Do you have to have a metal sledgehammer, or would a wooden sledgehammer do it if you hit the right person right squarely on top of the head?

To begin with, in this programme, Ed McGibbon pointed out that a bad practice had grown up in the province of Ontario, back in the depression years, of what was known as "professional jurors," people who were on juries repeatedly because they were just chosen by friends who happened to be in a position to choose them. Back in 1939 there was a prohibition put in the Act to the effect that you could not sit on a jury more than once in any year. That is in section 27 that I read a moment ago. Again, some two or three years ago, there was further tightening up of The Coroners Act to get rid of the practice of "professional" jurors. Just let me break into the script here. Ed McGibbon is speaking:

I asked Dr. H. B. Cotnam, supervising coroner for Ontario, whether the practice of picking hangers-on around the court room still goes on.

Dr. Cotnam said:

No, I don't think this practice exists any more. I am quite aware that this did exist in the past.

Ed McGibbon: Until when?

Dr. Cotnam: Well, I can only speak since my appointment, but certainly it hasn't existed in the last two years. Jurors are now picked in the manner that is outlined in The Coroners Act.

A little later Ed McGibbon said:

Dr. Cotnam, what procedure should be followed when impanelling a jury—a coroner's jury?

And Dr. Cotnam spells it out:

Well, the qualifications for a juror, of course, are laid down in The Coroners Act for the province. Number one, they should be on the municipal voters' list and their name must have "J" to it, meaning eligible

for jury duty. And the second requisite is that they cannot serve on a jury more than once in a 12-month period. Now, the actual section, I feel, is a dual responsibility of the coroner and the coroner's constable—

If I may interject here, Mr. Chairman, this is rather interesting. Dr. Cotnam saying it is a dual responsibility, not just of the constable but also of the coroner. Continuing in the script now:

—and the coroner should certainly have some part in this and sit with the constable and try to pick out juries that are going to be capable of assessing the matter under discussion of the deceased's death.

Then Ed McGibbon queried Dr. Shulman:

It is not possible to create a special list within the voters' list and the jury as indicated on the voters' list? If you continue using the same jurymen year after year, couldn't this become almost a professional jury?

This was Dr. Shulman's reply:

Well, that has happened in the past in Toronto—in fact a police officer who is no longer on the force has produced what is known as this officer's trained seals and the same jurors were there week after week. But this is an abuse that was corrected some three years ago. Sergeant Cruickshank of the Toronto police took over this function and this no longer can or does occur in Toronto.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the face of that, let us hear Sergeant Cruickshank. Ed McGibbon is speaking:

This means that you can select anyone from the voters' list providing they have a "J" opposite their name?

Sgt. Cruickshank: That is correct, yes.

Ed McGibbon: And you cannot call them short of one year after they have served?

Cruickshank: That is correct. One full year.

McGibbon: After one year, you can call them indefinitely?

Cruickshank: Oh, yes. You can call them for once a year only.

McGibbon: Once a year only?

Cruickshank: That is correct.

McGibbon: As long as they are still on the voters' list?

Cruikshank: As long as they are still on the voters' list. That is correct.

McGibbon: Sergeant Cruikshank, correct me if I'm wrong. This means that once a person is appointed to the jury duty of a voters' list, providing they remain on the voters' list, can be called again as often as you, the court officer, choose to call them, providing you do not do it more than once a year?

Cruikshank: That is correct. That is correct.

Dr. Shulman: Yes, that is true. They can, and in fact they do. But the police officer has been instructed to check and to make certain that they are still on the voters' list.

McGibbon: Now, once a person's name appears on that voters' list with a "J" opposite—does this mean that forever after, providing that individual appears on the voters' list, he can be called for jury duty?

Dr. Cotnam: No, definitely. Each inquest comes up and a jury needs to be impanelled. The current up-to-date municipal voters' list should be utilized by a coroner's constable in selecting the jury. I think here perhaps you are referring to the possibility of professional jurors—whereby—the coroner's constable, particularly in an area like Metropolitan Toronto, after a period of time gets several hundred names and he keeps repeating the same jurors. We think that in an area this size, juries can be gotten quite readily, not using the same people repeatedly.

Then McGibbon queries Sergeant Cruikshank again:

There is just one other thing in this selection of jurymen—

If I may just interject here, Mr. Chairman. If there ever was a case of a group of people really being led up the garden path—they were subsequently going to be revealed to be incriminating themselves—this was the group of people. However, let me get back to Ed McGibbon and his skillful job:

There is just one other thing in this selection of jurymen. How is it that you know that the jurymen you select is still on the voters' list?

Cruikshank: Well, I have their home phone numbers. I will contact them by phone, ask them if everything is the same as the year before, if they are living in the same place and if they are still on the jury list. I know them fairly well and I think they are pretty honest men. I trust them.

McGibbon: Now, at any point does the court ever question your decision as to the selection of jurymen?

Cruikshank: No, never.

Now, I recall Dr. Cotnam's suggestion that it should be a joint responsibility with the coroners. McGibbon again:

McGibbon: Is it not the responsibility of the coroner to supervise the court officer?

Dr. Shulman: Oh, yes, and the instructions have been given to the police sergeant that the jury is to be chosen from the voters' list, not from any special list which he may have prepared.

Now, Mr. Chairman, against that background—words from the officials involved, the coroners and the constable—let me now go to a few interviews with jurymen:

McGibbon: Do you own your own home?

Mr. George Brooks: Yes.

McGibbon: Are you on the voters' list?

Brooks: Yes.

McGibbon: And do you have a "J" beside your name on the list?

Brooks: Not that I know of.

McGibbon: Can you ever remember a time when you saw your name on the voters' list with a "J" beside it?

Brooks: Not to my knowledge.

McGibbon: Mr. Brooks, when did you last serve on a coroner's jury?

Brooks: On the 16th of this month.

McGibbon: Of this month? Have you often been a juror at an inquest?

Brooks: Oh, I have served possibly four times in the last four years. Three to four years.

McGibbon: How many times have you served all together, could you remember?

Brooks: Oh, that would be rather difficult. I would say that I served prior to the war and then after that I did not serve until five or six years ago. Five years ago, possibly.

McGibbon: So have you served—

Brooks: I would say I have served five—say five times in the last five years.

McGibbon: How is it that you have served so often as a juror, when many voters never get a call at all?

Brooks: Well, I believe the simple fact is that many people do not wish to serve on juries. These are always held in the evening and the average man, after a day's work, wishes to rest.

And a little later in the programme:

McGibbon: Does this not tend sometimes to create a situation where the same people are called over and over again?

Cruickshank: —

the sergeant, who is obligated to faithfully uphold his responsibilities according to The Coroners' Act:

Cruickshank: No, that has—may not happen. Sometimes, we will say this year, I have more inquests set in January for this year than I had last year. So I will have to go up to the city hall again and go over the voters' list and get quite a few names again to carry on until the other men come due to be called—

McGibbon: So you probably have some, if I may use the expression, veteran jury men on every jury and some new or novices—

Cruickshank: Oh, yes, there is—if you have three men that have been here before along with two new men, that helps the new man an awful lot.

Then Mr. McGibbon comes back with another juror.

McGibbon: Mr. Hodgson, how often do—have you served in the last, say, three years?

Hodgson: Three times.

McGibbon: Three times. Does this come up regularly each year for you?

Hodgson: Well, the first time was around the first of August, and then the next about the middle of August and the third around the end of August.

McGibbon: Do you feel that your name is on any specific list as a result of these regular August calls?

Hodgson: I think so.

And a little later:

McGibbon: Do you find yourself meeting up with the same jurors each year?

Hodgson: Well, only one chap, he was there two years.

McGibbon: Who was that?

Hodgson: The foreman of the jury, a fellow by the name of Levine.

McGibbon: He was on what, the last two?

Hodgson: No, he was on the first and the last.

McGibbon: I see. Is there anyone else who served on these juries with you each time?

Hodgson: Just my son.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. members do not want to listen to this clear violation of the law being revealed, I suggest they go out and have a smoke.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): What is it?

Mr. MacDonald: Clear violation of the law.

Mr. Reuter: I cannot recognize it. Not the way—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this is the usual trouble with a Tory. He cannot recognize the violation of the law when it stares him right in the face. I continue:

McGibbon: Is there a "J" opposite your name on the voters' list, do you know?

Hodgson: I could not tell you.

McGibbon: —any idea how—Sergeant Cruickshank came to call you in the first instance?

Hodgson: Well, he called my son, and I guess that my son told him I would be available if they wanted me, and he phoned me.

McGibbon: Had your son ever served on a jury with you?

Hodgson: He served on the three I did.

McGibbon: On the three? Did your son suggest that you be called or—

Hodgson: No, I could not tell you. All I did was get a phone call.

Another juror:

McGibbon: Mr. Henderson, how were you called?

Henderson: I was called by a police officer, who asked me if I would serve at a coroner's inquest. This officer is acquainted with a friend of mine whom he had asked to serve on the jury and he asked him if he knew of anyone else who was interested in sitting on a coroner's

jury. My friend gave him my name and as a result he called me.

McGibbon: Do you remember how you were called?

Stone: We were called by a constable.

McGibbon: When you say "we", you are referring to whom?

Stone: To all the jury. The five jurors.

McGibbon: I see. Do you know how he happened to arrive at your name?

Stone: This particular constable lives on our street. I understand that this—that he is able to do this—that it does not matter whether he calls all on one street or all in a line—apparently it is quite in order to do this.

Now, Mr. McGibbon, on camera, said this:

"Toronto File," incidentally, has examined the voters' lists for the names of twenty jurors who have served on inquests in Metropolitan Toronto in recent months and has found six who were not eligible for jury duty. Some names could not be found on the voters' lists at all while others did not have the required "J" beside them. One of the six was a dentist even though The Jurors Act specifically excludes doctors and dentists for jury duty.

Maybe this will be a flagrant enough violation to even capture the attention of the backbenchers over here. To continue:

Section 31 of The Coroners Act provides, for example, that a summons to a juror may be served by personal service or by sending it registered mail; but as things now stand it does not work out that way.

And then they go back on to interviewing jurors:

McGibbon: Did you receive the summons calling you for jury duty?

Brooks: You mean the summons as a piece of paper?

McGibbon: Yes. Well, it is my understanding that summons are sent out.

Brooks: No, this is not sent out. The summons is usually in my experience—the summons is in the jury room when you go into the jury room prior to going into court.

McGibbon: So you are phoned and you go down to the court and you pick up your summons there at the court?

Brooks: That is correct.

And incidentally, a clear violation of the law.

McGibbon: Well, what happens when someone has been summoned and does not appear?

Brooks: Well, I have not got the faintest idea because there is really no summons issued. You are just requested to come down and the summons is given to you when you are there. There is no summons as such issued.

And then another instance:

McGibbon: How were you called? Do you remember the circumstances under which you were called?

O'Carroll: It was through a friend of mine.

McGibbon: How far in advance? How much notice were you given?

O'Carroll: About four days.

McGibbon: Did you ever receive an official summons to appear or was it simply the phone call?

O'Carroll: It was a phone call.

McGibbon: Did you ever receive a summons?

O'Carroll: No.

McGibbon: Not even when you arrived at the inquest?

O'Carroll: Yes, I did—

McGibbon: There was one waiting for you when you arrived there?

O'Carroll: Yes.

An hon. member: Is that O'Carroll or Carroll?

Mr. MacDonald: And then, finally, Mr. Chairman, and this is perhaps the most serious of all if one is seeking a cross-section of the views of citizens who are chosen for a jury, McGibbon explained on the programme:

More serious, perhaps, is the sanctity of the jury room when the jurors retire to consider their verdict at an inquest. In this regard, the courts have long held that a coroner's jury is no different from any other jury in our judicial system, and that no one is to talk to the jurors or influence them in any way.

It used to be, however, that some coroners would so direct the jury that they would even go into the jury room and help the jurors to write their verdict. I asked the supervising coroner for Ontario, Dr. Cotnam, whether this still goes on.

Cotnam: It is true that this practice was done in the past and I can say categorically that this is not done now and we instruct everyone accordingly.

McGibbon: You say this is not done now and you instruct everyone accordingly; can you say that you have stopped the practice?

Cotnam: Yes, I think the practice is pretty well stopped now. I am not aware of this happening. We'll say, since my appointment, and not only is the coroner not to go into the jury room and instruct the jury, but neither can anyone else. The police officer can't go in and give them any additional information nor can the Crown attorney go in. If the jury sends out through the officer that they want some additional information or to clear up a matter then they must be brought back into open court again, and they can state their problem and the coroner can instruct them accordingly.

And then we have a cut in of one of the jurors; our old friend Brooks.

Brooks: Well, no, if you want to clarify a point that you are not quite sure of, I mean if there is something in the evidence you're not quite clear about, you call the constable and you go to the court steno and you bring back the actual wording that you want.

McGibbon: I see. Well, now—

Brooks: I mean that if some point comes up and you are not actually sure about it, you ask the constable, the sergeant, who'll then go and get the necessary data for you.

Now McGibbon comes in for a little discussion with the sergeant—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Let us have the commercial.

Mr. MacDonald: To continue:

McGibbon: Now you are totally responsible for a jury man.

Sergeant: That is correct, that is right.

McGibbon: I assume that you are responsible for them from the time they enter the court room till they come back.

You take them to the jury room.

Sergeant: That is correct.

McGibbon: And you are responsible for them. Now, who exactly is allowed in that jury room? With the jury?

Sergeant: No one at no time.

McGibbon: Under any and all circumstances?

Sergeant: That is correct.

McGibbon: Is the coroner himself not even allowed to go in?

Sergeant: No, he is not. No one.

McGibbon: What happens if somebody goes into the jury room?

Sergeant: Well, I can arrest them.

McGibbon: Has there ever been an occasion when you have perhaps needed to call the coroner into the jury room to discuss a point with him?

Brooks: Oh, yes.

McGibbon: And he will come in and discuss it with you?

Brooks: Oh, yes, he will. Yes.

McGibbon: Do they ever bring a witness to you when you are in the jury room?

Brooks: I have never had occasion to.

McGibbon: But you have had an occasion with the coroner.

Brooks: Yes.

Clearly in violation of the Act, Mr. Chairman.

McGibbon: Now, after the jury retired to the jury room, I understand in this case in which you served or the inquest at which you served, there was a request for additional information as to when the deceased had died. Do you remember the circumstances surrounding that particular request?

O'Carroll: There was a question asked like how long he had been dead. I mean how long he lived.

McGibbon: Fine. Now, who was it that answered that question for you?

O'Carroll: It was the doctor.

McGibbon: Was that the coroner?

O'Carroll: It was at the inquest.

McGibbon: And where did he answer that question?

O'Carroll: He answered it in the jury room.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on even further, but I want to conclude my remarks in the hope I can complete them by very shortly after six o'clock.

Mr. Chairman, the "Toronto File" programme of February 9 reveals that those

sections of The Coroners Act which refer to the choice of jurors and the prescribed procedure for the conduct of a jury are regularly violated. Either the supervising coroners do not know what is going on, or else they, as well as The Attorney General's Department, are once again winking at a persistent violation of the law.

The transcript of the programme from which I have just quoted provides testimony of these violations; that testimony was made public four months ago to literally tens of thousands of people within the viewing distance of the CBC. What is being done by those responsible for seeing that the laws of the province are obeyed?

After seeing that programme, Mr. Chairman, the House will recall that I asked the hon. Attorney General whether the records of coroners' juries were publicly available. Obviously they are, or should be, but only after considerable jockeying back and forth between Crown Attorney Bull and repeated questions to the hon. Attorney General did I get permission to examine those records. I want to present to the House the results of that examination. I might add that the information which I have extracted from the files and from which I now present conclusions to the House, is available to both the press and to the hon. Attorney General.

What I have here, Mr. Chairman, are the lists of jurors in over 250 coroners' inquests over the past two years in the Metropolitan area. There are literally hundreds of names; there are five jurors per inquest, so you can figure it out for yourself; hundreds of names and they have been retabulated alphabetically so that you can refer to them very readily.

Examination of the alphabetical lists, Mr. Chairman, will show that most of the juries are composed of veterans who reappear annually. Sometimes they show up exactly on the same date, sometimes just a week or so after the lapse of one year required by the law. In most cases the familiar names turn up before the year has elapsed, and in this way, Mr. Attorney General, there were 51 infractions of the law between January 1962, and January 1964. These cases are marked with a red "X" over the dates on the alphabetical lists which I have available for inspection.

There is some evidence that this has been going on for years.

For example, one inquest report for 1960 had been misfiled into 1963. And, back in that year, at least for this one jury, there were three men—Albert Millar, Paul O'Brien

and Arthur Virgo—who are still active in the current lists. All of these offences occurred at 86 Lombard Street, although the same tendency is noted in Scarborough and Weston. The inquests at 4199 Dundas Street West, Islington, and 5090 Yonge Street are in better order, though not without occasional irregularities.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the record for attendance—this is a "lulu"—is held by Thomas Johnston of 19 Empress Avenue, Willowdale, who served six times between April, 1962 and July, 1964 when the law permits only one jury attendance per year. The record at 86 Lombard Street is held by Gordon W. Crawford of 263 Queensdale Avenue, who has served five times between May, 1962 and November, 1963, twice as a foreman.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You said July, 1964.

Mr. MacDonald: If I may correct it, five times between May, 1962 and November, 1963, twice as a foreman.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The man before, the first one you mentioned, the one you said was a lulu.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You said he served so many times from such and such a date until July of 1964. Well, we are not in July of 1964 yet, so you must be thinking of some other date.

Mr. MacDonald: I can get the correction on that.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: All right.

Mr. MacDonald: I can get a correction on that in about two minutes. You are right; it is April, 1962 and July, 1963. Examination of the sheets shows clearly that in a number of cases all five are veterans; in many cases three are veterans, with two new ones making their appearance. In my tabulations, the veterans are checked in red, on the left hand side of their names. Yet we had the testimony of Dr. Cotnam in the "Toronto File" programme that the requirements of the Act are being lived up to because, and I quote Dr. Cotnam, "we think that in an area this size, the Metropolitan area, juries can be gotten quite readily, without using the same people repeatedly."

It appears obvious, Mr. Chairman, that a roster for jury service has been kept for a number of years at 86 Lombard Street. The

practice can be traced back to Sergeant J. W. Cruickshank's two predecessors, A. R. Andrews and E. J. Wickenden. It can be noted that when Sergeant Cruickshank was absent last September, presumably on leave, his stand-in, R. J. Holmes, was able to continue the practice without hindrance.

In view of the law, as laid down in The Coroners Act, and in view of the repeated assertions on "Toronto File" by both Dr. Cotnam and Dr. Shulman that the practice of professional jurors has been ended, what explanation can the hon. Attorney General give for this?

Let me give the House a few more details that have emerged from my research. Perusal of the juries reveals that on occasion all of the jurors come from one street, may in fact be close friends and neighbours. Exactly what this means, in terms of destroying the intent of the Act in seeking a balanced judgment from a cross-section of citizens, chosen at random, I shall leave for each hon. member's conjecture.

It is noteworthy that four streets in the east end of the city, between Monarch Park Avenue and Victoria Park Avenue, have provided a disproportionate number of jurors. The four streets from which the following list of jurors appear over the past two years are as follows:

Kingswood Road: 38, Harry Ellis; 420, John and Helen Brindley; 437, Elmer and George and Esther Haney; 439, Frederick and Margaret Gourlie; 441, William and Lawrence Seymour; 443, Walter McLeod; 445, James Herdman; 447, Ross and Grace Urquhart; 449, E. Thomas; 455, Sidney Sluman.

Northdale Boulevard: 65, William J. Wilson; 69, Donald H. Gorman; 75, John P. Hughes; 77, James A. Hodgson and Manfred Job; 79, John Rooney; 81, David Smith; 87, Ross F. Counter; 89, Ivor Ellis; 97, Arcadia Miladinov; 99 Albert Millar.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it should be noted Sergeant Cruickshank lives at 77 Northdale

Boulevard, the street from which I have just listed these.

Oakcrest Avenue: 72, Martin Snow; 77, Frank Careless and William K. Allen; 83, Cyril Smith; 85, John C. Andrews; 86, James Smith; 92, Thomas E. Denny; 106, Beverley J. Ashfield.

Finally, on Queensdale Avenue: 16, Roland Ellis; 149, Cyril Greenham; 167, Reginald and Margaret Matthews; 263, Gordon W. Crawford.

Another interesting point appears from a study of the jury records. The law requires that a juror's name be listed on the municipal voters' list and be marked with a "J". The last voters' lists were issued in all municipalities in October, 1962. There are 15 persons who served on 1963 juries who had moved since they served in 1962. Until new lists are compiled their names could not be on the list at their new addresses for no new list will be completed until this fall.

It is significant to recall, in this connection, the comment of Dr. Shulman on "Toronto File" that the police officer has been instructed to check and make sure that they are still on the voters' list.

There are a number of cases where one person has brought his friend, his fellow lodger, his brother, his sister and other relatives. A checking of the addresses documents this. During the two-year period there were at least eight husband-and-wife teams.

In the face of all this evidence, Mr. Chairman, which merely documents more solidly what has been readily available since the "Toronto File" programme of February 9 this year, what explanation can the hon. Attorney General give for such a blatant disregard for the law? And when does his department intend to see that The Coroners Act is complied with?

Mr. Chairman: It is now 6.05 o'clock. I will leave the chair and resume at 8 o'clock.

It being 6.05 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 4, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Monday, May 4, 1964

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, continued	2757
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2792

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 201.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the specific individual votes and estimates of the Attorney General, I think it only proper that I should deal, even if only briefly at this time with some of the points raised by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) in their remarks this afternoon. I would take these points as I noted them at the time. I made some notes then, in reply, and had a brief opportunity during the recess to add some information which may be acceptable and helpful.

One of the first items the hon. member for Downsview mentioned, was the accounts paid to outside counsel and the principle of engaging outside counsel generally in matters with which The Department of the Attorney General has to deal. On the principle of the engagement of counsel, I would say this; that I make no apology for the policy of securing the best counsel where matters of considerable import are to be prosecuted, either in the criminal or in the civil courts. This is a policy which has obtained down through the years and I think one that has proven its worth and proven satisfactory.

The suggestion was made by the hon. member that such persons might be engaged as part of the Attorney General's office. Perhaps there is some merit in that idea, but if counsel of top calibre are available, and can be engaged occasionally on very important subjects, I would not entertain the idea that that was not a good policy to follow.

With respect to the matter of accounts, the hon. member suggested that it was only a matter of submitting an account and it was accepted and paid. I would assure him that this is far from the fact. This is not the rule.

This is not the practice that is followed. Accounts are submitted; they are very carefully scrutinized. They are often referred for reduction and reduction thereof insisted upon, and, in certain cases, they are taxed. I think the hon. member made some reference to the taxation system at Ottawa by the Minister of Justice. That is simply very similar to the procedure often followed with respect to accounts here, that the accounts are reviewed very carefully by the officers of The Department of the Attorney General and taxed down in this department, which is on all fours with the taxation procedures in The Department of Justice at Ottawa.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, could I perhaps ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wonder if you would be good enough to reserve it until I have finished and then perhaps we can come back to it?

I am going on to the point where the hon. member made some reference to the law reform commission.

I think I would refer the hon. member to the bill which is now before the House. I believe it has received second reading. There was an inquiry asked with respect to the scope of that commission and I would say that after consultation with most eminent members of both bench and bar, the commission was authorized, in the language of the Act, in section two as follows:

It is the function of the commission to inquire into and consider any matter relating to (a) reform of the law having regard to the statute law, the common law and judicial decisions; (b) the administration of justice; (c) judicial and quasi-judicial procedures under any Act and finally, or (d) any subject referred to it by the Attorney General.

The point is, that the commission has broad powers on its own initiative. Not under the direction of the Lieutenant-Governor in council, or the Attorney General, except only in

the latter part of that section, where it says "any subject referred to it by the Attorney General." The commission may institute and direct legal research for the purpose of carrying out its functions and the commission shall report from time to time to the Attorney General. I am hopeful, of course, that this Act will become law at this session of this House.

The hon. member made some remarks with respect to legal aid and I think all hon. members of this House are aware that the committee on legal aid has been quite active. It is functioning, has held hearings through the province, has received, I understand, at its request, a very considerable number of briefs and presentations and its work is continuing. Questionnaires were sent out to labour bodies, ethnic groups, church groups and generally throughout the public of the whole province and I expect that committee will also be reporting shortly and we will be able to provide a type of legal aid which will be adequate and satisfactory. The matter, briefly, is now being pursued and studied in the fullest and most thorough way and, if we may have a little patience, I think we will find the answer.

I will not at this time take time to comment on the comparison of the public defender system with the legal aid system, but I think my hon. friend agrees with me that perhaps the public defender system, as it is employed in our neighbour country to the south, does not compare with even the legal aid system we now have, for which I give a great deal of credit to the members of my profession for instituting the system on their own, voluntarily.

The securities commission was remarked upon. My hon. friend remarked about the code of ethics which had been established with respect of which the law was silent, and inquired as to whether that code should be made law. I think he is perhaps aware—and this House should be aware now—that a committee was formed on securities legislation, to deal with these subjects. Among others: takeover bids, insider trading, proxy solicitation, disclosures to shareholders, primary distribution, and all other matters relating to trading and securities in Ontario. As to the personnel about which an inquiry was directed to me, I would say that the committee originally consisted of, I believe, Mr. W. B. Common, the deputy Minister; Mr. J. R. Kimber, the securities commission chairman; Mr. R. A. Davies and Mr. H. L. Mockridge, two very eminent lawyers, familiar in the securities field.

I believe that on February 14, 1964—I am now reading from a press release given out by my predecessor in this office (Mr. Cass):

The Attorney General today announced that this committee which was created to consider various aspects of security legislation in Ontario, has been enlarged to permit the widest scope of investigation. To ensure that this end is achieved new members have been appointed to this committee.

Then follows the names of five persons: Mr. J. S. Yoecker, QC, deputy Minister of The Provincial Secretary's Department, which department has the responsibility for the administration of The Corporations Act. Mr. T. A. M. Hutchison, FCA, a senior partner in the firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, chartered accountants; Mr. Hutchison is also secretary of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Ontario. Mr. Charles Warren Goldring, a director of Fry and Company Limited, who are members of the Investment Dealers Association of Canada; Mr. Goldring is president of the Toronto Society of Financial Analysts. Professor H. Ian MacDonald, Bachelor of Commerce, Bachelor of Philosophy, M.A. and so on, assistant professor of political economy and dean of men at the University of Toronto; and Professor M. L. Friedland, who also holds various and similar titles, of the Osgoode Hall law school, legal adviser to the committee.

I inquired during recess as to how active the committee had been and I find it has held a meeting every week since November; that is, some 20 meetings or more, and that it proposes now to hold public hearings and is working very actively with a full-time legal adviser.

The hon. member for York South raised certain points and if I can get his attention I would now answer him. One of the first items which the hon. member raised was the matter of the used car situation. I think it surely should suffice if I say to this House in reply that, as he is aware, legislation has been drafted. It would perhaps have been in committee this morning had time permitted. It will be there tomorrow morning. It provides for not only registration, but for licensing and investigation. I think it is quite a thoroughgoing piece of legislation and trust it will become effective legislation in this House at this session. It should serve—and I fully anticipate that it will serve—to regulate, control and permit the investigation where necessary in this field of our commercial life.

I do not think I can say at this moment, and I would not say, that I am about to let the matter pass into limbo. But the hon. member said:

Has consideration been given to restoring to some people the losses or to prosecuting those who defrauded them?

That this will receive further consideration, is all I can say, and I say this sincerely. Up to the point where we now come, where legislation is being presented to the House, this phase of commercial life in our province has been subject only to the remedies which are provided for in our courts, civil and criminal, such as prosecution for fraud and action for recovery of money wrongfully obtained by misrepresentation and other things.

Those remedies up to this point have apparently been considered sufficient. Perhaps something may be done by going back and looking at the matter. But certainly from this point forward, I think we will be able to take care of this matter in a reasonable and effective way.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is the hon. Attorney General expecting a report from Mr. Bray?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member asked about a report. Mr. Bray, I understand, made a report to my predecessor and it was out of that report that the legislation to which I refer has come. I have not, in the time I have had, been able to put my hand on a written report. But I know it was out of his report to the former Attorney General that this legislation now coming before the House was drafted and prepared.

The hon. member for York South had a great deal to say about coroners and about coroners' juries. I would, perhaps, be careful in saying this, but as I listened to him and to his reading of the presentation which was made over television, it seemed to me that while there were some infractions in the procedures which are laid down in the Act according to the sections which he gave, I must say, frankly, that, while I do not condone this in any way, they were not such as one might call a serious—even in the nature of a misdemeanour and certainly not criminal.

A coroner's court is an investigative tribunal, not one with an accused before it, but seeking to find out the facts by which some person came to his death; to find out whether it was malice, negligence or carelessness. Without saying this should be done, it is altogether possible that a juryman attending year after year after year might

very well become a more competent juror. I do not say that he should breach the law, or anyone in charge of the court should do so—

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore, your law is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps the law is wrong, I do not know. But I would say that as the law stands it is to be observed. I can say to the hon. member that steps have been taken to see that it is strictly carried out in every respect.

Mr. MacDonald: When?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now. Prior to now.

Mr. MacDonald: When?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: When, what?

Mr. MacDonald: Prior to now, when?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, it has been done prior to the time I am standing here speaking. Some weeks ago steps were taken to see that The Coroners Act is fully administered, strictly in accordance with its provisions. That this will be done, I can assure this House.

With respect to the Ontario Police Commission and the Ontario Provincial Police: I think perhaps I should say that it is significant, and I am sure the House is aware of this; that in Bill No. 99 as it was originally presented to this House, section 15 made a change that would make the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police directly responsible to the Attorney General. That section has been deleted from the bill as reprinted, as it has been before the committee and as it will come back to this House. I say that is significant. The law stands as it was, and the law at present is that subject to the direction of the Ontario Police Commission as approved by the Attorney General the commissioner has the general control and administration of the Ontario Provincial Police force and the employees connected therewith.

On this subject, I would say that I do believe that there will be an honest, conscientious compliance with that section. I think the intention of the government is very evident in the way that the legislation has been dealt with now. The government has a right to expect, and will require, that the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police co-operate with and, in the language of the section, be subject to the direction of the Ontario Police Commission as approved

by the Attorney General. I am sure that result will be achieved. There is, without saying more, every evidence that that result is being achieved at this time.

I am sure that that co-operation will increase so that we will have what is intended—a commission having the control and administration of all police forces in this province; with the Ontario Provincial Police Commissioner co-operating to the fullest extent and accepting the advice and the direction of that commission. On matters of broad policy, where the decision of the Attorney General is required, then the direction, advice and approval of the Attorney General will be sought.

I would like to say this: I think it achieves what is the ideal, in that in the administration of particularly the Ontario Provincial Police Force which is the force of the Ontario police and a provincial force it should be as far removed as possible from any political influence in the matter of recruitment, promotion, building of quarters and things of that kind, so that there will be no contact with the political arm in that sense, but that through the commission which directs, assists and advises the Ontario Provincial Police commissioner, there will be a line of responsibility in matters of policy making, and matters of broad policy back through to the Attorney General, who is the responsible officer of government who must be responsible for the actions of that force in that type of thing.

Having said that much, the intention of the government is clear. The action that has been taken with respect to the recent legislation, I think, underlines the attitude of the government. I have every confidence that the policy, as I have enunciated it, will be achieved.

The hon. member for Downsview asked if it was the intention of the Attorney General to have the commission complete a further investigation into organized crime.

Mr. MacDonald: It was my query.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yours? I am sorry. The present report is an interim report. I am aware of that. Referring again to the legislation before the House in Bill No. 99, that section, now section 17, provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in council may direct the commission to investigate crime and matters relating to the enforcement of law. All I would say is this: That when, and only when, the government decides that that commission should go forward to investigate further matters of crime, then it will be

directed to do so. That is the only answer I propose to give at this time. But I can assure the hon. member that the government is aware of its responsibility in this regard. It has the authority to do so, and has the commission there to carry on the investigation. To name it more definitely than that, I am not prepared to do on this occasion.

Then the hon. member for York South referred to club charters. I think I answered that partly at the time, but I was told I was naive. Perhaps I am. I accept the allegation, or imputation. But I did note in reading the article, which I had time to pick up during the recess and I am just going to refer to it very briefly, said first of all in brackets in this article:

McDermott and Feeley went into Don Jail in Toronto last June—

this is the article of March 26, 1964:

—to begin serving an 18-month sentence for conspiracy to obtain information illegally from police officers.

Then follows a paragraph:

Police in Toronto maintain that neither the Aram charter, nor the other one held by the two gamblers, the Cosmopolitan Hunting and Fishing Association, has ever been used for any purpose in Ontario.

Now this is what the Toronto police have discovered from their investigation. These are federal charters and the Secretary of State has not seen fit to repeal them. The police here say the charters have never been used. It is pointed out in this article that they could be used anywhere in Canada, since they are federal charters. I would say that it is one of the things I am very much interested in looking into further; but at this particular moment I can give my hon. friend no more complete answer than I have now done.

The hon. member almost, I thought, went to the point of charging the newspapers, television and radio people with being guilty of unlawful practices in reporting results of horse races.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the police commission said. Just quoting back to you—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think that the police report claimed that these persons were guilty of any criminal offence.

Mr. MacDonald: It said you should enforce the criminal code.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, on this point—and I have not had more than enough time

to look up some law—I find that in one case involving Leishmann some years ago, a charge was laid. He was the publisher of, I believe it was a racing form or a paper of very similar name. The court interpreted the section, which is a section of the Criminal Code, very strictly and very closely and dismissed the charge. He was publishing it wide open. I do not prefer to believe that all these people are criminals. Perhaps they are, but certainly if we could get the evidence to prove that they are, they would certainly be prosecuted. But I do not believe that the crime report went that far. Without further evidence, I can say nothing more at this time. I do not believe, unless there is some further evidence to this effect, that some \$45 million is being used to corrupt either politicians, our judiciary or our police force. I have a little more confidence in them than that.

Inquiry was made with respect to the Northern Ontario Natural Gas situation. I think it was the hon. member for Downsview who inquired, a day or so ago in this House, as to whether Mr. Farris had been convicted, if the report would be made public and what about further prosecutions.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister means York South.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: York South—I should be very careful to keep you two apart, I know.

I replied at that time to the question, stating that since the conviction was being appealed the report would not be made public at this time. I further replied that further charges were being considered, had been and were still being considered. I have nothing further to add to the answer I gave the House at that time.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): We now have one stage of the Farris case completed. There is an appeal and that may go on for some time. I take it the position of the hon. Minister is that there will be no publication of the report as long as that case is pending before the courts. Then let us assume that one is disposed of, and another charge is laid. Will that still further delay the publication of this report? On the procedure which the hon. Minister's predecessor followed, and he apparently also is following, is his report ever going to be made public?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can only say to my hon. friend that the release of that report while the conviction is being appealed might be very unfair, in a number of respects, to persons named therein. Until the appeal is

determined, I think it is the only proper and fair attitude to take.

Mr. Bryden: This is a new procedure.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now I will answer the rest of the question. I did not say at the time the report would not be released until the appeal was completed. I merely said that the Farris conviction was being appealed, and the report would not be released at this time. I did further say, as I mentioned a moment ago, that further prosecutions and the matter of other charges had been considered and was still being considered. There the matter must rest for the moment. I will not say more.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of very brief points that I wanted to refer to the hon. Attorney General. When talking about outside lawyers, I made specific reference to a particular sessional paper. If the hon. Attorney General has not had a chance to examine it, or the two or three similar papers that were produced as a result of either questions of mine or questions addressed by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) over the past several years, I would commend these to his immediate attention. These questions were specifically and carefully worded. One of the questions asked was, what was the amount of the bills submitted and what was the amount paid?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is that on the order paper?

Mr. Singer: Yes. Over the past several years, this particular sessional paper is in reply. The question, in substance, was directed to the government in relation to every department. It is not on the order paper this year, but it was in previous years. It may be that the procedure is changed, but in the three or four years that that question was there, the answers were exactly the same.

What are the names of outside lawyers or legal firms employed, for what purpose were they employed, what was the amount of the bill they submitted and what was the amount paid? I can tell the hon. Attorney General that in each year those accounts ran to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and in not one instance can I recall than an account, which was submitted, was paid in any different amount than that amount that was submitted.

Now it may be that as a result of those questions that were put on the order paper in three or four successive years that the government has changed its policy and is having a closer look at those accounts. That is only a

part of the point I made. The additional point I made and I think this is at least as important, probably more important: I can see no reason why the government should have to, every year as a matter of course, pay out hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees to outside lawyers. I can see no reason why there should not be a legal staff working for the government, under the control and direction of the hon. Attorney General, that cannot do this work.

On the odd occasion, in cases of outstanding importance, in cases of the most extreme difficulty, certainly no one is going to object to the government hiring the best counsel available. But if you read through any one of these sessional papers, Mr. Attorney General, I defy you to satisfy anyone, even yourself, that in these hundreds of instances of hiring outside lawyers, each one of which indicated that these cases were of extreme difficulty, could not have been handled by the departmental staff, if there was a departmental staff available.

I can recall a case just within the last few months. It involved my own office and a real estate transaction. A very simple one. We were acting for the vendor, and the government was the purchaser. For no reason that was apparent to me—even though a substantial sum of money was involved, it was a simple, ordinary real estate contract—it was found necessary for the government to hire outside solicitors.

I can see no excuse for this at all. It would seem to me that if the government takes competent lawyers into its own employ—and it will only get competent lawyers, by and large, if it pays them the going rate and does it in sufficient numbers—that it would save many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year.

Again I say that the information the hon. Attorney General gave to me, insofar as the fees are concerned, is not borne out by the sessional papers that were tabled, by the answers to those questions that were tabled. It may be that the system has changed in the last year, because I think the questions were asked over that previous period.

Now insofar as the law reforms—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Could I just say this? I thank the hon. member for drawing this to my attention and again I have to say, although I am reluctant to say it at this time, that since the question was asked I have not had time to get the full reply I should like to give him. But I thank you for drawing it to my attention and it will have my full study and consideration.

Mr. Singer: There are at least three returns made. My memory fails a little bit, but I know I asked the question at least twice. My hon. colleague from Sudbury asked it at least once and the result was substantially the same.

Insofar as the law reforms commission is concerned and the bill that is presently before the House, I agree with what the hon. Attorney General has said, but I was hoping that he would point the commission in some direction that he would indicate to them that maybe it would be helpful if a particular field of law was investigated. He has that power in the Act if he wants to exercise it, but I thought it might be helpful to the House if he suggested within the general, broad field—and I do not care which one he picks, there are so many of them—that the law reform commission is going to investigate something or other, and we can expect to have a report before the House the next time we meet after the end of this session. This is the sort of thing that I think would encourage many lawyers in the province; many people who have to deal with complications of the law, if we had reason to expect some serious law reform in a particular field within a reasonable time.

So far as the securities commission is concerned, I am interested to hear about this committee. I do not recall an announcement of the appointment of the committee having been made in the House. Was it made in the House? I do not recall it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I believe it was made—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): It was really discussed.

Mr. Singer: Well, in any event if there is—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is very active.

Mr. Singer: All right. There is such a committee sitting and certainly they have got an important task ahead of them. The importance of that task is heightened by the report of the commission headed by Chief Justice Dana Porter, where he and his commission have, exhaustively, in my opinion, examined some of the faults in our securities legislation and there could not be a better series of guideposts directed to this special committee than the hon. Attorney General refers to, than the 20-odd pages contained in the report of Chief Justice Dana Porter's commission, which point out where our securities legislation is lacking in direction and control.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might amplify my remark about the law reform commission.

I think the hon. member is aware that a very able and active committee of the law society has been working on the field of creditors' securities and they have done some very excellent work, I believe over a period of some three years. This was with the approval the assistance, and the blessing and the direction of the Attorney General. We printed a draft bill, which I believe we have—

Mr. Singer: I have a copy of it right here in my desk.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You have it. I have it. We have considered actually so far as to possibly introduce it to this House. We felt that another year's study might be helpful and the committee itself felt this would be a wise and good thing, and I believe there have been some discussions, public discussions on it here last weekend, which I regretted I was not able to attend. But that particular field has also been pursued in a very excellent way. I am not exactly sure how far we will go with that new bill but it is going to be studied further and something certainly will come from that. I think I could say this further, that the hon. member suggested that some direction might be given to the law reforms commission and I think I can assure him such direction will be given.

Mr. Singer: Well, I think this is fine. I am pleased to see this bill come forward. I do not know if The Attorney General's Department or the hon. Attorney General or his predecessors initiated this study. Whoever did, deserves a lot of credit.

This sort of study happened without the law reform bill having been passed and it is the sort of study that the bar association or the law society embarks on, on occasion, and is a very helpful adjunct to our whole field of administration of law. But apparently the government has decided that there is more that can be done in this regard and that is why the law reforms commission bill is before the House. I was hoping, and I would think that most members of the profession are hoping, that the government will point this commission in a certain direction, because the field is so large.

We certainly would hope that this commission will get to work soon, that it will have on it the most eminent people that you can find, the most qualified people that you can find, and that we could expect, say a year from now, there will be a report that we will have a chance to examine. That you will bring in legislation as a result of such a report.

The hon. Attorney General did comment on the remarks of the hon. member for York South concerning coroners. He did not comment on my remarks, and I was wondering if there is any study going on at all as to the importance of carrying on the present system. Now I agree with the hon. member for York South that if there are statutes on the books they should be enforced, but my remarks were in a different direction. I think that the time is long overdue that we examine the whole function of coroners and coroners' courts and inquests and all that sort of thing. And I think the series of crises that we have gone through indicate that more clearly than anything I can possibly say. I would have hoped the hon. Attorney General would have given some indication that this matter is at least under study or that there is some action going to be taken in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must say that when the hon. member spoke about coroners, as I recall his remarks, I made a few notes. But in the first part he related the history of this court, which has, down through the years, performed a very valuable service in the investigation of deaths, to determine whether there is malice or negligence or carelessness of a criminal import.

In one breath he said "perhaps this court should be a court which makes a finding, an accusative finding" as I recall his remarks, and whether the courts should be empowered to say this person is guilty of a crime in the sense of, although the hon. member did not use the word, a grand jury. Then he went on to say "has this court outlived its usefulness altogether and should it be revised, should its functions be taken away?" and so on.

Coroners' inquests have a long, long history behind them. That is no reason, perhaps, to say it is an unmixed blessing today, or that it is perfect in any sense.

Mr. Singer: It is far from perfect. That is what I was trying to say.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just because there was some difference, perhaps; just because some of the procedures that it is supposed to follow were not followed; just because there has been some difference in the opinion of certain coroners as to what it should do, does not, in my mind, immediately condemn the court entirely. I would accept the hon. member's remarks and be quite prepared to consider the functions and the procedures of the court. Perhaps on another day I may make some recommendation with respect to

this where indicated. But a coroner's inquest, properly carried out, is an investigative tribunal which does that function very well if it is thoroughly done.

Mr. Singer: It said 1921 in that report I quoted.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They still do it well today.

Mr. Singer: Not with doctors running it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps that is a point that is worthy of consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, some of the comments the hon. Attorney General made can more appropriately be dealt with under specific estimates. I propose to do it in that fashion because I think it is the tidiest. But there are two or three that, I think, appropriately come under the main office. I think we may as well clear them away now.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Shall we go ahead with 201?

Mr. MacDonald: Vote 201 is the main office, Mr. Chairman. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether you can get some of the hon. gentlemen over here to treat their responsibilities in this House seriously, or whether they want to continue to act like teen-agers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to two of the points in which, with respect, the hon. Attorney General has rather unfairly twisted what I have had to say.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sorry if I did that. It was certainly unintentional.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if it was unintentional, just let me show the hon. Attorney General where it was twisted. He said to me: "You are, in effect, saying that the news outlets are criminals."

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: All right. Let me, Mr. Chairman, read recommendation 16 of the Ontario Police Commission.

That the radio and television stations regularly transmitting racing results be prosecuted under Section 177(L)(1) of the

Criminal Code. There can be no doubt that such information can have value only to off-track bettors and bookmakers and is therefore clearly within the wording of the section as "intending to assist in bookmaking, pool selling, betting and wagering."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully suggest that the hon. Attorney General does not need to accuse me of saying that these people are guilty. His agency, appointed by this government, has suggested to him that he should prosecute them because their actions can only assist in bookmaking.

If the hon. Attorney General thought I was saying that he was twisting the thing, I submit that this is precisely what the import of his statement was. And I think there is an obligation on the hon. Attorney General to state now whether he is going to prosecute. Because I submit these broadcasts can only assist illegal betting through the bookmaker. This is the only conceivable value it can be.

Now, another point on which the hon. Attorney General was a bit unfair. I just want to clarify this. I pointed out that in the studies in the United States, a fifth of the illegal betting is estimated by the most reputable and authoritative research people—the Senate investigating committee, that has been working on this for years. They have stated that one-fifth of the money that goes into illegal betting goes into the treasury of the underworld, and that one-half of that amount is used for protection money. What I said is, if that pattern applies in Ontario, then \$45 million is being used as protection money. Obviously, I do not know for certain whether it is. The hon. Attorney General does not know whether it is. I would hate to believe that \$45 million was being used for that purpose. But even if it was only \$5 million that was being used to corrupt as protection money—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if I have to continue to say it over and over, then conceivably these people will stop talking so they can understand what I am saying. I said, if the American—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the members to allow the speaker to continue

without interruptions so we can carry on the business of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this: that the scandalous procedure we have had in this House this afternoon just proves that the fresh start that was made by this hon. Prime Minister in coming to grips with some of these problems and rescuing the Tory Party from the moral myopia in which they ignored violation of the law—

Several hon. members: Nonsense!

An hon. member: Get to the point. What vote are we on? What has that to do with the main office?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! I would ask the member to speak to the vote.

Mr. MacDonald: I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, on the main office.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. On law enforcement in this province. It is rather interesting that he starts, it is to get me sitting down. He listened to this mob over here this afternoon and never once raised his voice.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I wish, when the speaker is on his feet, that he would direct his statements to the Minister of the department at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: What I stated, Mr. Chairman, and obviously I have to repeat it because it is being misconstrued—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Have I the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Continue!

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you. It is that if the American pattern, which is studied by people who know about it, is being applied in Ontario, then that means that \$45 million is being spent for protection money in this province.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is supposition.

Mr. MacDonald: Correct. It is supposition, Mr. Chairman. And nobody can disprove that it is not happening.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Not only supposition. It is nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, sir, the Attorney General of a few years ago said that organized

crime was nonsense. This is the problem with this government. It very slowly comes to grips with this threat. That is the reason why I used the term "naïveté" this afternoon, because you are playing with fire and you do not know it.

That is the reason why I want to suggest this to the hon. Attorney General. His comment was that "this government now has the power to direct the Ontario Police Commission to complete its investigation." But since the Ontario Police Commission has said clearly that their report is an interim report, and that they have not completed the job, can I ask the hon. Attorney General why they would conceivably withhold the direction that the job should be completed as soon as possible?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: First of all, the bill is not yet law. I said that when the bill was effective legislation, then the government would determine what further direction the commission should be given. That is all the answer I propose to make at this time on that subject.

With respect to the question as to whether the Attorney General is going to prosecute newspapers, radio and television—

Mr. MacDonald: Newspapers were not included. Just radio and television.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was going to say that newspapers should not be included because they are specifically exempted by the section of the code. They can publish betting results until doomsday, or racing results rather, and the odds and so on. They are specifically exempted by section 177 of the code. The section is so worded that it, I think, would make it extremely difficult to get evidence that would make a charge stand up against radio or television doing the same thing as the newspapers.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But that is just my opinion at this moment. It is very easy to say prosecute them but you have to have the evidence to make your charge stand up.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the commission which made this report happens to be a judge and if he has not some appreciation of what is required in prosecuting I do not know who has. If he has not got at least that measure of appreciation, I do not know why he continues to sit on the bench. He, as chairman of the police commission, made this proposal and all I am

suggesting to the hon. Attorney General is that it cannot be dismissed out of hand, because nobody can deny that the results of these broadcasts regularly on the half hour during the day is to assist the whole organization of bookmaking. And it is idle for this government to deplore illegal gambling and to tolerate assistance which is open and flagrant in this fashion.

I am not making the proposal. It is a judge who is now back on the bench and exercising his responsibilities.

The only other two brief comments I want to make at the moment, Mr. Chairman, because this is the appropriate place to deal with them. I think, is that in the used car business—if, indeed, it is accurate that the legislation that this government has brought in as a result of a report that has already been made—it is clear that the investigation was a façade, that it was not necessary at all because anybody could have told you beforehand that what you needed to do was to licence and set up some sort of a tribunal to review complaints. I claim no omniscience on this issue but, before the investigating commission was established, I suggested that this was an answer.

This clearly proves that the establishment of the commission was just something to appease the public and I submit to the Chairman that if this investigation has submitted a report then this House is entitled to get a copy of that report. I specifically ask the hon. Attorney General now: Did the report in any way comment on the activities of established used car dealers, not fringe operators, and does the government propose to take any specific action with regard to established used car dealers, rather than just the fringe fly-by-night operators?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They are all included in the bill, every car dealer, not just those who deal in used cars alone. Everyone in the business.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, it simply means this, that this government and this Attorney General's department having failed its responsibilities for years in coping with flagrant fraud and fleecing of the public is now going to wipe the slate clean so that these boys get off with it completely.

That is just what it adds up to. I do not happen to have the editorial here from the *Globe and Mail* but there was one editorial which very firmly stated to Mr. Cass that there were two jobs to be done. One is to pass the laws, another one is that if there is widespread violation of the law, you just do

not shrug your shoulders and say "This is for the individual to take action in the courts." It is your responsibility to do something in coping with widespread violation of the law, both civil and criminal.

This government tolerated it for years and then belatedly they came into the picture and now apparently they are going to do nothing further about it.

My final point—the hon. Attorney General is a new man in the office and I want to be fair with him—Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Attorney General wants to ponder a little bit further on the Northern Ontario Natural Gas situation, fine, but I reiterate once again, it is a scandal for which this government must assume responsibility unless it very quickly clarifies the situation with regard to Mr. Justice Landreville. Because if he is not guilty, the cloud should be lifted from his reputation. If he is guilty, he should be removed from the bench.

As long as this government tolerates a situation like this for another day, it is responsible. There is no point in getting up and pleading for respect for the law because you are not going to get respect. Why should people have respect for the law? Why should they have respect for our courts? And why should they have respect for the judiciary, when you sit and do nothing when there are charges like this being made about a man who is sitting on the bench?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Resolve the charges!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before you leave vote 201, would the hon. Attorney General elucidate the \$5,000 figure put in his estimates for Royal commissions, item number four?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The item of \$5,000 is a nominal amount actually in the accounts for the purpose of paying disbursements with respect to Royal commissions.

Mr. Bryden: I assume it may be increased significantly?

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, could I ask about bail under this estimate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: About the subject of bail?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

An hon. member: Bail and jail.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know whether that is under this estimate or not. I think that would come under vote 207.

Vote 201 agreed to.

Vote 202 agreed to.

Vote 203 agreed to.

Vote 204 agreed to.

Vote 205 agreed to.

On vote 206:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, as we all know, an unfortunate event occurred at a place called Reesor's Siding a little over a year ago. Three men were killed and eight were injured by gun fire. As a result of that incident, over 100 men who were on strike at the time were prosecuted and each of them was fined, well, at any rate, not all of them were convicted but most of them were convicted and those who were convicted were fined \$200 each. In connection with the same incident, there were some people who were described as "settlers" who were not on strike but who had been cutting timber in the bush. Three men were charged in the first instance with non-capital murder and that charge was subsequently reduced to possession of offensive weapons. These charges were laid in connection with the deaths of the three men that I mentioned and injury to several others. The fines in these cases were \$100, on the charge of possession of offensive weapons. In view of the fact that three men were killed and several were injured as a result of the possession and use of these offensive weapons, it seemed rather a light fine. It seemed that The Attorney General's Department considered it rather a light fine because at the time it indicated that it was going to appeal. But then we learned through the press on March 28, 1964, that:

The Ontario Court of Appeal ruled Thursday that The Attorney General's Department waited too long to appeal \$100 fines levied against three Kapuskasing bushworkers last October. The court refused an application by the department for an extension of time in which an appeal could be filed. The department felt the penalty imposed was not severe enough.

I would like to find out what possible reason there could be for the failure of The Attorney General's Department which is fully familiar with the provisions of the criminal law and with the provisions regarding appeals in such cases, to apply for leave to appeal in time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: All I am able to answer the hon. member for Woodbine at the mo-

ment, is that I know that the decision of the court he refers to was on a motion to extend the time for leave to appeal and the court refused. I am not able to answer at the moment why the appeal had not been filed within the ordinary time allowed. But I would be glad to get further information on that, given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Attorney General that while he is looking into the matter he might inquire into the handling of this whole affair from beginning to end. It is incredible that the only charge laid when three men were killed was a charge of possession of offensive weapons.

Let me put it this way: initially the charge was non-capital murder, but this was reduced by a grand jury, as I understand the procedure, which held that there was not sufficient evidence for a more serious charge. Now, I want to know why the grand jury did not have the evidence before it.

It would seem to me there was bungling of this case from beginning to end. In fact it is very hard for the layman, and particularly the layman affected in that part of the country, to believe that The Attorney General's Department and the authority charged with the administration of justice had their hearts in this case from the very beginning.

Quite true, in regard to the unarmed workers, who were fired upon and who were charged with unlawful assembly, I believe the case against them was proceeded with with utmost despatch and I am not suggesting they should have got off. If they broke the law they should have paid the penalty and they were, on the basis of the evidence, fined \$200.

But they were the people who were on the receiving end of the gunfire. They did not fire the guns, they did not even have guns. Then how was it that in the case of the people who were on the firing end, adequate evidence could not be collected, first of all, to sustain the laying of a charge which would seem to be in keeping with the nature of the offence? Then, after even the reduced offence was dealt with in the most lenient manner, how was it that the department could not take action to place an appeal in the normal course of events?

I am suggesting to the hon. Attorney General that the people who are affected cannot help but think, on the basis of any evidence they have before them now—and on the basis of any information from this department or any other government source, they are entitled to think—that there was no serious

effort to make these charges stick or even to see that the accused were faced with proper charges in court.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know what the hon. member might expect in the way of an answer to his diatribe, if I may call it that. Here was a situation of two milling crowds of very opposed ideas, meeting at night and shots are fired and three are killed.

It is deplorable, of course! Terrible, of course!

There were some policemen in the area, and they were on the scene. But it is one thing to say they should have been found guilty, they should have been charged with murder, and to get the evidence to prove it. The justice who attended at the assize was Mr. Justice McRuer—Chief Justice McRuer—a most capable, respected, eminent and able judge.

Now we come to the matter of evidence. I am not prepared to say, or even to suggest, that every effort was not made—I think it was made, to find out who fired the shots. But in those circumstances apparently it was not possible to do so. A charge of non-capital murder was laid and the men charged went before their own peers and equals, the grand jury, and all the evidence that was available was placed before that type of court and they said there is no bill on that charge.

This is the administration of justice. To say that there was not an effort made to get the evidence is something that I cannot stand here and substantiate nor deny, because I am not aware of any such situation. For the hon. member to stand up and say that I think is very unfair. If he has proof that no effort was made to find the evidence, let him say so. So far as the situation is concerned, I have told him how it was dealt with and I have no criticism to offer for the way the administration of justice was carried out.

Mr. Bryden: I want to make it clear, since the hon. Attorney General brings in the courts, I did not say anything in any way casting any reflection on the courts. I am quite satisfied that the courts acted on the basis of the evidence presented to them. I have no doubt about that at all. So perhaps we can keep that red herring out of the picture altogether and just get down to what is before us here tonight, and that is The Department of the Attorney General.

I have been told by representatives of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union—I believe the government has been, too—that there were people who had material information

to give to the grand jury who were never called before it although they were ready to go. Now I think there should be an explanation of that.

Perhaps the hon. Attorney General could get away with his answer with regard to the case presented to the grand jury, but I do not see how he can possibly get away with this. How on earth can he explain the failure to apply for leave to appeal within the required time? It seems to me that the entire mulling of the case requires a very careful investigation of the way it was handled from the very beginning.

I would like to know—since I have raised the matter, I would like to carry it a little further—I would like to go back to the time of the event, I would like to refer to an item that appeared in the *Northern Daily News* of Kirkland Lake. It was headed “Kapus-kasing Tragedy—A Reproach to All.”

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): What is the date on that?

Mr. Bryden: This was at the time, it was February 13. It was just after the unfortunate incident at Reesor's Siding.

Mr. Cowling: In 1963?

Mr. Bryden: February 13, 1963. It is a little over a year ago:

So senseless was the slaughter a man can only experience a terrifying sensation of being back in the dark ages. He has trouble believing it actually occurred in this supposedly enlightened day.

Out of the shocked reaction there is certain to come a tide of criticism of the provincial government and the Ontario Provincial Police charged with preventing violence and bloodshed in a situation that has threatened to burst daily into flame during the past month.

That it could have been prevented seems obvious.

Everyone in the province, including Premier Robarts, unless he has had his ears stuffed with pulpwood, knew the settlers were armed and ready to shoot in defence of their right to transport pulpwood to the mills.

Yet an OPP on duty where the outbreak finally came is quoted as saying afterwards he didn't know the settlers had guns. If he didn't know then he must have been the only adult in the province who was unaware of the fact. People 500 miles from the scene could have told him about the guns.

Most dreadful feature of the case, apart from the government and police inaction that permitted the bloodshed to occur, is lack of reasoning behind the settlers' action.

Then it goes on to deal with the settlers. I will not bother reading that particular portion. A little later it says:

The only poor, miserable grain of comfort in the sorry situation lies in the fact it wasn't the strikers who did the shooting. Had that been the case the whole province would be aflame with headlines about their viciousness. We would be lucky if killings were not followed up by lynchings.

Now that it is too late we presume the settlers will be disarmed, police reinforcements rushed in by the hundreds and a tight lid clamped on the region.

But if the whole grisly affair doesn't rock the government and prompt an overhaul of The Attorney General's Department and the Ontario Provincial Police, then the whole lot of us can be pre-judged guilty of setting the stage for the next act of violence.

That is the *Northern Daily News* of Kirkland Lake. That editorial was written before any charges were laid. It was just after the event. It suggested at an even earlier stage that there was something gravely wrong in the activities of the Ontario Provincial Police. They were not on top of the situation. From what I have heard—I was not there—in talking to people who were there, and confirmed by this comment from a newspaper which admittedly is not in the immediate area but is in northern Ontario, everybody knew that real trouble was brewing, that these men had guns and that if they had guns there was a danger they would use them. The Attorney General's Department and the provincial police did not take the sort of decisive action that was required in the situation. Then, when following their lack of action, actual shootings occurred and men were killed, there was still a failure, in my submission—or at least grounds to believe that there was a failure—to follow up and take proper action under the law. The thing has been handled in a slipshod manner from beginning to end. I will read another editorial comment on this from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, a newspaper which I do not think this government would consider to be an irresponsible newspaper. This was on October 19, 1963.

The people of Ontario have not yet received a satisfactory explanation why only 25 police reinforcements were sent to

the area when violence threatened, involving 1,000 independent lumber cutters and 3,500 strikers. There were these recorded warnings: A union leader was quoted as speaking of raids by hundreds of men. An independent trucker told of being dragged from his vehicle as four Ontario Provincial Police stood by. The Mayor of Kapuskasing warned that the settlers were going into the bush with guns and were desperate enough to shoot. Two clergymen called for an increase in the number of police. An independent logging jobber suggested the situation was so ugly that consideration should be given to bringing in the militia. Independent truckers complained of threatening phone calls.

Yet police were not dispatched in sufficient numbers to keep the peace until three strikers had been shot and killed and nine others injured.

Three independent bush workers have been fined \$100 each for their part in the incident, in which hundreds of striking union members raided the camps of 20 independents. One hundred and thirty-eight of the strikers have been fined \$200 each. The 20 settlers were originally charged with non-capital murder, but the major charge was dropped after a grand jury examined the case. Mr. Laforce says—

that is Joe LaForce who was then president of one of the locals of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union:

Mr. Laforce says that the result of the grand jury hearing "makes a mockery out of justice in this part of Ontario," and that it indicates the Ontario Provincial Police, by failing to gather sufficient evidence, is not upholding the laws of the province.

Opinions on the court's decisions may, of course, vary. But one thing is clear. Law and order broke down at Reesor Siding one day in February. The public is entitled to know why.

Mr. Chairman, that editorial arose in connection with a request made to the government by Mr. Laforce, on behalf of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, that a Royal commission should be appointed to inquire into the whole matter. I am going to ask the government why it is not prepared to appoint a Royal commission.

I would submit to the hon. Attorney General that, on the face of it, there are too many unanswered questions. There are adequate grounds for investigation at every stage of this proceeding into the law enforcement before the overt violence occurred; into

the way in which the charges against these people were handled; into the failure to launch an appeal from the obviously ridiculous penalties that were imposed by the court. All of these matters should be inquired into.

The people have a right to know. Particularly the people in the area have a right to know what happened. If there was no breakdown in law enforcement, then that fact should be clearly established. If there was a breakdown, something should be done to make sure it will not happen again.

I would like to point out to the hon. Attorney General and the government that there are negotiations in this industry coming up again this year. There was a most unfortunate occurrence as we all know, last year. The whole strike was mishandled by the government and by The Department of Labour from beginning to end. As a result, things finally blew up in violence, serious and regrettable violence, and the mood of the people now is a lot worse than it was then because of the events that have transpired.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): That is not true.

Mr. Bryden: It is true. The mood of the people is a lot worse than it was because of the events that have transpired. I am suggesting to the hon. Attorney General that if he is concerned about maintaining law and order in this province, and in that specific part of it, the air should be cleared now before those negotiations proceed. If there is another strike there, heaven help us. I do not know what might happen. But let us not run the risk of it happening. Let us get this situation cleared up now.

Surely the hon. Attorney General cannot tell us that this matter has been satisfactorily explained. From beginning to end, there are unanswered questions as to what happened and why action was not taken adequately at the various stages along the way. I am suggesting to him that this should be looked into at all stages, including the activities of his own department, by some independent person. I am suggesting further that the scope of the inquiry should be broadened to look into the whole causes of the discontent in that area of the province to determine why these people have been driven to the sort of situation where man has been pitted against man to the point where even—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member has asked two questions, one further question and then one question in connection with the

appointment of a Royal commission. I feel that the Minister should be allowed to answer those two questions.

Mr. Bryden: If he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have some information for the hon. member. I think there is no doubt it was a deplorable thing which everybody, without question, deplores. It was a tragedy. We can all agree with the hon. member on that. But I would say it is so easy to be wise after the event.

My information is that there were 12 constables at the scene where this took place. They did their best in the circumstances to prevent any such thing as this. But who is to say, if there had been ten times the number there, that this could have been prevented? There were many who implored that no constables be sent there. Who is to say what was the wise action to follow?

As to the investigation, there was sent immediately to the scene a staff inspector, the most senior man, and two inspectors of the Criminal Investigation Branch of the Ontario Provincial Police. All persons who could possibly be found who knew anything about it—more than 100—were interviewed, some in French, some in English or whatever the language they spoke. The investigation and the criminal prosecution was under the direction of Mr. Colbeck, one of the most experienced, mostly highly respected and regarded Crown attorneys in the province. He was in charge of it. I have told you about the justice who sat on the bench.

Now, if the hon. member is still referring to the question of why more evidence was not found, I just cannot give him any more in the way of an answer. I think it was a situation in which, out of the night, there came this shooting. It was just impossible to bring it home to the persons who pulled the triggers. I do not know any other answer that one can possibly give.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to agree with the hon. Attorney General that it is always easy to be wise after the event. There is also an old saying that justice not only must be done, but it must be seen to be done. I am trying to tell the hon. Attorney General, and he should surely know anyway, that there are a large number of people involved who, at the present time, are not satisfied that justice was done or that everything requisite was done to ensure that justice would be done.

Is it not a fact that the government had a request several months ago from the Lumber

and Sawmill Workers Union—which is one of the major parties involved in this whole affair in Northern Ontario and will continue to be involved, no doubt for many years, in labour negotiations and labour disputes of one kind and another—that that union told the government in no uncertain terms that they were not satisfied with the way the thing was handled and that they wanted a Royal commission?

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that there are enough unanswered questions that they have a right to feel dissatisfied; that they have a right to ask for the answers to those questions. Their request is not frivolous. If it were a frivolous request, okay. But there is certainly enough doubt about the whole matter that it ought to be inquired into so that these people will be satisfied that everything possible was done, if indeed it was done. If it was not done, then something should then be done to rectify the situation. But no sense of confidence in the law enforcement agencies of the province is going to be produced as long as this situation continues unresolved. Does the government simply say: "We did the best we could," or "As far as we know the people concerned did the best they could; and we have nothing more to say about it"? I think it is reasonable to suggest that this party, an important party representing a large number of men including the men who were killed, that its request was a reasonable one. It is reasonable therefore, indeed it is essential, that the request be granted in order to clear the air for future negotiations.

I am going to suggest also that the subject of the inquiry should be broader than just this one incident, because this incident developed out of a long history of discontent in the industry, of discontent of working men who believed that they were being dealt with unfairly. I think that the inquiry should cover the whole matter of the application of The Labour Relations Act to this particular industry. There are difficulties into which I shall not go because they more properly belong under other estimates, but they are there and they should be inquired into.

There should be an inquiry into the whole policy with regard to the issuance of timber-cutting licenses—that is a matter which we can go into in further detail when the estimates of Lands and Forests come before us—but all of these matters should be looked into. This is still an explosive situation and I think the government should do everything possible to clear the air, especially with a new round of negotiations coming up. Let us hope that the negotiations are concluded

amicably without any disputes at all, but we all know that in this type of industry disputes under the best of circumstances are difficult to deal with. If there is no attempt to clear the air with regard to the last series of events, then I feel very alarmed at the prospects in the event that there is a breakdown of negotiations in the coming year.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three items I want to raise under this broad estimate of the administration of justice, but I just want to add a brief footnote to what my hon. colleague has said with regard to this.

There was an interjection from one of the hon. government members when it was said that the lumber and sawmill union had asked for a Royal commission. Mr. Chairman, may I draw to the attention of the hon. Attorney General it is not only the union which has asked for a Royal commission. As a matter of fact the municipalities and many other bodies in the area felt that there should be a Royal commission to resolve basic conflicts out of which another event like this can rise. Namely, the fact that the companies have on the one hand workers who are their own employees in the union, and they have also timber being cut on settlers' permits. They are in a position where they can play one off against another—a perfect setup for another explosion.

The second brief comment I want to make is, as my hon. colleague said, not only that justice should be done but that justice should appear to be done. The incredible thing in this instance is that even The Department of the Attorney General was not satisfied that justice did appear to be done, so they decided to appeal; but they muffed the appeal. This was the final bit of mishandling in what many people believe was not a well handled affair from the outset.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to go on to a few other items under the administration of justice. During the past two or three weeks the hon. Attorney General has received, I am informed, repeated—

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 206; 207 is the administration of justice.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry.

Vote 206 agreed to.

On vote 207:

Mr. MacDonald: During the last few weeks, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General has received representations from a number of

people in the area of Brockville with regard to the unsuitability of the magistrate who is now presiding in the courts in that area. Last Friday's *Globe and Mail* carried a story, the first paragraph of which reads:

The Augusta township area school board has asked The Ontario Attorney General's Department to dismiss Magistrate Gordon Jermyn as a result of remarks he made in a recent case.

I have a letter from a person in the area who points out that a petition has been sent to the hon. Attorney General. It was signed by the reeve of Augusta township, by a minister of the United Church, by several school teachers and at least two prominent businessmen.

They have only approached some people in the area, they have not had time to get as exhaustive a petition as obviously would be available. This correspondent of mine stated that he had contacted the mayor of the city of Brockville who indicated that he had already, in his capacity of mayor, forwarded a protest to the hon. Attorney General; and that the reeve of Augusta township informed him that as early as January, 1964, the county councils of Leeds and Grenville placed an order on the books complaining about Magistrate Jermyn's unreasonable judgments.

As I have been given the story, there has been a growing sense of public indignation with regard to the judgments of this magistrate, but it apparently has reached an explosive point recently in his handling of a case concerning a school teacher who strapped a child and then was assaulted by the mother, the father, an older brother of the child and some friends of the family. In the course of the representations that were made—or rather in the course of the trial—the magistrate made this kind of a comment, to give you an example of the kind of man that the petitioners claim him to be. As reported in the Brockville paper, Magistrate Jermyn is quoted as saying:

If I did not get an explanation from him [the teacher] I would probably have done what they did. He should not have strapped the girl.

However, I agree with the Crown that all went out with a concerted effort to clobber him and they did.

In other words, here is a magistrate who is not dealing with the charge before him, a charge of assault, but is presuming to deal with what happened earlier in the school room. Indeed he not only presumed, he went so far as to say at one point in Johns-

ton's testimony—that is the teacher's testimony—and I quote:

I give you two to one I could walk into class and keep better order than this man can.

Now obviously, Mr. Chairman, this person is simply not suitable to be sitting on the bench. This is only the last case of an accumulation of which I have in my files. I do not want to take the time to put on the record the examples of this kind of comment and extremely bad judgment in assessing cases that are brought before him. In fact, I would finally put it in the quiet tones of the editorial of the Brockville *Recorder*. On April 23 they said this:

From time to time this newspaper receives letters expressing concern about the magistrates' courts in this area. One such letter appears in other columns on this page.

Court decisions bring mixed reactions from the general public. The conduct of the court sometimes causes concern in the degree of connection with any particular case. It has not necessarily a bearing on the resulting public opinion. Courts are not above public opinion.

Recent reaction to the magistrates' courts in this area, particularly the conduct of cases reveal aroused public opinion. People who are never likely to become involved with the law personally, but people who are interested in the dignity of the court and respect for the law have been upset by the lack of judgment apparent in some decisions and in the conduct of the courts. These people feel that the law and all officials concerned with it exist to serve the citizens with as much dignity and fairness as possible.

And that includes the witnesses as well as the accused. The magistrates' courts in this area, Brockville, Prescott, and Kemptville, are open to criticism. Not the same magistrate serves all of them, but all leave much to be desired in both consistency in judgment and the conduct of the court. When Crown witnesses are abused, when decisions are given which flout the evidence, when trial sites are traversed to provide privilege to persons wishing to avoid publicity, one can only have the feeling that the courts have deteriorated.

As the letter writer asked, to whom are these magistrates responsible for their behaviour? They are accountable to the public in the end, but insofar as the people are represented by the government, this newspaper has commented before that

there is need for closer scrutiny of our courts by The Attorney General's Department with perhaps the creation of an office of magistrate general, staffed by people who can assist in the conduct in magistrates' courts across the province. Some magistrates may not make the grade with even the assistance, but only in this manner are we going to get any assistance in the conduct of our courts and in decisions. Not enough attention is paid to magistrates' courts by The Attorney General's Department.

Now I come back to the question that was asked in this letter and quoted in the editorial. To whom are these magistrates accountable for their behaviour? I put that question to the hon. Attorney General and ask what is the intention of his department in this case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will reply to the first part of the question. I would say the hon. member will appreciate this incident is recent and material in the nature of complaints has just been received. I will say this, that it is being considered and is being studied.

As to what may be done, The Magistrates Act, which is Chapter 226 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, gives the answer. It is rather brief and I can read it. Section 3 of that Act is as follows:

Except as provided in section 2—

which does not really have any bearing:

—magistrates shall hold office during pleasure.

And then subsection 2:

A magistrate who has held office for two years may be removed from office before attaining retirement age only for misbehaviour or for inability to perform his duties properly and only if

(i) the circumstances respecting the misbehaviour or inability are first inquired into, and

(ii) the magistrate is given reasonable notice of the time and place appointed for the inquiry and is afforded an opportunity of himself or his counsel being heard and of cross-examining witnesses and producing evidence on his own behalf.

A magistrate, I may say, is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. Then the subsection goes on:

The Lieutenant-Governor in council, for the purpose of making an inquiry under subsection 2, may appoint one or more judges of the Supreme Court to make such

inquiry and to report thereon, and the judge so appointed has all the powers that may be conferred upon a commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act.

Then I might read this further subsection:

Where a magistrate is removed from office under this section, the order affecting the removal and all reports, evidence and correspondence relating thereto shall be laid before the assembly by the Attorney General within the first 15 days of the next ensuing session.

So, as I say, the matter has just come to the attention of my department, it is being considered, and I have outlined the procedure which would be followed if it were felt necessary to decide if a magistrate should be removed. The decision would not be the Attorney General's, it would not be the government's; it would be a decision held after an inquiry before judges of the Supreme Court appointed for that purpose.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the hon. Attorney General's decision to appoint such an inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It would be my responsibility to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, while we are dealing with the conduct of magistrates, is it correct that another magistrate in the southern part of the province has voluntarily resigned recently for conduct unbecoming a magistrate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Recently?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do recall the resignation of a magistrate coming to my desk some four weeks ago or thereabouts and his resignation was accepted.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a year or so ago there was a rather amusing little episode when a paper in Timiskaming riding carried a story from a meeting of the Progressive-Conservative Association to the effect that it had recommended a certain person to be appointed as sheriff. I queried the hon. Attorney General's predecessor as to whether or not this was normal procedure—that recommendations for appointments came from the local Conservative association. I repeat—it was a little amusing and we let the matter rest there.

Subsequently there has been an appointment as sheriff of one Robert McArthur. I am informed, reliably, that Mr. McArthur owns

and controls the McArthur Mining Machinery Company, which has lost some of its property to the town of Cobalt for non-payment of taxes, and that he and his company have been sued in divisional and district courts. Indeed, as of two or three months ago, there were two suits still outstanding. On one occasion it was for non-payment of wages in 1962 under The Servants and Masters Act. Further, back in 1940 or 1941 this same gentleman was charged with highgrading but there was no conviction in the particular case.

Is this accurate, Mr. Chairman, and if so may I ask the hon. Attorney General how he can justify the appointment of such a person as sheriff?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must confess I missed some of the hon. member's remarks. The hon. member said, "Is this accurate?" Does he mean the report that he read?

Mr. MacDonald: I mean these stories that I am giving about the record of this man, and if so, how can the hon. Attorney General justify the appointment of such a man as sheriff?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: First of all, I do not know that the reports are accurate. I have never heard of it before. I have never heard a word of it before.

Mr. MacDonald: Was the appointment made on the recommendation of the local association?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Unless some of my staff can tell me, I cannot tell the hon. member that. I do not know, but I can find out.

Mr. MacDonald: I guess it is highly appropriate that the hon. Attorney General should smile when he gives that reply.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, it is not, that is my reply. I do not know. I have never heard of the man. The matter may have come across my desk, but I do not recall the name. I know nothing of this and I would not answer the hon. member otherwise.

Mr. MacDonald: I would appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Attorney General would, when he has looked into the matter—and perhaps that may not be until after the session—confirm whether or not what I have put on the record is accurate in terms of the record of this man who was appointed as sheriff. If so, I want to suggest to him now that it is not a proper appointment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not intend to delay my reply. I only smiled because I said

I could find out. I meant I will find out. I know nothing of this matter at this moment. Yet it may have come across my desk and may have received my signature. But I will find out. I do not think it was my appointment.

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, it was before this Attorney General's time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well then, I know nothing of it.

Mr. MacDonald: It was the department that made the appointment.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What about the fellow who stole the \$140,000?

Mr. MacDonald: He was not appointed as sheriff.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He held a high office in the hon. member's party.

Mr. MacDonald: Look, Mr. Chairman, what relevancy has this got?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is just as relevant as what the hon. member was talking about.

Mr. MacDonald: What relevancy, Mr. Chairman, has this? I have cited incidents in the records of this man. I have asked for confirmation, and if so, why was he appointed as sheriff, and this has absolutely no relevance at all. This is another little old Tory principle, that two wrongs make a right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have received a communication from a man who was chosen for a grand jury in the Parry Sound area within recent months, this year. He was foreman of the grand jury and—

An hon. member: Is it signed?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, it is signed. The grand jury was given a number of functions. One of them was to look into—as grand juries often do—the buildings locally. It was given a third responsibility, related as follows in a communication which I have received:

It was our duty to check the prisoners held in the jail to make certain that no one was being held without knowing the charges against him and without having been brought to trial. The judge proceeded to point out that for certain legal reasons

which he could not tell us, we would not be allowed to go to the place where prisoners were lodged. This is the particular matter that concerned me. He said he would send the sheriff to examine the prisoners and he would report back to us.

As we waited for the sheriff to report on the prisoners we were told he would not be reporting to us. We then proceeded to the courtroom. There we were told by the judge that we would have to accept the sheriff's word that no person was being held without knowing the charge or without being brought to trial.

One grand juror said he had been on the grand jury before and on that occasion the foreman had gone to the prisoners and asked them individually about the charges and the trials. He told us this in our private room, not in the courthouse.

As a member of the jury I did not know whether any prisoner was being improperly held. The point disturbed me and has ever since, so I wanted to ask someone, such as yourself, if the procedures that I have outlined were proper.

Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to be familiar with the normal procedures in connection with the grand jury. However, when a specific responsibility is given to a grand jury, what explanation can the hon. Attorney General give for refusing to permit it to carry out its responsibility—for saying that it must be done by the sheriff, and then subsequently saying that the sheriff is not going to report back?

Now I must say as a layman I have had growing questions in my mind with regard to the whole functions of grand juries. I have heard Minister after Minister get up when we would face them with the recommendations of a grand jury and dismiss them as being irresponsible. We had this as a matter of fact the other day, from the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) with regard to a recent grand jury report on 999 Queen Street. It raises the whole question as to the function of a grand jury and whether or not it is an outmoded function.

But presumably it is now the law, it operates in accordance with prescribed procedures. Is it the right of the judge, in this instance, to tell the jurors that they cannot get the facts for reasons that he will not explain? To say the sheriff will get it and then the sheriff does not report back? What is the hon. Attorney General's comment on this whole business?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: First of all, I rather think there are some inaccuracies in the report you received.

Second, I would say that if the gentleman who took the trouble to write to you would care to write to me, I would investigate all that he says.

Mr. MacDonald: All that is irrelevant. He was foreman of the jury.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not deny his right to write to any hon. member of this House, but I say if he would write to me I will be glad to investigate.

Mr. MacDonald: That is very condescending.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But I say this also: I presume this was the Supreme Court and that a Supreme Court judge was sitting. It is the duty and function of the grand jury, after dealing with the bills which are brought it or the indictments which are brought before it, to inspect public buildings. Quite often a Supreme Court judge will say that this has been done within the past six months or a certain period of time, it will not be necessary to do it again. This is on buildings such as hospitals, jails and other public buildings, including the courthouse itself. If it were actually said that you cannot see the prisoners in the jail, I would like to know this.

Mr. MacDonald: That was said.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If this was said, there is this still to be said: The sheriff is the responsible officer reporting to that judge of the Supreme Court. The Crown attorney of the district is an officer of the court, and I suggest and point out to the House that his duty is not only as a prosecuting officer, but as an officer to see that justice is done and properly administered, for the benefit of the accused or any citizen or any prisoners as well as for the Crown. He stands there and reports to the judge.

I seriously doubt if what has been reported to my hon. friend is correct. I think the short answer is that if this may be reported to me it will have the utmost thorough investigation.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute now, Mr. Chairman. This man happens to be a school teacher who is a reputable member in the community. He was foreman of the jury. May I ask the hon. Attorney General what aspect is he denying as being accurate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I doubt that the judge forbade him to go to the jail, to see the prisoners.

Mr. MacDonald: I am very glad to get this on the record, because I have quoted directly from his letter. He is a responsible person in the community. He was foreman of the jury and I am quoting exactly what he said and it is in the record.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a person who is over 21, of sane mind and is a reputable person in the community chosen as foreman of the jury, is not going to make a mistake on this kind of factual situation. However, Mr. Chairman, I leave it with the hon. Attorney General to look into the matter.

Mr. Thompson: Under vote 207, Mr. Chairman, I understood the hon. Attorney General to say that I could raise the question of bail. Am I right? Thank you.

I noticed, and I am quoting from papers because I am not a lawyer myself, something that concerns me because of some people who come to me in my own riding and also from the newspaper reports. I am quoting from the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, February 8. I notice a headline:

BAIL'S MERIT OUTLIVED,
LAW PROFESSOR SAYS

Bail for accused persons has outlived its usefulness, Martin L. Friedland, an assistant professor at Osgoode Hall Law School, said yesterday.

I could go on, but I think perhaps the hon. Attorney General is well acquainted with the arguments that were raised. I noticed an item before that in the *Globe and Mail*, on February 14, 1963, and I expect that the hon. Attorney General is also acquainted with the article by Ruth Worth in which she suggests: "For the rich bail; for the poor?"

Then, sir, if I could raise my last point taken from your own government members, I would refer to the speech by the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Eagleson) on March 20, 1964. He suggested, and I quote his remarks:

Another matter that should be looked into with a great deal of thought at this time, is the matter of bail in our province. As the law presently stands, an indigent accused often finds himself languishing in jail, whereas the person who has been more successful or fortunate enough to have friends to raise the bail, finds himself free.

I am sure that the hon. Attorney General also has read those remarks. I wonder, sir, if having looked at this, and I realize that this is a portfolio that he is just taking over, but could he comment in connection with what his plans might be or what he is going to do in connection with bail?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can only answer part of the question. I am aware of the articles to which the hon. member referred. I am aware of the discussion which arose at the midwinter meeting of the bar association, and the matter of bail was discussed there as the article reported. As to what my department is going to do, I have no answer at this time.

It is a matter that, again, has come to my attention in the brief time I have had this portfolio and I have not got a programme at this moment to report to the House. But it is definitely one that is deserving of consideration and it will receive it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, on this subject, I wonder if the hon. member would care to offer some suggestions to this problem? It is a problem that concerns my department a great deal, because it is obvious that there is a great deal of resentment on the part of many inmates who have been committed because they cannot pay their bail, cannot raise bail.

It concerns us a great deal, but obviously the hon. member must realize that it is not as simple as it sounds to the ordinary person when you phrase the question as simply as that: why should a person who cannot raise bail be committed, as against a person who has money and is able to raise the bail? The question is what happens to a person who would just refuse to pay his fine, for example, or to raise the bail when he is able to do so merely because he knows that nothing will happen to him if he does not?

Does he have any suggestion as to what the solution for this problem would be?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to reply with suggestions that have been put forward.

I agree that it is a complex problem. Not being a lawyer I would just restate, sir, that it sometimes seems to me, when a man comes up for bail and he has a job, a wife and children but has not sufficient funds, depending again on the crime, it seems to me in some cases unjust that a man should be expected to have a large sum of money handy immediately in order to be released. Looking at that

kind of man in that situation it would seem that perhaps bail may not be required.

I would ask the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions to look at some of the suggestions that have been made—for example in this article by Ruth Worth. These are some examples of what is done in the United States through licensing of professional bondsmen who charge a percentage of the bail. I understand from some of my legal colleagues that this is a particular approach they look on with some concern. But there are other suggestions—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you agree with that?

Mr. Thompson: As I say, I would think that something must be done.

I say again I am not a lawyer, but time after time we have seen a situation where some man has been held in jail for a long time because he could not raise bail. I appreciate, as the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has suggested, it is a complex question. The government, in order to deal with it, must look at all points of view and I would not stand here at this point other than raising it to you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to get the benefit of your experience.

Mr. Thompson: I would suggest, sir, if I could, to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions that for him, like me, it might be helpful advice to read the several—he has read it?—then he must realize that there are a number of alternative suggestions. Perhaps the hon. Minister could get together with the hon. Attorney General and come to a solution.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a word on this. I think it has been obvious to most lawyers, especially around the city hall in this city, that the vast majority of charges, and the vast majority of individuals who come in conflict with the law, do not need bail. There are very few individuals who are going to run away because of the charges placed against them.

Again it depends upon the charge, of course. If it is a major offence like armed robbery or something of that type, naturally the authorities should be very difficult to deal with. They have to be tough with these people. But the vast majority of cases that come before the courts involve liquor or the impaired driver. It is ridiculous to hold an impaired driver in jail overnight; the police

should put him in a taxi and send him home. Many of these men who are charged with being impaired have never been in trouble in their lives before; as far as the moral turpitude of their acts is concerned, they have not been involved in any type of theft.

These men do not need bail and I suggest that at least the courts should experiment with doing away with bail. Start with this type of offence to see how it works. Of course, if it is abused, then the experiment will have to stop. Maybe it would be something to experiment with. But from what experience I have had I would say that the vast majority of people who come in conflict with the law do not require bail.

This subject is brought up year in and year out. Now we have a new Attorney General and I hope he will take a new look at it. This should be obvious, I think, to any lawyer in Ontario. Fortunately the present Attorney General has had a vast amount of practical experience. From what I have learned of the new Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, I think he has got this practical experience and should be able to get a quick grasp of the question of bail. I hope that he will do something in the immediate future, because this goes on and on and yet so many experienced people ask why do they bother with the present bail system.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think perhaps it might be helpful if I should add to the remarks I made to the hon. member for Dovercourt, that the committee on legal aid is giving this very matter a great deal of study.

It is, in a sense, sir, very closely related to the matter of legal aid. I am advised that a good look is being taken at what is known as the Manhattan bail project, which was instituted in New York and which has worked very well. This involves having a prisoner released on his own recognizance or a very minimum bail or no bail at all. It gets him back to work and takes him off the country. Generally this sort of thing has worked extremely well. I would just like to reassure the hon. members of this House that this matter is, as I said in my earlier remarks, receiving consideration. I trust that something can be done and done before too long.

Mr. Thompson: This is again from experience in my aiding office in the evenings. I have encountered several situations where deserted wives have come to ask if something could be done about husbands residing in another province. I am thinking of one case, particularly, in Manitoba. You go

through a certain procedure of writing letters to be told about a method of co-operation in trying to ascertain the whereabouts of the husband in another province. There is some laxity as shown in articles I have read. I am wondering, has there been an approach to tighten this up in any way, when men leave wives and families and move into another province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is again a very difficult matter to deal with in a satisfactory way. The law and the means are available. We have reciprocal arrangements with all the provinces of Canada to pursue and bring back persons who fled in this way and who are subject to obligations which they fail to carry out and which they are trying to evade. We can enforce the orders which are made in Ontario in another province, but the type of person who seeks to evade the order is the type to keep on evading and running and making it extremely difficult to catch up with him and to enforce the order. Much is being done. I do not suggest that the most perfect effort has been put forward, but every effort that seems reasonable and within reasonable limits is being carried forward. We have reciprocal arrangements with all the provinces in this regard.

Mr. Thompson: Probably there are technical aspects to this question but I had a case in which there was a man with two children born in Canada. The family courts had ordered that he should not see the children, and then last Christmas he took the children to another country. I was told that nothing could be done about this, owing to certain technicalities. I should probably go further into it with the hon. Attorney General rather than to ask it on the floor of the House. But again there was the case of a husband leaving his family and provincial welfare being needed in the situation. I just question whether there is an adequate approach with other countries or if one is possible.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must confess, I find it impossible to answer the question unless I know the facts a little more definitely—the type of order that was made, the court that made it and the terms of the order. I cannot say yes or no on the facts as presented. I do not think the hon. member could expect me to say anything more at this time. I would be glad if he would come and discuss it with me because it is a matter which we should like to pursue. It is a complex and difficult thing. Anyway, we can tighten it up and we would be glad to do it.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to mention at this point the low pay that assistant Crown attorneys receive here in Ontario. I think when a new Crown attorney is taken on he gets something in the neighbourhood of a little over \$6,000. The unfortunate part about it is that these fellows are bright enough, they get good training in working in the Crown attorney's department, but then, of course, with that pay and the slow raises they get, they are not going to stay there too long. They go and do private practice. As a result, the taxpayer is paying for a post-graduate course.

Many of these men I feel would stay with the Crown attorney's department if they received a proper salary. They start around \$6,200 and in due course they get around \$8,000. A few of them, especially if they become Crown attorneys, do better than that. But they do not do too well and if we are going to have a proper administration of justice, Mr. Chairman, we are going to need trained personnel and a lot of that training is really experience.

So often here in Toronto you just get to know the assistant Crown attorneys and the first thing you know a new batch appears. The men who have been there for two or three years have gone on to better things in private practice and the department starts training a new batch all over again.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Why would the hon. member want to get to know the Crown attorneys?

Mr. Trotter: I think it is obvious when there are men who have had experience over the years that they get to know how the courts are handled. They get to know when a man maybe requires a defence. I have known assistant Crown attorneys who have taken a real interest in people who have come up against the law. They are people who are not normally of the criminal mind, but are almost a social welfare case. If they can get an assistant Crown attorney who can be helpful, they can often see to it that a man gets a suspended sentence, instead of just letting him drift on to jail.

These men are definitely a credit to the administration of justice. But it only comes with experience, because if a man is not experienced he might go too easy on a man who should be in jail. So again I would say it is the responsibility of an assistant Crown attorney to use his personal judgment. You do not get these things out of books.

In a great area, especially like Metropolitan Toronto, we have, as I have heard it referred

to in this House, a sort of sausage-grinding machine turning out justice at the city hall. This is something that we have to put a stop to, and see to it that every individual gets a proper hearing.

It is true that we are trying to do something in this area about having more space for courts, because certainly at the present time at the city hall it is a disgrace; the cell block and the shortage of courts. This is, we hope, in the process of being repaired. But it will rest entirely with the hon. Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, to see to it that proper salaries are paid to assistant Crown attorneys so that we can retain good personnel.

An hon. member: What is a good salary?

Mr. Trotter: I am asked by one of the backbenchers from the Tory party what is considered a good salary. Certainly it would depend on what the average lawyer is making in private practice. It depends, of course, on the economy at the time. What has happened is that the wages paid by the hon. Attorney General's department have not kept pace with the general lowering of the value of the dollar.

In other words, \$6,000 a number of years ago may have been a good salary, but today it is an extremely poor salary. We are not going to retain a man who has spent seven years in getting a higher education. We are not going to retain that type of individual at \$6,500 a year.

An hon. member: How much would you pay him?

Mr. Trotter: I would venture to say that a man starting out as an assistant Crown attorney should be paid between \$8,500 and \$9,000. This gives some idea.

I know the hon. Attorney General has many problems facing him as a result of having just acquired the portfolio. It is for this reason that a number of hon. members in this House have probably not shouted as loud and long as we might have against the government, because many of these questions about the payment of lawyers, and the providing of bail have been brought up time and time again. I do hope that while the new Attorney General, sir, is enjoying his honeymoon, he will spend that time bringing forth new plans that we will hear next year.

There is one thing, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Attorney General will find out—if he does not already know—and that is that there is a long list of lawyers throughout the prov-

ince in private practice who do a lot of work for the hon. Attorney General's department. It is work that is farmed out. It is, in many ways, political patronage. I think it would be far better if more of that work was done directly by the hon. Attorney General's office. If they hired personnel and paid them a decent salary, the work would be done more efficiently and the department would have a far more satisfied staff.

I say the wage problem, the salary problem, affects not only assistant Crown attorneys but the lawyers retained or employed directly by the office of the hon. Attorney General here at Queen's Park. This whole question of salary should be re-examined.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must say I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale. I think I should tell him that there has been an upgrading of the salaries for assistant Crown attorneys as well as for Crown attorneys. I think I will just briefly say that the salary range now begins at \$5,000 and ranges up to \$13,000 annually for an assistant Crown attorney. This is a considerable increase over previous salary levels.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General could tell us how many years a man would have to be assistant Crown attorney before he would get \$13,000? I realize the salary goes fairly high, but so few get it and take so long to get there that \$5,000 is more typical than \$13,000.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is not just a matter of time. It depends on the area, the nature of the work and the extent of it and so on. But I can assure the hon. member that the salary range has been increased. It was one of the things that the department took into account and has provided for.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I understand that the hon. Attorney General has some responsibility for assisting the directors of the humane society in the administration of the regulations pertaining to them across the province. There is a matter of some importance that I would like to bring to his attention. I think he would benefit if he would look into the matter in the months ahead and perhaps take some steps to correct it.

As you no doubt know, there is a large and lucrative practice in the province in the collection of dogs for experimental purposes. None of us who have seen the advances in medical science over the past few years would for a moment suggest that these

experimental animals be denied to the laboratories that require them.

On the other hand, quite a traffic has developed in this connection, which the humane society and other associated authorities have great difficulty in controlling. I would suggest to the hon. Attorney General that it would make a very effective control if he would see fit to bring in some legislation that would license the various groups and individuals who in fact have developed this into a business.

As it presently stands, where their facilities do not come up to minimum standards they are brought before the courts and fined. In many cases the maximum fine permitted is really, as in so many cases, simply considered as license to continue. The authorities and officials of the humane society are very interested in the government—and I believe it is the hon. Attorney General who would act in this capacity—implementing some system whereby the people who supply these animals for experimental purposes would be inspected and licensed. The hon. Attorney General may correct me if this does not fall within his jurisdiction, but my information is that it would. I would ask him to look into it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I would have to say that what the hon. member is talking about at this moment does not fall within the jurisdiction of my department. That is not to say that, perhaps, some action might be taken or some legislation framed. But I think the only responsibility that our prosecuting force, or the police, might have in connection with animals, or the humane society as they deal with animals, would be the prosecution of offences for cruelty. I think the hon. member is aware we do prosecute in those cases.

Regarding the matter of registration, inspection and so on of the places which gather animals for scientific purposes, I do not think, at the moment at least, it is the responsibility of my department. It is not something that we do now, as far as I am aware. Maybe we should.

Mr. Nixon: I do not want to labour this, but I know when the matter comes up before the humane society, they often deal with the hon. Attorney General or someone in his department over this particular difficulty. The solution would be some sort of licensing procedure that might come under the responsibility of another department but would certainly ease this department.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 207 agreed to?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not consider it is the responsibility of the hon. Attorney General to review decisions made by magistrates except by inviting appeals in certain cases. At the same time, I think that this is an appropriate time to call attention to decisions that appear less than sound.

I am going to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a decision which in my opinion leads working people to the conclusion that there is—at least this is a decision of a class that leads working people to the conclusion—one law for some people and another law for others.

I will merely read the press account of the case as it appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on December 13, 1963:

A charge of driving while his ability was impaired against John H. Addison, Liberal member of Parliament for York North, was dismissed yesterday by Magistrate R. C. Taylor.

Charles Stevenson and Norman Barnes, probationary detectives, said they had seen a sports car driven north on Church Street at 1:50 a.m. on November 17. The wheels spun on wet pavement, the car's speed was erratic, though not over 40 miles an hour—

I might interject, Mr. Chairman, that to the best of my knowledge, the speed limit for the full length of Church Street is 30 miles an hour. However:

—and it crossed the middle line of the street. They stopped it at Bloor Street and found Mr. Addison at the wheel.

Constable J. C. Woodcock said Mr. Addison smelt strongly of an alcoholic beverage. He swayed and stumbled when asked to walk heel to toe. His speech was slow and somewhat slurred, but he understood questions and answered them reasonably.

Mr. Addison said that he had been in charge of the committee rooms at the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair that night. He had four or five glasses of champagne between 11:30 p.m. and 12:30 a.m., followed by coffee and sandwiches. The wheels of his car spun because the machine was equipped with a limited-slip differential, he said.

James Cudney of Stoney Creek said he had sent his wife with Mr. and Mrs. Addison to be driven to North Toronto. She was eight months pregnant, he said. "I would certainly not have done that if Mr. Addison had not been in fit condition to drive." Mrs. Cudney told the court Mr. Addison's driving had not made her nervous.

Magistrate Taylor said he relied upon the Cudneys' evidence. He felt the probationary detectives had given the sports car's spinning wheels too much significance.

Mr. Nixon: He will know better next time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, four or five glasses of champagne, according to the information I have, are the equivalent of four or five bottles—not glasses—bottles of beer; probably more, but at least that much.

A working man who was hauled into court and who testified or admitted that in the space of one hour he had drunk four or five bottles of beer or more, and about whom it was testified that he smelt strongly of alcoholic beverage, that he swayed and stumbled when he was asked to walk heel to toe, and that his speech was slow and somewhat slurred, would get somewhat different treatment with that sort of evidence against him. I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that members of Parliament and members of the provincial Parliament and people in similar positions should be treated in magistrate's court in exactly the same way as any other citizen.

Vote 207 agreed to.

On vote 208:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two points that I want to raise on vote 208.

May I ask the hon. Attorney General how much money was spent during the past year on advertising for the department? For example, I have an ad here: "The Department of the Attorney General." It is divided into three sections: "Serving the Legislature"—"The Government of Ontario comprises a Cabinet of Ministers of the Crown nominated by the Prime Minister from among his supporters in the Legislature," and "The Attorney General is by tradition a senior member of the Cabinet," etc., etc. It is a simple, elementary grade approach to civics, describing the role of The Attorney General's Department. This particular ad happens to be in *The Anglican*, but I presume it is put in many other papers. My question is, how much money was spent for that kind of advertising in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: At the moment, I cannot put my finger on an allocation for advertising. I will see. It is probably back in one of the estimates we have passed.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, well, I noticed public information here; I could not find anything else that would be appropriate for this.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. member will give me a moment, I believe I may find it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member object to the Anglicans having it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The information I have is that the advertising—if this is what you might call it—is done by the hon. Provincial Secretary for various departments.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, if I may be of assistance, that is part of the continuing programme that is done for informing newcomers to Canada of the functions of the various departments. I do not know specifically the reference to the Anglican paper, but that ad appeared mostly in the ethnic press in various languages, I believe.

Mr. MacDonald: When a church so integral a part of the establishment gets into the category of being ethnic, I can assure you that there is a little lack of discrimination creeping into the disposition of advertising on the part of this government.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is for newly arrived Anglicans.

Mr. MacDonald: It was part of the Family Compact 100 years or so ago. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Everybody belongs to an ethnic group—even the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree, except the native Indians. I suggest that if you want to subsidize all of the various papers, do it more openly than through the department of the hon. Provincial Secretary in this fashion.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to a few brief comments with regard to the coroner situation. The hon. Attorney General tended to dismiss, rather lightly, my documentation of violations of The Coroners Act this afternoon. He said that he felt they were not very serious. I want to suggest to the hon. Attorney General on vote 208, supervising coroner and general inspector of anatomy, that either the whole concept of the jury—that its members are to be chosen from the general run of the public so that you have a cross-section of the citizenry—

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, is it vote 208 we are on?

Mr. Singer: That is right.

Mr. Cowling: My 208 says "public safety" here.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. member would only sit back and listen—

Mr. Cowling: We have had the public coroner—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, when I made my earlier reply to the hon. Attorney General's observations, I said I was leaving some things—and this is one of them—to the appropriate estimate, and this is where I am dealing with it. If the hon. members want to go home, then go home.

Mr. Cowling: We just want to stop hearing the hon. member talk about—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, go home.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order. Continue.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your saying that I can continue.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Somebody has found another nickel.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General's description of most of the violations of the Act as being more or less technical violations and therefore not of a serious criminal nature, I suggest to him, violates the accepted basis of choice of a jury—the proposition is that in any kind of a jury you can have a "professional" group made up of experienced persons. I am not going to belabour the point with the hon. Attorney General, who is learned in the law, but this is in violation of the whole basic principle of the choice of a jury.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Would the hon. member permit me to say that this situation no longer pertains and that the Act is now being carried out correctly in every detail? I might have made a little bit light of what had happened. I will accept that, if that is what the hon. member wants to tell me. But I did say that the situation had been corrected, and that nothing of this sort was going to occur again.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask if it has been corrected since the "Toronto File" programme?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Since when?

Mr. MacDonald: February 4, 1964.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know whether it was since that, or before that, but certainly

since then it has been corrected. Since then I know the Act is being carried out.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. I am very glad to hear it is being carried out. But there was one other thing which I documented this afternoon that I want to suggest to the hon. gentleman is very important. That is what has been described, for example, as the sanctity of the jury room. The proposition that when a jury is sent out to make its decision that people who might be in a position to influence the decision, can confer with them, as was documented by jurors, seems to me to be a very serious violation of the Act. If it is now being enforced, this is good. But it was rather shocking that this kind of thing should have gone on for years, either unbeknown to the people who should have known it or tolerated by the people who knew of it, until it was exposed in the fashion that it was.

However, the specific question I want to put to the hon. Attorney General is this: Are all of the very serious charges that were made by Dr. Shulman with regard to the influence of The Attorney General's Department, in regard to the influence of the medical profession, and so on, now a closed chapter? Is it all swept under the rug, so to speak? Is no public investigation going to be made of it? That is my first question.

My second question is: What is the opinion of the department now with regard to the future of the post of chief coroner? Is the hon. Minister waiting until public indignation dies down and then, once again, launch an attack on Dr. Shulman? There were some very, very sharp comments made by such people in the department with regard to Dr. Shulman. Is this post going to be retained? It seems to me that the House is entitled to some information from the hon. Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: First of all, if the hon. member's remarks are directed at me, he said "are you once again going to launch an attack." I never launched any attack.

Mr. MacDonald: The department.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The department. I do not believe I can say, either, that the department launched an attack on Dr. Shulman. Dr. Shulman made certain complaints and was quite vocal about them. Perhaps he was quite right in saying the things he said. They were investigated by the department, and so far as my investigations have gone, it appeared that most of his complaints were

on matters of questions of law, questions of the legality of procedures. When they were investigated in great measure they were found by the law officers of The Department of the Attorney General to not be an infringement of law.

But as for any suggestion that there is going to be an attack brought back on Dr. Shulman, I think this is not really worthy of the hon. member who suggested it. It certainly is farthest, I think, from the mind of anyone in The Department of the Attorney General. Dr. Shulman, as far as I know, is doing a good job. I trust he will continue to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: The post is going to be retained then, I take it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have no other thought in my mind.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I want to make my annual plea that the \$443,000 that we are asked to vote for emergency measures be put to a better use.

Over the years I have tried to get from a series of Attorneys General a statement of what the policy is on emergency measures. One time we had a policy of evacuating everybody to Bruce county. That was abandoned in favour of building shelters. That was abandoned in favour of, well, almost nothing. Now it appears that we are back, at least, to designating escape routes that apparently lead to nowhere. I brought this forward for the edification of the hon. Attorney General. I know he is new at his job. He might be interested in the series of discussions that took place in the city of Toronto concerning the expenditure of some of the monies that were voted for emergency measures.

In a story dated April 10 this year, the Toronto *Telegram* under the heading "No Shelter? This Way Out" has this to say:

The first civil defence emergency route signs in Canada will be erected throughout Metro during the next few weeks, Metro emergency measures chairman Alderman George Ben announced today.

Even though that was a few weeks ago, I have not seen any of those signs yet, so I presume that the few weeks has not expired.

Painted a bright reflective blue and yellow, the 1,052 metal signs will be erected along fourteen routes, including Yonge Street, Avenue Road, Lakeshore Road, Bloor Street and 401. When a disaster hits, or an air raid warning sounds, these are the routes on which vehicles will feed out of the city

into rural areas where emergency accommodation and supplies are stored.

And I thought we should hear from the hon. Attorney General, or from someone over there, as to where these emergency accommodation arrangements have been made and supplies stored. How often are they checked? How many dollars have we spent to set these areas aside and to store up all of these emergency supplies? Chairman Ben goes on to say that:

Civil defence is as important today if not more so than ever. If terrorist bombs start blowing up mail boxes here, as they did in Quebec, our EMO will spring into action. And if we ever get an earthquake or another Hurricane Hazel, our forces would be the backbone of rescue work.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is the hon. member laughing?

Mr. Singer: I am laughing at the ludicrous approach that he takes. He is the man in Metro charged with the responsibility of running this. He is the man in Metro that is helping waste this \$443,000 of the province's money. He goes on to say:

EMO is like a sprinkler system in a building. You never think about it until a fire hits.

Alderman Ben said:

Metro EMO will stress a public information programme this year: movies, lectures, newspaper, radio and TV advertising plus special public demonstrations. We have the finest EMO force in Canada today but the public must know so that apathy does not take over.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is my boy, George.

Mr. Singer: I thought this was a very good quote:

When nuclear war over the Cuban situation became a very real thing in 1962, our emergency measures offices were flooded with calls from people wanting to know what to do. "Well, now is the time to learn," he said.

Then there was a little bit of trouble over the signs. By the time this story got into the morning newspapers on Saturday, April 11, the *Globe and Mail* ran a story saying that:

Metro EMO organization may find itself left holding the bag, a big bag containing \$4,000 worth of emergency road signs. Purchased by EMO the 1,052 signs—

and I think that they are the same 1,052 that were referred to in the evening clipping:

—designed to direct survivors of a national disaster nuclear attack to fourteen escape routes out of Metro were to be installed at 268 key intersections. The triangular blue and yellow signs were delivered a few months ago and have been in storage at a police sub-basement on Eglinton Avenue West awaiting installation.

I think the police commission could well have a look at this because valuable space is taken up with these signs. I gather they are still there.

Mr. Pollard, the EMO director, said yesterday that EMO does not currently have the money, estimated at \$20,000, to install the signs. He said he hoped the municipalities whose roads form a part of these routes would put the signs up.

However, with the exception of North York, this idea was received coolly by the municipalities involved.

"We are meeting a little resistance," said Alderman Ben, chairman of EMO.

Metro traffic engineer, Sam Cass, said in an interview that if Mr. Pollard's proposal were accepted, his department would probably be responsible for installing the majority of the signs as most of the routes follow Metro roads.

Up to this point, of course, as the Attorney General has observed, there is nothing to indicate where these routes are going to lead to, where the emergency storage of people is going to be or where the food is going to be after they get there. But this does not deter our fearless EMO group down at Metro.

He said the request was a little late because his department's budget had been fixed this year. It is doubtful, he said, if money could be found this year unless he receives a direct order from Metro council.

But Mr. Ben, you will remember, was concerned that in 1964 we should be aware of what would have happened if the Cuban situation had exploded in 1962. But in 1964 we have not got enough money to put up the signs that would have led people to these places that would have solved the situation in 1962.

"If Mr. Pollard wants them put up he will have to send a letter to the council," said Roland Anderson, Scarborough traffic co-ordinator. He said erecting signs was a costly and time-consuming job in sub-

urban areas because posts must be erected for most of the signs and a search made for underground utilities.

"Even if the Scarborough council were to approve the expenditure it is doubtful if the work could start before the summer," said Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson has not quite appreciated, obviously, the seriousness of what happened in 1962 in the Cuban crisis. But here is a ray of hope:

However, North York's traffic co-ordinator, Sidney Cole, said he felt the work could be absorbed with the staff's regular routine.

Mr. Pollard said he was encouraged by this response to the signs by members of yesterday's meeting. He said he would call a meeting in the near future with municipal traffic co-ordinators to iron out difficulties, adding that he hoped to see the signs start appearing on street corners in the next few weeks.

Mr. Cowling: Does the hon. member not think they should be painted blue and white?

Mr. Singer: Oh, I think that is a fine colour, but I am just wondering whether the space in the police station where they are stored could not be put to better use and I think that the police commission should get at that investigation right away.

Last year's EMO budget, Mr. Pollard said, provided funds to erect the signs but the provision was dropped when the project was not advanced.

Police Inspector George Madison told the EMO meeting the traffic on the 14 routes known as blue routes—

that is for the hon. member for High Park: —would be one-way heading out of Toronto.

Just how that is going to work I do not know, because now, as we are getting into the spring season, even last weekend, on any of these 14 routes it was difficult to get traffic moving to handle normal weekend traffic without delays. No one has quite figured out the direction of traffic in the event of such an emergency, but if we get the signs up I think everything is going to be fine.

He said there would be no priorities to persons using the roads. If there was sufficient warning of a nuclear attack, buses would be sent for persons without cars.

The inspector said later that in the event of an attack—

and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions will be interested in this:

—that in the event of an attack the prisoners would be released from the jails but the prisoners would have to find their own way out of Toronto.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Once again:

Most of the routes run north and south between Highway 27 and Etobicoke and Little's Road in Scarborough—

Then it describes a few of the routes. Well, the *Tely* got back into the act that afternoon and it was not quite in accord with what it had the evening before, I guess they read the *Globe and Mail* story. There seemed to be a little confusion and it then had a story in the Saturday afternoon edition:

EMO CRISIS OVER DISASTER SIGNS

Metro Emergency Organization has \$4,000 worth of signs but no money to erect them. The 1,052 signs designed to direct survivors of a natural disaster or nuclear attack to 14 escape routes were to be installed at 268 intersections. Mr. Pollard said he hoped each municipality would erect a sign and with the exception of North York, the plan was meeting resistance.

The estimated cost of installation is \$20,000. The committee was told how the 14 emergency dispersal routes would be used to carry one-way traffic out of Metro, but those without cars would have to stay.

An hon. member: The poor people!

An hon. member: What about buses?

Mr. Singer: We have forgotten about the buses. That was Alderman Thomas Wardle who said that. Then finally, to cap the history of the remarks of the chairman:

"The sinners run and the saintly stay," quipped chairman Beck.

Well, Mr. Chairman, when the reports of these meetings of EMO and the expenditure of our provincial dollars that are so badly needed in so many other fields is dealt with in this way by public authorities, it really is ludicrous to put into these estimates year after year sums of money that apparently are doing no good.

We have a lovely group of blue signs painted, I suppose in the colours directed by the hon. member for High Park, taking up valuable space in the basement of a police station. We have great problems about what we are going to do with people who are going

to be evacuated—goodness knows where, there are no areas into which to have them evacuated. The predecessor of the hon. Attorney General, or it may have been the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), assured us very seriously a year or two ago that they had abandoned the idea of evacuating everybody, we were going to have shelters. Then somebody produced all sorts of blueprints and we were going to have shelters all over the place. Apparently we have stopped building shelters and we are back to evacuation.

The whole thing is a bunch of nonsense and I think it is high time that the government started to cut down on some of this useless expenditure. If the government is at all serious about emergency measures let us have a programme that really means something and is going to do something to help the people, but this vote of \$443,000 is a ridiculous and wasteful government expenditure.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I might fill in the Toronto *Daily Star* of the same day. I will do that eventually, but I do want to add a voice pleading that some sense be brought into this programme or that it be abandoned.

At the present time the general plan, at least it was when I had some close connection with it, is that in the cities, when the warning came, the EMO organization would take its equipment and clang out 20, 30 or 40 miles into the country or some place and then be ready to come back in to rescue the poor people who might have survived there.

So you have all the cities doing this, going out in the hope that they will get back in again. Now surely—I have raised this before and I do not know whether it is done yet or not, I do not think so—but surely if we are sensible about this we would have the Toronto EMO people trained to go into Hamilton and Oshawa and Barrie maybe. We would have the Hamilton and Oshawa and Barrie people trained to come into Toronto. That way we do not have to go through all this business of rushing out and coming back again.

One thing is dead certain, if we have an enemy who is interested in creating devastation by means of nuclear weapons, he is going to fix a time when EMO just cannot get out. He is not going to pick a time when traffic is at a minimum on the roadway. He is going to pick the rush hour, morning or night, or the weekend that we heard the hon. member for Downsview talk about, when the roads

are jammed, when maximum damage can be done and when the whole traffic organization and transport organization can be dealt the greatest blow. So it just seems senseless that we should continue this kind of playing around with problems which just cannot be answered in this particular way.

Now we did have one crisis where EMO might have played an important part. Where these signs are to go, I just do not know, because I think most people who have any chance of getting out of Metro Toronto, or any other city, know the route out of the city. My guess is that the beautiful signs—blue and white are they?—the hon. member for High Park is going to have them. Those signs will only tend to confuse the issue and people will be trying to follow those signs and they would not know where to go.

On April 11, 1964, the date quoted before, the Toronto *Daily Star* said this in speaking of the one instance when there was real danger on this continent when the confrontation came between Russia and United States over Cuba, and we get this:

Metro's Emergency Measures Organization received no guidance from Ottawa during the Cuban missile crisis in October, 1962, EMO director Col. J. H. Pollard said yesterday. In an interview following a briefing with the local political leaders on Metro's disaster plan, Col. Pollard said, "Nothing rolled up there in Ottawa."

That was in 1962. Things were not rolling very well then under Mr. Diefenbaker, were they?

Said Col. Pollard:

There was nothing visible to us. Meetings were not called, nothing. We nearly—and this is the crowning achievement of our EMO in Metro:

—we nearly decided on our own to move fire equipment out of Metro to dispersal sites.

So the crisis was here. We had no direction from Ottawa. We had no direction from any provincial authority and the local people almost decided to move the fire equipment out of the city, so it would be out there 30 or 40 miles to fight the fires in Metro. It is time we quit this foolishness.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would solicit comment from the hon. Attorney General in regard to what has been considered a serious situation by some municipalities and individuals. That is the very serious concern about the inadequacy of ambulance service and facilities in many

areas of the province. I am sure that the previous Attorney General and his department had been made aware of the problem quite forcibly by municipalities, in the Orillia area and the London area, from the Association of Ambulance Operators and from medical people and doctors across the province. I feel that there should be some attention given to this concern and I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would inform the House as to the policy of the government in regard to the very serious requests in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could say this, in reply to the hon. member, that with respect to the ambulance matter, the committee has been studying it with the municipalities, I understand over some two years. A number of meetings have been held and a report is in process of being prepared and will shortly be available for implementation. That is all I can give the hon. member at the moment.

I would like to return to the matter of the Emergency Measures Organization. I would point this out. While there is room for difference of opinion, perhaps there is room for some levity. Let us hope we can always treat this subject with levity and might never need to treat it seriously. Nonetheless, the matter of the Emergency Measures Organization and the safety of the country against the type of attack for which the organization was first designed, is a federal plan, a scheme of the federal government to which it contributes very heavily in funds and direction for the organization.

Generally, the federal contribution is 75 per cent. The breakdown which I have indicates that, and indicates that in the municipal projects the municipality contributes ten per cent, Ontario 15, and the Dominion government 75 per cent. Just to go down to the foot of the page, our contribution as shown in the estimates is \$443,000. Against that is the federal contribution of \$1,809,870. The organization now has under federal direction and in co-operation with the federal government, 49 area groups. These consist of counties, areas or single municipalities with the province, the federal government, the municipality, the county or the area participating. The number of municipalities involved in those 49 area groups is 755. The total population embraced by them all is approximately six million out of the population of this province.

So we are in the position of endeavouring to co-operate with what is really a federal responsibility and to which large federal contributions are made and to which direction is given by the federal government. I think

I might add this, that there has been a considerable pointing of effort and planning now in emergency measures, to such things as disasters of fire, flood, earthquake and so on. I think this is sensible and I believe that while we are not the only province, or the only country concerned with this situation, as hon. members well know, I hardly hear anyone suggesting it should be abandoned entirely. Certainly this is not the view of the federal government with which we are asked to co-operate.

Mr. Thompson: I would say this to the hon. Attorney General through you, Mr. Chairman, that we have listened to a variety of points of view on this estimate of almost half a million dollars in the past, before you were in the House. We had at one time, sir, Mr. William Nickle. I would refer to him as the general in charge of this situation. He explained to us that there was an organization in every municipality. Then, sir, when he was going into this, the hon. Leslie Frost came in and said he felt this was a situation for the military. Then, sir, in order to clarify the thing for us, we went up in the bus to Camp Borden. This was before your time, of course.

When we got to Camp Borden there were deputy Ministers present. Somewhere in that Camp Borden area there was a place for the Cabinet and for the head of the government. It did not include us, but we have no particular brief about that because I do not think any of us would ever get to Camp Borden if there were to be a disaster. It is quite a way to there. But, however, sir, I remember we saw the military action on this. Because I will not be embarrassing any particular officer now, because it is in the past, I can say that I remember one officer. We had been taken in to listen to him. We learned that some place near the area of the hon. Minister of Mines that there was fallout sweeping across. The officer was showing us how they were on the alert and warning the North Bay people or Port Arthur. He was phoning and he looked sort of embarrassed and apparently he was—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): We have a fine building up there.

Mr. Thompson: I will tell you what happened. Do you know, sir, with all respect, that we finally heard him say, "What, he's out to lunch?"

Our point is, and I am sure it is the point of all of us, that here is \$250,000—sorry, \$500,000—and we would suggest we have never had a clear-cut programme—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): We have had some signs though.

Mr. Thompson: We have had some signs. But I think we should take both things seriously: the fact that should some calamity happen—and it is not just war we are thinking of, and please God none of these things will happen—that is one thing, and the second thing is that \$500,000.

Could the hon. Attorney General tell us, or will he bring it in for us as soon as he can, what really is his programme? He says it is the federal government programme—does that mean the militia? What is the \$500,000 of the provincial government's money going to? Could I ask also, does the hon. Attorney General have anything to do with the signs? If the hon. Attorney General is asking us to approve \$500,000, could he tell us how this is going to be spent?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can say this to the hon. member. Mr. Hurst, who has been appointed the acting director of the Emergency Measures Organization, has made a report. I do not have it with me here, but I can give it to the House within this week, when I have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Attorney General: I understand that some of the emergency measures organizations wish to buy their own properties. Has his department set a policy on this yet?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have no answer on that question.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I ask the question: is there any supervision at all at the provincial level as to how these monies are spent? Who buys what? Do we have any report on this?

Mr. Letherby: No, not at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have a breakdown of the matter which may, I think, serve to satisfy the hon. member. The total of \$443,00 is broken down in the following way, that is, into some ten different projects.

The first one is the municipal projects to which, I might say as I go along, the municipalities paying 10 per cent will contribute \$136,468. The province's share on those projects is \$204,704. I have, although I will not bother reading it, the contribution of the federal government to those projects, those municipal projects.

Then there are those which are purely

provincial and which are divided simply between the province and the federal government. The contribution of the province is \$95,823, that is 25 per cent, and three times that is contributed by the federal government.

Then there is the mutual aid, fire, radio, which is a three-way project, contributed to by the municipalities, 70 per cent; the province's share is 15 per cent, amounting to \$12,909; and the federal government the same, 15 per cent.

The next item is radiation defence equipment, which is purely provincial and that contribution is \$41,586. The province pays the whole percentage there.

On the proposed expenditure for the year ending March 31, 1965, covering planning and operations of the programmes on which the province and the federal governments split at 25 per cent to Ontario, 75 per cent to Ottawa, our contribution is \$111,125.

On the existing municipal projects, to which the municipalities pay ten per cent and the province 15, the contribution of the province is \$264,855 and the federal share is 75 per cent, running up to \$1,324,000.

On mutual aid, fire, radio network, the province's percentage, being 15 per cent, is \$10,000. On additional fire apparatus—that is the assistance to certain municipalities with fire apparatus—the province's contribution is \$27,000. In health, police and fire services, of which the province's share is 25 per cent shared with the federal government's 75 per cent, the province pays \$24,250.

On assistance to other government departments, the province pays 25 per cent and our share is \$5,000. The federal government pays 15 per cent.

That makes a total of \$443,000.

Mr. Young: May I ask, Mr. Chairman: This assistance to other departments, does this mean assistance in training, perhaps of police and firemen in small municipalities, is this what this means?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Assistance to other government departments?

Mr. Young: To other government departments, yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a comparatively small item, \$5,000. I do not know whether I can give the hon. member further details on that, but I could think of various ways in which the Emergency Measures Organization using money voted in The Department of the Attorney General, might be of assistance,

at least to that extent, that is, \$5,000 to other departments of the government. I cannot furnish any further details.

Mr. Young: It just seems that if the Emergency Measures Organization is going to be effective and efficient it should be tied in very closely with fire and police departments, perhaps stressing training there, rather than having a separate organization. This might have some effect, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I just say it does tie in very closely with the previous item—health, police and fire services—the item of \$24,250. Then there is the other one, the additional fire apparatus at \$27,000; and mutual aid, fire, radio network, \$10,000. There is a very close tie-in with police and fire in these organizations in the county, city and outside areas, and so on.

Mr. Young: Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, through you—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: In the city of Fort William the Emergency Measures Organization is handled by the fire chief—he is the chairman—which shows a very definite tie-in.

Mr. Young: Could I ask one further question then, Mr. Charman? Could the hon. Attorney General tell us what proportion of the money which is being spent on EMO at the present time goes for salaries of officials, directors of local organizations, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I can tell the hon. member. The breakdown of the \$443,000 on that basis shows salaries, \$87,000, and that includes contributions to salaries of other officials outside the department. Travel is \$10,000. Maintenance is \$30,000. Public information courses and conferences, \$14,000. And municipal projects \$302,000. That makes a total of \$443,000.

Mr. Young: I am sorry, I am afraid the—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The \$87,000 was for salaries.

Mr. Young: Yes, but I am wondering about the overall total, because a good part of that municipal grant would go towards salaries of the directors in the field and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member would like, I take it, a breakdown of the \$302,000?

Mr. Young: If the hon. Attorney General has it, yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would have to get that for the hon. member. I do not have it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General mentioned Mr. Hurst, who is the acting director. There was a Mr. Tyrrell, who I understood was the deputy Minister in charge of the Emergency Measures Organization. Is that gentleman no longer in that position?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think that is right, he is no longer there.

Mr. Singer: He is no longer in that position. Mr. Hurst is the man now acting in charge of all emergency measures? That is the Mr. Hurst who was the fire marshal?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He still does his job as well.

Mr. Singer: Oh, he is fire marshal and acting director? Fine!

To go back to these signs, and to be quite serious about it, somebody apparently bought and paid for 1,052 blue and white signs that are now languishing in a police station basement. Was there approval sought? Does the province not have anything to say about the expenditure of the money in connection with these signs? Would it not have been reasonable and logical if somebody was going to buy signs, to designate "escape routes," or call them what you will, that somebody had to determine where these "escape routes" were going to lead to?

This has been held over year after year after year and it would seem to me that we are spending half a million dollars of the public money needlessly. Some of the estimates as the hon. Attorney General mentions are most important, common wavelengths for police vehicles, fire vehicles and that sort of thing, that sort of expenditure is well worthwhile—but when you get this nonsensical expenditure, obviously made by people for the purpose of carrying them on in jobs that perform no function, like storing 1,052 blue and white signs in the police station basement, then we are just throwing public money down the drain.

I would have thought that before anybody, even the Metro EMO group, would embark on this sort of thing, that somebody would control it. Or even if it escapes immediate control and somebody made a mistake, that the hon. Attorney General, as the responsible Minister, now having noted it, would make sure that this could not happen again.

We hear from Minister after Minister: "If I only had enough money I would be able to

do so much more." Now here is a place where the Minister could save and stop wasting perhaps a couple of hundred of thousand dollars and put it to much better use. I would hope, sir, that the Minister would seize upon this opportunity. This is one avenue of putting more money to better use.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Were those signs bought by Metro?

Mr. Singer: They were bought by Metro and EMO. Undoubtedly provincial money paid part of the cost.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Paid part of it. And federal?

Mr. Singer: And federal. We are not in the House of Commons. We are in the provincial Legislature. We can only complain to the Minister.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, to get back to the original question: the one I was complaining about was the Wellington Emergency Measures Organization, who have money to buy their own headquarters but, I understand, they cannot get approval from The Attorney General's Department. Is this true or—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sorry; I did not hear you.

Mr. Worton: They have the financing to buy their own headquarters and yet your department will not give an okay to them to purchase their own building.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am still unable to get the first part of the hon. member's question.

Mr. Worton: Sir, as I understand it the Wellington county Emergency Measures Organization have the finances to purchase a headquarters building for their EMO organization. Before they can buy it, they have to get approval from the hon. Attorney General's office.

This has been asked for, sir, and it has not been forthcoming. This is what I wanted to ask earlier, or at least the point I wanted to get across earlier.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I cannot answer the hon. member. Is it the municipalities that have made application or the Emergency Measures Organization?

Mr. Worton: The Emergency Measures Organization of Wellington county.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And you say application has been made?

Mr. Worton: Yes. In fact, I spoke to your predecessor myself, sir. Evidently there was nothing forthcoming and there is still nothing forthcoming.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can only promise to look into the matter.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the EMO. I think the hon. Minister will find out that Perth county, Stratford and Listowel have been most active on EMO for a number of years. As far as the Wellington county organization is concerned, where I live in the town of Palmerston—a part of Perth riding—the EMO is served by the intimate relations they have to phone connections, fires, tornadoes, anything that happens. I just want to say thank you to the citizens of the municipality for furthering these organizations, who look after the people. This has been going on up in Perth county for years. Just last year at our district EMO meeting at Seaforth, Mr. MacFayden, who is the co-ordinator for Perth county at Stratford, was one of our guest speakers. He described public utilities and all the other services that are in the municipality and which are tied in by the EMO. I think the department is doing a good job in sponsoring and assisting these organizations with approved grants.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return briefly to the coroner's office to refer to an incident of not too long ago. It is reported in the *Globe and Mail* of March 25th of this year. I will read two paragraphs of the story. It is datelined Pembroke:

Dr. H. B. Cotnam, Ontario's supervising coroner, yesterday attended an inquest at which his father, Dr. I. D. Cotnam, 81, was absolved of any blame in the death of one of his patients.

I would like to state right now, Mr. Chairman, that I am not in any sense directing my inquiry to Dr. I. D. Cotnam. There was a coroner's inquest and it was decided by that inquest that Dr. I. D. Cotnam was quite blameless in whatever happened. I am quite willing to accept that. I am not questioning the decision in any way. It is the next paragraph, which I will now read, that I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Attorney General.

The supervising coroner sat beside Coroner Gordon Hermitte of Pembroke, who conducted the inquest, but did not participate in the proceedings.

Now the question I want to put to the hon. Attorney General is, I think, quite a straightforward one. Does he consider it desirable for the supervising coroner to sit beside the presiding coroner at an inquest when one of the matters that was at issue affected his own father? Does he consider that a desirable procedure?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In reply to the hon. member, I would say that, generally, I think it would be in order for the supervising coroner to sit beside the coroner conducting the inquest under ordinary circumstances. Unless he interfered with the proceedings, and it does not appear that he did in any way, I cannot see why, in the light of his interest in the matter—unless he interfered—he should not sit there.

I think this is a matter that would occur, perhaps, only once in a blue moon, if I may use that expression. But unless there is some evidence that he interfered with the conduct of that inquest, which was conducted by a coroner and with a Crown attorney examining witnesses, I cannot see what objection might be taken.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, surely the mere fact of his presence on the bench beside the other coroner leaves at least an impression of interference. The hon. Attorney General used the expression "if it was a matter in which he had an interest" there might be a reason for him to be there. I suggest that it was a matter in which he had a personal interest. That would be a good reason why he should stay as far away as possible. Certainly, this form of procedure can create a wrong impression.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Did the hon. member say that he sat on the bench beside the coroner?

Mr. Bryden: It said—I will quote what it said:

The supervising coroner sat beside Coroner Gordon Hermitte who conducted the inquest—

I do not know exactly what it meant by "sat beside." I would interpret it to mean that he was up at the head of the courtroom sitting beside the supervising coroner. I would suggest to the hon. Attorney General that a desirable practice in such a matter would be for the supervising coroner, under these circumstances, to stay as far away from it as possible, and that he not sit anywhere near a position that looked like a position of authority.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will say this: I do not think he should have to stay as far away as possible. I think he has a right to be in the courtroom, or the place of hearing, apart from his position as supervising coroner altogether. Whether he had a father involved, or any other relative, he had a right to be there at a public inquest. Perhaps he might have exercised a little thought in not appearing to sit in a position of authority. But if he did not interfere, and there seems to be no suggestion of that, then I would not feel too seriously about it. But I certainly think he had a right to be there, to listen and to be interested. If he had evidence to give, he could even have given evidence. But if there is no suggestion that he interfered, I do not treat the thing too seriously.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is another matter under vote 208 relating to the Attorney General's lab. I notice that this section of the vote has been increased from some \$430,000 to \$537,000. I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General if he considers that this increase is sufficient in view of the frequent statements that have been made in recent months, sir, by the director of the Attorney General's lab that a very large increase in its facilities and staff is required if it is to do the job it has been called upon to do.

All of the stories that I have read refer to the fact that the Attorney General's lab, by doing some work that is not related to its principal function—that is in testing pharmaceutical preparations supplied to Ontario hospitals—has saved this government a large sum of money. I, in common with some other members of the House, sat on a committee which inquired into the matter of the cost of drugs and we found that to be true. They have done an excellent job there. But it would appear, from the stories we have seen in the press—all of them based apparently on information obtained from Dr. Ward Smith—that the lab is being starved in some of its other activities.

It may be that an increase of \$100,000 this year is all that the organization can absorb in the way of expansion. But on the other hand, I am rather concerned when I read in the press that many cases are held up in the courts because the expert evidence that is available from this source only cannot be produced in time; and that sometimes this expert evidence just is not produced at all. I would like to hear some sort of a statement from the hon. Attorney General with regard to this year's estimate and the long-term plans for the Attorney General's lab.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, the estimate first of all is increased from last year's \$428,500 to an amount now of \$537,000. That is an increase of \$108,500, which is almost on the nose, I think, of a 25 per cent increase. That is a fairly substantial increase in any estimate. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) tells me that, to the best of his recollection, this was what he thought was their budget. They seemed to be satisfied with the requisition made in that amount for this year. There are long-term plans to expand and extend the work of the laboratory and obtain better space for it and better facilities. I think that having obtained a 25-per cent increase in one year is a fairly reasonable evidence of progress.

Mr. Bryden: Dr. Ward Smith is quoted in the *Globe and Mail* of February 13, which is two or three months ago, as saying his agency should have eight times the space and three times the staff and I would doubt if \$100,000 would provide that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In this year, no, it will not provide that, but more space is definitely required. More space is planned and a programme of expansion is in the plan, but not to be all accomplished this year by any means.

Mr. Bryden: There is another statement here that I would like to call to the attention of the House. This is in the reporter's own words. It is not attributed to anyone.

One of the more unhappy results of this shortage—

that is the shortage of staff and space:

—is that the laboratory's scientific study on Crown cases awaiting trial is backed up on an average of four to six weeks. The accused person held without bail awaiting this evidence for the trial to proceed has to be patient in jail.

Does the hon. Attorney General think that some significant progress can be made in reducing that sort of waiting period in cases coming to trial?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A large part of the increase is for increased competent personnel and I think this will quickly help to clean up the backlog.

Vote 208 agreed to.

On vote 209:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, before we deal with 209, and I take it that vote 208

has been passed, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow—I gather it has been arranged with the two Opposition parties—we

will proceed with the balance of the estimates of The Department of Education, starting at 3 o'clock, and then when we have completed that we can return to the estimates of the hon. Attorney General.

We are sitting at 3 o'clock tomorrow because there are some achievement awards being presented here in the chamber and this is the only place to do it, apparently, so we will sit at 3 o'clock, not 2 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.25 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 5, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Tenth report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans	2795
Second report, standing committee on highways and tourism, Mr. Reilly	2795
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	2796
Recess, 6 o'clock	2824

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1964

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We welcome to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from Central Elgin Collegiate, St. Thomas; under the Speaker's gallery, members of the Etobicoke North Women's Liberal Association. We are also pleased to welcome on the floor of the House, to the right of the Speaker's chair, the hon. Walter C. Weir, Minister of Public Works and Highways for the province of Manitoba.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's tenth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act.

Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Bill No. 109, An Act to provide for the registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton), from the standing committee on highways and tourism, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

And the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 123, An Act to provide for the establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett).

How many property owners are going to be bought out by the Upper Thames River Authority in order to construct the Gordon Pittcock dam and how many of these property owners have voluntarily accepted the offers made to them by the authority?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. The number of properties involved is 46. The number who have accepted voluntarily, offers made by the authority, is 12.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to announce to the House that further progress has been made in the discussions between the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and The Department of Highways dealing with crossings of the Welland canal. These discussions have covered changes in the crossings necessitated by the proposed twinning of the locks of the canal and also the replacement of existing crossings because of increased traffic volumes. Agreement in principle has been reached on all the major points, and both authorities now wish to meet with the municipalities along the canal where these new facilities must be provided. The purpose of these meetings would be to work out the details of the various projects as they affect the municipalities.

While the immediate plans, to coincide with the twinning of the locks, call for the construction of tunnels at Carleton Street in St. Catharines, replacing existing Highway 58 bridge in the Thorold area, and a new facility, previously announced, in the city of Welland, the discussions also included proposed tunnels to be constructed at a later stage at Allanburg—Highway 20—and Highway 3 at Port Colborne.

A similar statement is being made to the House of Commons in Ottawa today by the hon. J. W. Pickersgill, federal Minister of Transport.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (continued)

On vote 518:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the House is asked to approve the expenditure of \$48 million in vote 518. As well as this, we are going to discuss the provision for advancing further money on a loan basis to the universities of Ontario, which will make available to university education a sum just in excess of \$100 million.

This is the amount that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), in his judgment, feels will meet the needs of education at this level for the coming year. This is the money that is needed, evidently, to provide the facilities of all types at the university level: the laboratories, the libraries, the other expansion in buildings, as well as to train and provide the staff and the maintenance that is needed for our rapidly expanding university system. We were assured by the hon. Minister in this House on Friday last, that their most careful statistical research would indicate that approximately 38,000 students will be available for university training in September, 1964, and that as near as they can tell this will leave a surplus of something approaching 1,500 to 2,000 places in the universities of the province of Ontario.

It is obvious that the distribution of these students will probably leave something to be desired, particularly during the months when their applications are being sent to universities and sent probably to more than one university. Nevertheless, we have the assurance of the government that for the year coming, without any change we presume in entrance requirements, that every qualified student will be looked after.

I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister should certainly, somewhere in the discussion of this part of his responsibility, deal very directly with what the statistics are and what the indications are, not only for the coming year 1964, but every year up to and including 1970. Because we have certainly been led to expect by the report of the universities' presidents that there is going to be a serious shortage of university facilities between now and 1970, and we want the assurance of the government

that proper provision is being made before this crisis of numbers, as it has been called, is upon us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is true that there is very little conjecture remaining about the number of students that must be accommodated. These people are presently in the schools, in the high schools, and many of them have already indicated by their examination work and by guidance interviews that they will be requiring this sort of advanced education in the immediate years that lie ahead.

The crisis will be upon us, according to the statistics that are available to us as ordinary members of the Legislature, in the term 1965-66. It is in this area particularly that we would ask the hon. Minister to comment specifically as to how his plans will meet the predictions of the statisticians. Certainly we would expect this additional information some time this afternoon.

Another thing to be borne in mind as we discuss university affairs, is that in the years that lie ahead many more of our students than will go to university will be in Grade 13 and graduating from high school with their honour matriculation certificate, and these people must be accommodated in some areas of post-secondary education in this province. Many will go into the expanding areas of technology; the teachers' colleges, the nursing schools; and, obviously, many will enter the work force directly from their senior matriculation training.

The number, however, that will be available for further training and education beyond those who will be going to university must always be borne in mind; and according to the report that we have at hand it will be a number that is almost equivalent to those who will be taking university training by the end of this decade. A number then, amounting to 100,000, sir, will certainly require, many of them, additional education beyond the secondary level. Here is an area where there does seem to be considerable confusion in the advice that the government has received and in the steps that they have taken to plan for this large number of students.

In my view there must be a continuation of academic training at the local level. There are many ways by which this may be provided. The university presidents, who have reported to the hon. Minister through his advisory committee, have suggested that perhaps the normal grade system might be extended beyond Grade 13 into a suggested Grade 14.

There have also been numerous suggestions that colleges at the community level, either under local auspices or more preferably under the auspices of the present university system, could be set up. This, in my view, is the solution that should recommend itself to the planners in The Department of Education.

I think it would be a shame if any system of community colleges were to be divorced from the academic train so that they would become something aside from an academic institution and be more or less a part-time school for adult training with, perhaps, courses in art and that sort of thing exclusively. I would recommend most seriously to the House that any extension, then, at the community level be along academic lines.

One of the greatest problems that the government must face, and is dealing with to some extent, is the provision of staff at the post-secondary level. There were ample warnings in the time from 1955 on toward 1960 that the provision of staff was going to be one of the major difficulties, if not the major difficulty, in the provision of education at the post-secondary level. If one is to look at the records of those days, it is obvious that the government of the day took no steps, certainly no effective steps to increase the number of students who were going on to doctorate work or to post-graduate work. As a matter of fact, if one examines the statistics after the warning bell was first sounded in 1955, they actually indicated a decrease in the number of graduate degrees granted in this province and across the country.

I would be the first to say that the plan introduced some time ago, which provides fellowships in the humanities and social sciences for those who wish to proceed with graduate work in the province of Ontario, has been very effective. I would certainly say that the restriction of this to the humanities and social sciences is something that should be explained carefully to the House.

I presume that there are adequate funds available from various research projects to provide graduate scholarships for those in the natural sciences, which are not accommodated under this fellowship plan. I am sure that the hon. Minister would agree with me that anyone who has indicated that he has the ability at the undergraduate level, and has the interest in proceeding to the graduate level, should be given every monetary encouragement so that everybody with this ability will have ample opportunity.

I would also suggest to the hon. Minister that it would be quite in order, I feel, if

these people who desire to go on for graduate work would be granted permission to pursue this study out of the province with provincial fellowships. I would not even suggest that a rider to the money made available be put in to insist, perhaps, that they be required to return to the province, although every effort should be made to make such a return attractive to them. Certainly any use that we can make of education facilities outside of Ontario for those of our students who require this advanced education we should certainly take advantage of.

In the provision of staffs at the post-secondary level, as well as being sure that every effort is made to train these people, it is essential that better pay scales be established. Of course, the government would not in any way dictate these pay scales. But they would make sure that finances were available so that these people, who would be interested in going into teaching at the post-secondary level, would at least be paid on a level equivalent to what they would get in secondary schools.

There are cases—I suppose they are gradually decreasing in number—but certainly many cases in the universities of the province where people with high academic standing are actually making a monetary sacrifice when they choose to teach at the post-secondary level rather than in the collegiates.

It is also true, as has already been stated in the House, that the government has not provided a safety valve for the numbers of students who may wish to go on to university education that are in excess of the facilities that will be provided through the financial and planning efforts of this government. I do not want to dwell at any great length on the use of television in this regard, but all of the hon. members of this Legislature who have read the Deutsch report know that there is a very serious and carefully worked out plan there whereby, in the view of the presidents of the universities of Ontario, television can be used to provide regular university courses for those students who may not be able to enter universities in the years that lie ahead.

We are glad to read in the press, but I have not read it in any official publication, that the developing universities in the province are going to make some use of educational television on a closed-circuit basis. This is very good, indeed, and it could be that the very best teachers, professors and those with the best background will be able to extend their contact with large numbers of the student bodies in more than one university in

this way. The government is to be commended if they had any part in the assistance of this provision.

Mr. Chairman, the relationships between this government and the universities of the province have been very much in the minds of those concerned with education in the past few months and years. We think, particularly, of recent statements from the government benches having to do with what the history of the development of the universities has been; and more recently, of how the universities are going to be dealt with by a new department of government in the years that lie ahead.

I would like first to make some reference to how this government in the past few years has undertaken the financing of necessary university expansion. It appears that the universities have met in private with the hon. members of the government and the Treasury, presumably the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) among others, and negotiations have taken place in secret.

The people of this province, and certainly the hon. members of this Legislature, have never been informed what the original university requirements might have been. There seems to be a very beautiful veneer of gentlemanly undertakings between the government and those representing the universities, so that there is much tut-tutting and looking askance if, in fact, there are any squawks from the university level at all.

Now mind you, from the government's position we have the blandest assurances that all is well. There is a tendency for even those in the Opposition, when they are presented with these statistics, to be assured. Certainly, for those citizens across the province there is ample assurance from the government that all is well as far as university expansion is concerned; and that ample funds are made available without any restrictions or intrusions for the expansion of the universities. Nevertheless, there seem to be some squawks from the university level. It is perhaps advisable that we refer to them at this time.

I think particularly of Dr. Hagey, the president of Waterloo University, who is also chairman of an important commission of the government. He stated categorically that the support that this government has extended to the universities is dangerously short. He mentioned a figure of \$65 million, which I believe applied for a period of two years. He said:

We have been instructed by the government—at least by the advisory committee on university affairs—that we extend every

effort to accommodate 100,000 students by 1970.

Although I am not quoting him directly, the implication was that this man, who has the responsibility at university level, felt that there was not sufficient support to do this. Many of us have also had an opportunity to read the report of the committee of university teachers, who have indicated once again that in this particular connection the government's support has not been adequate. They very much feared that actual intrusion into the affairs of the university by the government was something that had to be seriously guarded against in the future.

It appears that in summary, for years the grants to universities have been seriously insufficient, at least in the considered opinion of those at the university level. The university people have described them as being distributed in a capricious and inequitable manner, and I understand this distribution is directed by the hon. Minister's advisory committee. It has been necessary to negotiate on a year-to-year basis with the government, without any real assurance of continuing support so that real planning at the university level would have been possible.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we have heard announcements about this in the House. I believe it was a year ago, when the hon. Prime Minister said the universities could count on as much money as they had in the past at least. In this way no doubt he felt that some planning would be possible. I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this was a poor guide to go on as far as planning is concerned because there would be very little thought in this part of the 20th century that the grants to universities would be reduced. There is much to be said for the funds being made available for the universities over a period—I would submit, in five-year blocks—so that long-range planning would be possible. It is in this connection that the government can be seriously criticized.

The advisory committee, then, has played a large part in what the government has done in the past few years, in making monies available for the expansion of the universities. I would say to the hon. Minister that one area where perhaps public relations more than anything else has fallen down on the side of the government, is that there is a feeling—and held with much justification by university people—that although the advisory committee is efficient and made up of able men indeed, they do not have sufficient representation of the university community,

so that their needs, aside from a strict efficient businesslike approach, would be properly known.

I would read from the list of members of the advisory committee, headed, of course, by Dana Porter, chairman, a man known to many of us, to all of us certainly by reputation. As vice-chairman is former Prime Minister, hon. Mr. Frost, a man whom we hold in high esteem and evidently is very efficient indeed in the workings of this particular committee. The other members of the committee are: Mr. Chalmers, who represents Maclean-Hunter or is employed, I understand, by Maclean-Hunter; Mr. Gathercole, a graduate of McMaster University, and a servant of the public of this province; Mr. Leonard, a Senator; Mr. Mitchell, employed at Super-test Petroleum; the secretary, John R. McCarthy, a gentleman who is advising the hon. Minister this afternoon.

I submit in this list there is no one who would be considered by those at the university level as representing their interest. Certainly the interests of government are well represented here and the interests of business. Mr. Chairman, it has been surely brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Education and no doubt the hon. Prime Minister, that this is an area in which the expansion of the committee, if it is going to continue to operate, is absolutely essential. We need only think of the other sections in The Department of Education. The affairs of the secondary schools are dealt with largely by people with experience in this field. The same is true of the primary area of education. I would not say they were entirely analogous but certainly the recommendation is an important one and I hope the hon. Minister will consider it seriously.

Mr. Chairman, I was running a tractor with a seed drill all morning. It is a diesel tractor and a very noisy affair, but I must say it was easier to make myself heard there than it is here. Nevertheless, I know there are a lot of very important things going on in the House and perhaps university affairs is not one of the most important.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): I am listening.

Mr. Nixon: Okay, as long as the hon. Minister of Education is listening I appreciate it.

As far as new policy is concerned—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The hon. member better stick his head up in the air if he is going to be heard.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Nixon: You know, Mr. Chairman, over the weekend I had an interesting experience in driving through the areas in Renfrew South and Renfrew North where the hon. member who is interjecting comes from. As I drove through some of those rockbound areas I thought of our rockbound friend here who intrudes in the debate in this unnecessary manner. I hope that he will pay attention to this so perhaps the area in which his representation is most important will be able to benefit from it.

Certainly there is no doubt that the provision of a Department of University Affairs is in response to a widespread concern that this important area of the affairs of this province has not been dealt with effectively over the past few years. As one goes through the country and reads what is said by those concerned with education, there is no doubt that the provision of adequate education at the post-secondary level is in everyone's mind. I submit to the hon. Minister that the government's decision to deal with this by establishing another department is simply in response to this concern.

We trust that this new department will not end up like The Department of Insurance, which is really just a branch of another department. There has been no announcement of a separate Minister to have this responsibility and it may well be that it will be in effect just a branch of The Department of Education. We trust that this is not so, having heard the announcements having to do with the development of this new department.

Certainly the criticism which would level itself, and which would make itself evident in this connection is that the whole area of the responsibility for education is unfortunately being broken by the implementation of the new department. One editorial has said that education was being decapitated and I suppose this is so. It is a shame that the overall planning of education cannot be conducted by one ministerial responsibility. It is obvious that the new department, when it is finally enacted by the Legislature and set up, will take onto itself a considerable amount of responsibility for close investigation of the particulars of what goes on at the university level.

We have heard the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Education say—and we agree with them in this—that we want to see that the money which is granted for post-secondary education is well spent and is not

wasted. On the other hand, we do not feel that the new department or any other department of government should intrude itself into the everyday university affairs so that its auditors are on the heels of everything that is done by the university. We must regard them as autonomous institutions. We must consider our responsibility to provide at least a share of the wherewithal that will provide the expansion that is so well needed.

I would quote from the Deutsch report in this connection, when the university presidents are discussing the possibility of changing the responsibility for university affairs and have suggested that perhaps a ministry of higher education could be created. We presume that The Department of University Affairs is this.

They say that this arrangement would have the grave disadvantage of giving the government direct control of higher education, a situation that runs counter to the whole tradition of higher education in the English-speaking world. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the traditions of higher education are valued and honoured by almost every member of this House—the man who is presently interjecting possibly excepted. In this connection, it is our responsibility in the Opposition, while going along with the government in saying that the money must be effectively spent—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the members to respect the speaker who is on the floor trying to give his message to the members of this Legislature, and would ask your co-operation towards this end.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And so I would say it appears, from reading and listening to the statement that accompanied the introduction of the bill to set up a Department of University Affairs, that there is at least a danger of the intrusion of the Minister of the new department, or some other Minister of responsibility in the government, into the autonomous affairs of the university. In this connection I would like to say that the proposed Capital Aid Corporation does not allay these fears. We know that the money is going to be granted on the direct authority of the new Minister, whoever he may be. Naturally, he will give this recommendation, or he will grant this authority after being suitably advised. But he has the say-so as to who gets the money and how much it will be, which is certainly a direct intrusion if we are to take the words

of the Deutsch report as having any meaning in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think this is an area that once again is worthy of some exploration. That is, what do the hon. members feel, really, we mean by autonomy, or academic autonomy? We mean by that, perhaps, the reluctance of government to allow a university, say, to establish a faculty of medicine if the government feels there are sufficient faculties of medicine. I am not saying the government takes this position. But is this to be construed as an intrusion into the academic autonomy of an institution?

This is very important and I would like to have the views of both the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), because as I have said and the hon. Prime Minister has said on several occasions, it is not the intent of either the legislation or the government to infringe on the academic autonomy of the university. This is not our desire whatsoever. But there are these areas and I would like some thoughts from the hon. members opposite as to whether they would construe this as an infringement on academic autonomy.

Mr. Nixon: I would not think that the situation described by the hon. Minister would be an intrusion in academic autonomy. It would be gross waste of public and private funds, if such a medical school were established when statistically there was absolutely no need for it. As a matter of fact, I could not think of a university that might even suggest they get into the medical school business unless there were some need for this. As I say, I would like to deal with this area of autonomy perhaps later.

However, I would say that in the bill that is setting up the new department and the University Capital Aid Corporation, there is no indication that there will be anything but the Minister's sole judgment as to where the money goes, and as to whether there will be any long-range grant. There is no doubt that he would be advised. He would be foolish if he proceeded without advice. But if the advice he receives does not have the confidence of the university community, then certainly he is heading for trouble along those lines.

I would like, when the opportunity arises, if the hon. Minister would have something to say about how the monies that are going to be loaned by this new corporation will be paid, because surely the income of the universities over which they have direct control is pretty well exclusively from their fees.

To suggest that fees, in the long run, are going to repay the money lent them by the corporation is not reasonable at all. The money will be repaid from future grants. It may well be that this corporation should not be a capital aid corporation to extend loans, but to provide the grants that are going to be needed.

The fear of intrusion into this whole area really centres, in my own mind at the present moment, around what the university fees will be. Certainly the amount of fees charged will depend directly upon the view of the new Minister of University Affairs as to what monies will be made available.

It is interesting to note that in the past few months university after university in the province of Ontario has indicated that they are going to raise their fees next year by an amount of approximately \$50. I think the University of Toronto was the last to make this statement. They said their fees would go up \$50 to \$60. If we were looking at an anti-trust situation, this would almost look like price fixing. Why would they all come to the conclusion at one time that they needed \$50 from each student this year?

It almost appears that they sat down with the university advisory committee and they all decided that this is what was required. This may be an intrusion into the freedom of the individual institution. That is one thing that is significant and simply just an indication of what could lie in the future.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am, of course, in this position as Minister of Education. The university advisory committee reports to the government. I am here today to give the hon. members as much information as I can. The best information I have would indicate that the decision to raise fees by the universities was a decision made very definitely by the individual institutions. There is no question of this.

Also, I would tell the House as Minister of Education that we are reviewing the possibility of raising the bursary or loan limits by whatever the average would be for the increase in fees. If it is roughly \$50, sir, then we are going to consider the possibility of the increasing of bursaries by a like amount. This has not been decided because we do not know whether all the universities are doing this. But I can assure the House that as far as I know, the decision to raise fees was one made very definitely by the universities themselves.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I accept that from the hon. Minister. My particular inter-

est was the fact that the increase was almost identical in the whole university community.

Hon. Mr. Davis: To a degree. I think this would account for it: One does it; then others use whatever the first amount was. I gather it was \$50.

Mr. Nixon: Then it seems to me, although all of us are concerned with the provision of facilities, there is every reason to believe that in the next few years there are going to be large numbers of qualified students who will not be able to attend university. It may be that the main point of this afternoon's discussion should not be on the crisis of numbers, but on the crisis in the universities as autonomous institutions.

I submit that I have not attempted to build any ironclad case that would indicate the government is intruding in university affairs. But at this time when we are going to face a continuing crisis at the post-secondary level that we must build well and build carefully. Certainly, there are many expert opinions to go on. I think, particularly, of the report of the committee on higher education from Great Britain that was chaired by Lord Robbins. I am sure that the hon. Minister is more familiar with this report than I. Yet there are parts of it that apply to our own situation precisely, and I would like to deal with it briefly. The report came down in October of 1963. It has been discussed in the press and it is considered very highly indeed by those who have some interest and abilities in education. It begins by talking, at least the part that I wish to refer to, about the responsibility of the state. I refer to page 228 of the report where it said:

It would be generally agreed nowadays that the government has a responsibility to ensure that the development of higher education is adequate to national needs.

Provincial needs in our case.

Moreover, it is clear that in the determination of the aggregate amount to be spent from public funds it necessarily has the last word.

The advisory committee quoted the same passage in their report. It is a very important passage because it has to do with the point the hon. Minister raised a moment ago: That the province, in this case, surely has the responsibility for overall planning and direction.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what the hon. member might include in the overall planning and direction? This is a very

grey area. I think that in examining this question we get close to trying to assess what university autonomy really is.

Mr. Nixon: I would prefer, Mr. Chairman, to indicate the areas that I would exclude from the government responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right.

Mr. Nixon: I must say that my list comes directly from the Robbins report, with some comments that I have added myself. After the responsibility of the state is indicated, it goes on to say that the intrusion into the academic affairs at the university level does not always bring about efficiency or even the best use of the funds available. I would quote from page 229 of the report:

We are convinced also that such academic freedom is a necessary condition of the highest efficiency and the proper progress of academic institutions, and that encroachments upon their liberty in the supposed interest of greater efficiency would in fact diminish their efficiency and stultify their development. This is something that is of paramount importance as the government takes more and more of the responsibility of financing education at this level and it is well for us to accept the warning with all of its gravity.

Certainly there is no worry about infringement of individual freedoms at the university level. We would grant that immediately, although it is interesting to look back at some of the historical events that have occurred in this province. There have been occasions when the Legislature and important members of the Legislature, in years gone by, have undertaken to impose their will on the academic freedom of the university community. But we would assume that in the ordinary course of events this would happen very rarely indeed. So we are not concerned with individual freedom, but more the freedom of the institution to run its affairs in an autonomous way. It is this freedom that could be in danger at the present time.

I believe that the academic community at the post-secondary level must be free to direct its own affairs having to do with appointments to the staff, and the curriculum that is made available at the individual institutions. It may be that there would be a certain amount of overlapping, but surely co-operation and co-ordination among the universities would be better than having a super-authority that would make the decisions based on the statistics and indicate to a university that

it would have a certain area of responsibility as opposed to some other.

The whole position of university standards must, of course, be a part of the freedom of the individual institution. I am referring particularly to the standards in the course, rather than the standards of admission at this time, although I will refer to the others in a moment. The fact that certain universities in the province may have been able to develop an aura of excellence, not enjoyed to quite the same extent by all the other universities here, is certainly to the credit of those institutions. We must leave the situation so that such outstanding abilities in certain areas can continue to show themselves, so that the general standards within the university are open to the universities themselves for control.

When it comes to admissions, this is a difficult point and the Robbins commission itself asserts that it is difficult. It is difficult for a government to refrain from making very strong suggestions as to, for example, what the level of admission should be. There have been statements both from this side of the House and from the hon. Prime Minister of the province as to what we would consider a general area for possible admission to the universities of this province. But this is an area which in the last analysis must be up to the administration of the individual institution. It is, however, I submit, the responsibility of the government to see to it that if there are restrictions on the admissions which mean that large numbers of students cannot avail themselves of education, then the responsibility lies with the government to see that suitable alternatives are provided. I would think that this would be a reasonable approach for the government.

To go on, the areas of the balance involving teaching and research must be under the control of the universities. Of course, this would, in the long run, be controlled by the sums available for fostering research, much of which comes from private enterprise as well as from government sources. The general shape of the development of the individual institution must remain, as well, with the university. This means that the government will have to restrict itself considerably in what the new department does when it sets about to direct in a general way, the development of post-secondary education. The responsibility is with the state to provide for the provincial needs. It is also the responsibility of the state to keep its hands out of the day-to-day work of the individual institutions. We on this side are not opposed to either of

the bills that will be discussed later in the day. They are a possible solution and a solution that the government has decided that it will use for the problems that face us. It is up to us to indicate the dangers of these particular solutions and I have done this to the best of my ability.

But it is wise, surely, for the government—a Conservative government—to look well at what is a tested solution and an alternative to its present situation and its present plan. I refer to an institution which has developed in the United Kingdom and which has directed the government money into higher education for some years. It has just been carefully investigated to see how effective it really is. I refer to the university grants committee which is fully described in the report that I have been referring to. I would like to quote briefly from the report in this connection right now. This is of course a British report. On page 235 the report says:

Fortunately this country—

that is Great Britain:

—seems to have hit upon an administrative invention that, although not precluding all such dangers, has the effect of making them much less probable—a device of interposing between the government and institutions, a committee of persons selected for their knowledge and understanding—

—which would, and I am no longer quoting directly from the report, have the main responsibility for administering these affairs. In this way it is possible to ensure that the necessary measures of co-ordination and allocation, which I would say the government is very directly concerned with, are insulated from inappropriate political influences.

The inappropriate political influences are not the type that might spring to mind immediately from the discussions in this House previously. We are not thinking of any direct appointments or anything like that, but the very fact that the government, which is not an educational authority *per se*, would intrude its judgment into the everyday affairs of the university community. This device is exemplified in the present arrangements for the famous university grants committee and its principles are best explained by a reference to its constitution.

I want briefly to refer to it. I would say that this committee is made up largely of university people. This does not refer to people having university degrees, obviously. They are people who are associated with the university community in an administrative

way or else in a teaching or research capacity. This does not mean that all other interests are kept out. Representation could be as broad as the government saw fit, as long as the majority is not dissociated from university connection.

The committee has two jobs. It advises the government on needs on a rather long-range basis, and secondly, it takes the money that the government in its wisdom and ability provides, and distributes it. In this way it is possible, in the case of England, to provide blocks of money over five-year periods. In this way there is true academic freedom and the institutions are able to be masters of their own development in the sense that I have have tried to define.

It is also true that for special purposes, and it may well be that the medical school the hon. Minister mentioned would be one, that supplementary grants would be approved by Parliament and paid directly, I suppose through the committee, but they would be earmarked grants and paid directly to the recipient university.

The system is flexible, it is tested, it has recently been examined, and it works. I would submit to the hon. Minister that he should look at it carefully—I would like to hear from him what objections there were to forming a university grants committee like this compared with the present proposal for a new department and a continuation of the advisory committee in its present restricted way.

The Robbins report has been very useful not only for the jurisdiction which commissioned it but in areas all over the world that are having this same problem with education at the post-secondary level. It is true that what is effective in England might not work here. It is also true that there are other areas of uncertainty at this level of education and many of them have been raised in the House in the last few days. I think particularly of the difficulties, we might call them a muddle in the area of post-secondary education at the technological level, where we are not sure what the schools will have as their real area of responsibility when they are called technical schools. We do not know how the institutions at the vocational level will be co-ordinated across this province. We know that there is a real conflict of views having to do with community colleges and the extension of academic education at the community level.

The hon. Minister himself has stated that the Deutsch report that I have referred to several times during my remarks, did not go

deeply enough into these very areas which are presently giving us so much difficulty. Surely all these things would make a good case for having a committee, or a commission if you would call it that, that would concern itself with all these problems of education at the post-secondary level in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the hon. member for York South, has called for a Royal commission on education which would have a responsibility having to do with the whole area of education. I would think that surely, to be effective, any new investigation along the lines that we have been discussing should be restricted to the area at the post-secondary level, because it is here that the major problems are presenting themselves. There is no doubt that the difficulties at this level will increase over the next few years and certainly be with us for the rest of this century. It is important that we plan very properly and carefully the development of education at the post-secondary level. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this can best be directed by a full inquiry into education at the post-secondary level.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, education is our greatest problem, and within the context of that problem certainly the most challenging aspect is related to higher education. If I can just make a brief comment on one of the concluding observations of the hon. member for Brant, that if we are going to have a Royal commission investigation—or a committee of inquiry, as I described it—into education, that it should be restricted to the secondary field.

I am not going to argue vigorously with him on this. It is rather significant, however, that in Great Britain, following an investigation into the higher levels of education in the Robbins report, there is now a considerable body of opinion emphasizing the view that this has only separated out the higher level of education, and that some of the relationships of the higher levels of education back to the secondary and public level are so intimate that the whole field should be surveyed.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it was in the context of that overall need, that I was suggesting a continuing committee of inquiry which would deal with the problems as they move from stage to stage throughout the educational system.

The problem of Grade 13, for example, is a problem at the end of the secondary

system but at the beginning of the higher level. It is only one link in the chain.

However, I do not want to pursue that thought any further this afternoon. I want to deal exclusively with the challenges of higher education at the university level without any further comment on the whole range of other post-secondary education, because we have dealt with that to some degree. I agree with the hon. member for Brant that it is a very vague and confused area, and there is desperate need for clarification so that we will know what our lines of direction are.

I think our real problem here this afternoon, and I am glad that we are now relieved of some of the boorish interjections here so that we can give some serious consideration to it—because we are going to be mapping the pattern for the next generation, or conceivably much longer than that, of the higher levels of education which are desperately important, not only from the view of education but from the point of view of economic development and many other related fields.

There are a number of aspects of the problem of higher education and I want to treat of each one of them. The first one is the crisis in numbers; I want to say to the hon. Minister that he has really complicated this picture in a fashion that has left me mystified, over the weekend, as I tried to absorb what he said last Friday. I want to go back and review exactly what has been said and what the hon. Minister now contends is the situation.

I do not know who is correct, but once again it seems to me that it is about time that we got some of the basic facts resolved. In essence, if I may state his conclusion, because I want to come back to it after, what the hon. Minister stated was that this fall, for the coming term of 1964-65, there will be some 38,000 students at our university level and that we were going to have some 40,000 places available at the universities. In other words, we are going to have something in excess of 2,000 places beyond our requirements.

Mr. Chairman, all I can say is let us go back for a moment and review—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to interject this—just reading my notes here again—I said the maximum that could be provided for would be 40,750, but that a more desirable number would be 39,500 and this would still provide us with a margin of roughly 1,400 based on the anticipated enrolment of the universities. I would not want

the hon. member to feel that we are suggesting there will be 2,600 surplus. I am suggesting that the happy number would probably be around 39,500.

Mr. MacDonald: I accept the hon. Minister's refinement. I submit it is a little irrelevant to the basic point I am trying to make at the moment. The hon. Minister says we are going to have 2,000 extra places, and, as I shall draw to the attention of the House, all of those who have been studying, with every available statistical assistance for years now, have come to the conclusion that on the basis of this fall we would really be having some 7,000 to 8,000 more students in our universities. However, I am getting to my conclusion without taking it stage by stage, and I want to do that.

For some years now we have been operating on the basis of statistics that were provided in the first instance by E. F. Sheffield who used to be with DBS and who is now with the Canadian University Foundation as their research director. Years ago I knew Ted Sheffield very well. In fact he was my wife's teacher at what is now Sir George Williams University and I have always been interested in his work.

Dr. Jackson, of OCE research, has studied and restudied the statistics in so far as the problems of Ontario are concerned and he has come up with figures that I had been led to believe were conservative estimates. As a matter of fact, Dr. Jackson came up with a number of projections, and the university presidents themselves chose projection number five. I want to come back to exactly what that means in this coming year, but Dr. Jackson has been reassessing this whole picture in the course of developments over the last year, or even the last few months, because there are changing factors in the picture all the while. He has told me personally in discussions I have had with him, and he has said publicly, that in his view, his figures tended to be on the conservative side.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I want for just one moment to digress here to put on the record a comment of Dr. Jackson which is part of his very comprehensive and detailed presentation to the Canadian Education Association at its conference in Quebec City last September.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was there to hear it. It was an excellent presentation.

Mr. MacDonald: It was, yes. I am quoting from page 27 of the mimeographed version.

He said:

In a society which needs not fewer highly educated men and women, but more, a selected process should promise more accuracy than any now available.

Entrance qualifications for students in universities is the topic with which he is dealing.

There is likely to be a real tug-of-war over this problem, probably with the universities on the losing side.

As you know, up to the present time universities have more or less set their own admission policies, and in theory at least each university acted independently. And they obviously desire to retain this right. As a matter of fact, admission requirements have been steadily raised to the point where for some universities up to 40 per cent of the candidates acceptable in my time would now be excluded, including outright rejection of myself. And university authorities have openly stated their intention of raising entrance requirements and standards for each year to even higher levels, understandably enough perhaps in view of increases in knowledge during my lifetime.

But these actions affect national and provincial growth and development in these days when so much depends on brains and so little on brawn, and also the educational plans of many young people of above-average ability. Consequently, and for the first time in this country to my knowledge, not only are the actions of the universities being questioned, but also their right to take such actions.

In Ontario, many parents are gravely disturbed by what seems to them to be an imposition of unreasonably high standards of achievement, and our Premier went so far as to suggest to the universities in his statement in the Legislature on government policy in regard to university expansion, that they seriously consider reducing entrance requirements. McMaster is conducting an experiment along the lines suggested for a limited number of students.

Suspensions have been voiced that the universities are planning to resolve the numbers problem by excluding more and more students, steadily closing the college doors, so to speak, and taking advantage of the crisis to restrict admission to the select few gifted individuals who are highly motivated and practically self-teaching.

My hunch is that social pressures will severely restrict the traditional rights of the universities and these matters generally,

and in particular will rudely yank the college doors wide open more or less along the lines of the pattern in the United States. Certainly, the problem of numbers cannot be solved by the easy solution of exclusion, and in fact I predict that the numbers probably will be arbitrarily increased in magnitude by about 20 per cent in the near future through a yielding to social pressures in the matter of admission requirements.

Mr. Chairman, here is a man whose reputation is so unchallenged in government circles that I think we have to pause and reflect upon the full significance of what he said. He has said that educational standards of admission have been raised some 40 per cent in some universities to the point that he would be excluded today. And I may add, so would I, for reasons that I will not go into in detail here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I might be, too.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister says he might, too. I think we should get that on the record so as to enlarge this goodly company who would be deprived of the rights of higher education in this day and age.

But he also says that the pressures are going to follow along the lines of what has happened in the United States and I want to come to that. Let us just see what has happened in the United States as compared with Canada, that these pressures are going to force university doors to be opened so that it is likely that the university requirement will be 20 per cent over figures that we have been dealing with.

Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, the projections for 91,000 students in 1970 may well be 110,000 students in 1970, as these pressures now begin to exert themselves. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I think it is well for us to take cognizance of just how far behind the general North American pattern we are in providing opportunities for higher education. The latest figures—forgive me for quoting from *Canada Month* but I happened to come across this; it is not one of my usual sources of quotation, I can assure you—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can get the hon. member the same quotation from a better source.

Mr. MacDonald: These are reliable statistics in this instance. They point out that in 1962, 12.3 per cent of our college-age students were in colleges, that is the age of 18 to 21. To be fair, Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether that 12 per cent includes our Grade 13, which really should be a college

bracket. If it does not, the figure might be closer to 15 or 16 per cent. But at the same time that our figure was 12 per cent, in the United States it was 39.5 per cent. They point out that in Sheffield's projection—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Has the hon. member got the quotation of the British figure?

Mr. MacDonald: No, but it is much smaller, incredibly smaller. I shall not go into the details of the Robbins report which documents how small the British figure is by comparison.

However, let us get back to Sheffield's projection, because they point out that Sheffield's projection for 1970 envisages 21 per cent enrolment of the college age bracket, 18 to 21, as compared with our present 12. By that time they expect that the American figure will have risen from 39.5 to 45 per cent. In other words, the only point I am making, Mr. Chairman, in passing, is that the figures that we have been working with have been modest figures. They are going to end up with the opportunity for higher education going to only half the same percentage of college-age students as will be the case in the United States by 1970. Therefore we should not under any circumstance entertain the proposition that the projections that we have been living with are really too high, that they are going to be reduced.

Let me get back to the theme that I was trying to follow here. In face of all this, it has been contended repeatedly throughout this session by the government that, "We are facing this problem and we are meeting it." They started with the Throne Speech, when they said that "We are in a position to cope with the impending crisis of numbers in 1965." The advisory committee report was made available to us a week or so ago and on page three there is one sentence which says:

The provisions which have been made to date for enrolment have been a little ahead of schedule.

Now we have the hon. Minister coming into the House and contending that we are ahead of schedule, in fact, with the refinement of figures he gives us, we are going to be ahead of schedule this fall, with a surplus of either 1,400 or some 2,600 places for students.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is good once again to go back and take a look at the studies that were made, not just the Jackson and the Sheffield studies, but the Deutsch report. The Deutsch report, when it was

made to this House in 1963, I believe it was prepared in 1962—pointed out that by the year 1965 there was going to be a deficiency of 6,000 places in universities in the province of Ontario, and that this deficiency would rise to 10,000 places by 1966 and to between 20,000 and 30,000 places in 1970. This was the clear-cut warning of the Deutsch committee, as a result of which it made recommendations to this government.

What were those recommendations, Mr. Chairman? They were that the government should give consideration to the creation, to the launching, if you will, of some three or four new institutions. There should be a new institution of higher learning in the Niagara peninsula, and they suggested that it should aim for a student population of 1,000 in 1965 to be able to close this gap. They suggested that there should be two colleges in the Metro area, now named Scarborough and Erindale, and each of these should be in a position to accommodate 1,000 students by 1965. And finally, they proposed that we should have an independent university in the Guelph complex and that by 1965 it should have capacity for some 500 students.

The interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is that the Deutsch report in effect envisaged a closing of this gap of 6,000 by only 3,500—1,000 from each of these three new institutions, plus 500 from Guelph—so they were not closing the gap completely.

Let us analyze what are the up-to-date prospects for each of these new institutions. The hon. Minister draws a very interesting little red herring across the trail by saying that some of these institutions are ahead of schedule because they are going to open up in temporary quarters—which have been made available through finances advanced by the government—this fall rather than 1965, but the student body will be only 100. I am not deploring the making of a start because they will cope with a lot of their problems and iron them out, but it is only 100, and in the overall picture it is only a drop in the bucket.

The prospects, insofar as the hon. Minister has brought us up to date, are that by 1965 you will have not 1,000 students in Brock but only 500, not 1,000 students in Scarborough but only 500, not 1,000 students in Erindale but zero, because Erindale will not be opened at least until 1966, other than perhaps on this experimental 100 student body proposition. At Guelph, presumably, you will have 500, so that instead of closing the gap of 6,000 with 3,500, the hon. Minister is going to be closing that gap as the Deutsch report foresaw it, with three new

universities each having facilities of 500 more, a total of only 1,500.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member but I think when he is relating these figures he must also accept the possibility, indeed it is a fact now, that some of the existing institutions have expanded their facilities more rapidly than was anticipated in the original Deutsch report, but I will get into this in greater detail when I reply.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it, and perhaps this is some small measure of the discrepancy that I am trying to analyze here and clarify, but my understanding from the Deutsch report was that they got from the universities a commitment to expand beyond their plans in 1962 and 1963; and that the gap was still going to be 6,000. Therefore, they propose these three or four new universities. So that my understanding, up until now, was that the expansion of the existing universities has been taken into account in these calculations.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me get back now to the present position at which the hon. Minister says we are. He contends that we shall have this fall, 38,100 students at all levels in the university, and that there will be some 40,750 places. Or more accurately, he said some 39,000 and some hundred places.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, once again I apologize for interrupting. If the hon. member will recall my statement accurately, the total number of students in provincially assisted universities will be about 38,100. All these studies, if memory serves me correctly, are based on the entire province, and the estimates for all types of university related accommodation.

As the hon. member is, I am sure, well aware, Waterloo Lutheran has 1,200, or will have in 1964-65; Guelph 1,800; Ottawa University, other than medicine and science, around 2,900; the preliminary year at several universities—which we do not include in the figures—I have given as around 500 for a total of 6,440; OCE, 800; Library School, 105; the denominational and theological colleges somewhere around 700, and the College of Art and the technology division of the Lakehead College, something over 1,000. This totals, Mr. Chairman, 9,137 for 1964-65. And these, Mr. Chairman, are not included when I refer to the provincially assisted universities. I think this figure, perhaps, will make up for a very large portion of the

discrepancy which the hon. member is concerned about.

Mr. MacDonald: I wish I could say that the hon. Minister has clarified the picture. Just let me go on and present to him the basics as I see them.

I have tried to remind the House that the estimated figures that we have been living with, if anything, are on the conservative side and why they are on the conservative side. Indeed, we may be working for an objective in 1970 that is too low.

Let me go back to what the Deutsch prediction was for 1964-65. Estimate number five, which has been accepted by the university presidents, establishes the projection for this fall at 46,300. When Dr. Jackson reviewed this in his presentation to the Canadian Education Association in Quebec City last September, his projection—as found on page 16 of his speech—is for 45,300 to 45,400. Let us settle on a figure between 45,000 and 46,000. He has said since that he feels this figure should be revised upwards. This certainly means—and this is what I want the hon. Minister to address himself to some time—that the hon. Minister is coming in and saying we will have 38,000 students, whereas Dr. Jackson and everybody else has said we should be having this year between 45,000 and 46,000.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will try to make this clear for the hon. member right now. I think we can accept, as one basis to work from at least, the estimate of Dr. Jackson. I have some very recent information. I called Dr. Jackson in Kingston yesterday. But dealing with the other aspect for the moment, I have stated that on the information that is available to the university committee and to the department, we will have 38,100 and that we will have space for approximately 39,500—or, if he wants to, use the other figure 40,750. These are for the provincially assisted institutions. Out of that has been taken certain areas like OCE, which we do help finance, but they are not included in the figure when we refer to provincially assisted institutions. So that adding to the 39,500 figure for 1964-65 you will have enrolled in these other institutions something in excess of 9,000 students.

Our best estimate is that we will have accommodation in 1964-65 for roughly 48,500. From this, we would anticipate, if we include this 9,000 figure as being related to the number of students attending these institutions, somewhere in the neighbourhood of, perhaps, 46,000 or 47,000 students who may

be anxious to enter these institutions. What the hon. member has to do is add the places available in the non-provincially assisted institutions to the 39,500; taking the lower figure. The hon. member will find that we are not very far away. In fact, we are ahead of the estimate that we call estimate five prepared by Dr. Jackson. I hope I have made myself clear, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the hon. Minister, while he is on his feet, what are the institutions again that he has listed that are not provincially assisted?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. Waterloo Lutheran University, 1,200; the Federated Colleges at Guelph, 1,800; Ottawa University—we have deducted from this number the medicine and science faculties because they are provincially assisted—2,940; the preliminary year at several universities where there will be roughly 500 students which are not included in our other estimates; for a total of 6,440. Then there is the OCE and the Library School for 900. Then there is Huron College and Brescia College for 702. These are not provincially assisted but they will accommodate this number of students in 1964-65. Then we have the Ontario College of Art and the technology division at the Lakehead College, for an additional 1,090, making a total of 9,000 plus. These, Mr. Chairman, should be added to the figure of 39,500 if we take the lower figure.

Mr. MacDonald: I thank the hon. Minister. I think I see it now. All I can say to him is that I hope, in some fashion or other, he gets this information out to the public. While he maybe was able to contact a lot of the people now at a conference in Kingston, I was not able to but I did contact a considerable number of people in university circles here in Toronto over the weekend and since then. They were as mystified as I was. I see the explanation now and I think it should be communicated, if possible.

However, all that this really does, Mr. Chairman, if we move forward into other aspects of the problem of higher education, is to remove the problem of the crisis of numbers from the government's complacency. I will concede to the hon. Minister that he has now resolved—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one thing very clear: This government is not the least bit complacent when it comes to post-secondary education. We regard it as a very serious problem.

Mr. MacDonald: I hold in my hand an editorial of the *Globe and Mail* of February 10th which opens thus:

The Ontario government took a complacent view of the progress of the universities in its review of provincial affairs presented in the Throne Speech at the opening of the Legislature last month: "With the assistance of substantial government grants, our universities are continuing to expand at a rate sufficient to meet the needs of the rapidly increasing numbers of young people seeking university education."

These reassuring words were true as far as they went, but there are a number of critics who think that they did not even begin to discuss the real problems of the universities.

I am one who agrees with that. I want to go on now to deal with some of these other problems because, if I may just state generally the position of the New Democratic group in this House, we have serious misgivings—as I think everybody in the higher education level has. Let me rephrase that. We have some misgivings with regard to the proposition of establishing a Department of University Affairs.

We were cognizant of the sensibilities of people in university circles with regard to interference in university independence and autonomy. But despite these undercurrents, the university presidents chose not to be articulate on the point. They have accepted the proposition of this department. We, therefore, I think, have no alternative than to go along with it.

However, Mr. Chairman, in the government's decision as to the relationship that will be established between this new department and the university, I want to suggest that our misgivings are so great as to on some occasions be opposed to specific proposals the hon. Minister has made, or that the government has made. I want to deal with those now.

In the first place, for example, I think one should take note of the fact that there has been a strange sort of unwillingness to communicate publicly on some of these matters on the part of the government and to a degree even more—and I say this frankly and pointedly—on the part of university presidents. Bascom St. John had an article in which he referred to the people who are speaking for universities, it was on February 10, and his comment was that "There have been individual exceptions, but on the whole our university people had been modest to the point of inaudibility."

This is a pretty accurate description. One could talk with them personally, and hear a good deal of grumbling and objection, but for some reason or other they will not raise their voices. It is fear of the reaction from the government; and it is complicated by a feeling that they are in a competitive position—which surely is the height of folly—with other institutions of higher learning, with the result that they all want to play it cozy and quiet. It is not out in the open where, I submit to the hon. Minister and to the hon. Prime Minister, it should be if we are going to build public interest and support for the needs of higher education at the present time.

There was one rather interesting exception to this. It comes from a man whom I had assumed for other reasons the Ministers of this government had confidence in, and I am referring to Dr. Hagey of Waterloo. They had sufficient confidence in him that they chose him to head their Medicare or medical insurance investigation—if I do not intrude that nasty word Medicare where the government does not want it. But on March 4, Dr. Hagey really spoke forth. He said, for example, as quoted in the *Globe and Mail*:

Last year the government grants were \$26,000 short of the funds requested for the university.

Sorry. It was \$26 million. And he added:

It is now well known that the university grants in the new budget are \$39 million short of that requested by the university.

In other words, if the universities last year were asking for approximately \$96 million and they got \$70 million, this year they are asking for \$140 million and they got \$101 million.

Now this is a pretty important statement, in view of the mechanism that the government has decided they are going to establish. Indeed, in the supplementary reports to the Deutsch report on behalf of the university presidents, they complain that they are not going to be able to meet the objectives of 1965 in expanding their facilities, because last year they got only 60 per cent of the capital grants they required.

This brings us, Mr. Chairman, into the whole sensitive area of the relationship of the universities to the government within the format of The Department of University Affairs that the government has now established.

The hon. Minister intervened once or twice when the hon. member for Brant was speaking and he was trying to solicit from

the hon. member for Brant some of his thoughts in exploring these sensitive areas. It was a very skillful little intervention on his part. Well, I want to meet head on his proposal for exploring some of these, because I have some specific suggestions to make and some of them are in opposition to the proposals the government has made. But first I want to quote Bascom St. John again, who on April 26, just a couple of weeks ago, made this observation:

It might be said that the method the government chose would be the test of its sincerity in proclaiming its desire to preserve university autonomy.

I concede to the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister sincerity on their part in wanting to maintain the independence and the autonomy of young universities, but I think Bascom St. John has put his finger on the acid test. The acid test of sincerity is the machinery we are willing to establish, and in the light of experience in Canada and elsewhere, whether or not you have chosen that particular machinery which will least intervene, which will create the least danger of intervention in university affairs and university independence. I want to suggest to the government that this is precisely what they have not done.

For example, let us consider the advisory committee. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in my view the advisory committee has outlived its usefulness. Lest anybody suggest that this is just my view alone, I think it is rather interesting and useful to turn to the comments that have been made by a number of people.

I turn first, for example, to the annual report of Dr. Claude Bissell of the University of Toronto. On page six of the *Varsity Graduate* reproduction he said this:

The advisory committee on university affairs has been a useful intermediate stage and has worked with the committee of presidents in the establishment of several co-ordinating programmes but it appears likely that a stronger and more representative body will be needed in the near future.

Now, at least, he was very seriously criticizing the present status of the committee, if not indeed suggesting that the day had passed for a useful contribution from the advisory committee. Dr. Bissell is one, I would say, who along with the university presidents has tended to talk in somewhat muted tones. Indeed I hear that there has been an exchange of letters between Dr. Bissell and the

"Laird of Lindsay," Mr. Frost, in which, if it could be published, you might have about as forthright a discussion of some of these very delicate problems in relation between university and the government as is possible. I wonder if the hon. Minister cannot persuade the two principals involved to publish them; then we could get this discussion going.

Some newspapermen succeeded in digging out some of the buried facts with regard to representations on these delicate issues such as the university faculties report that the *Globe and Mail* dug out a couple of months ago, and I want to come to that in a moment. Nobody has succeeded in unearthing for the public this alleged correspondence between Mr. Frost and Dr. Bissell.

However, there was Dr. Bissell's view. The *Globe and Mail* editorial that I quoted from a moment ago though, had a comment with regard to the advisory committee. This is what they said; it was on February 10:

The existing advisory committee on university affairs has wholly failed to do the job required of it and might well be courteously retired.

There was a second view. Let us take a look, for example, at a couple of comments that Bascom St. John has made with regard to the university advisory committee. He refers to it as:

An amateurish and unsatisfactory advisory committee in university affairs that the government has on its hands.

This is one of the problems of the government, in his view.

I have here a quotation that was carried in the *Toronto Telegram* on March 19 quoting Dr. R. G. Stanton, editor-in-chief of the *Ontario Mathematics Gazette* from the University of Waterloo in which he said:

The former Ontario Premier, Leslie Frost, failed to recognize the approaching university problem during his term of office.

He made a charge in the latest issue of the magazine, usually read only by professional mathematicians and teachers, that the provincial government is not only lax in support for provincial universities in the past but it is still so. The tragedy here, Mr. Chairman, is that a great deal of this criticism, perhaps for understandable reason, is tending to be focused on Mr. Frost so that the usefulness of his contribution, because of the growing criticism, is being seriously brought into question. Finally, you had the observations of the university faculty, the Ontario Council of University Faculties, as found on page 32

to 34 of their report. This is what they have to say on page 33:

With all due respect we observe that the members of the advisory committee cannot be accepted to have an intimate knowledge of university matters since none of them have had the experience as a university teacher or administrator. They are all busy men with many other responsibilities both public and private.

There can be no question that comprehensive and continuous review of university matters is necessary, but we strongly believe that the committee as constituted and staffed at present is not an appropriate body to undertake it. In addition, we believe that the responsibility for providing informed and comprehensive advice does not lie with the body which determines the provincial grants to universities.

Then they go on to make specific proposals that I want to come back to in a moment.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think it rather significant to take note of what the advisory committee on university affairs itself had to say. Indeed, in the latter part of their report, they say this, on page 18:

The new department will relieve the advisory committee of a number of functions it is now performing and may indeed remove any necessity for the advisory committee to continue.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, let it be said of the advisory committee that they are becoming sufficiently sensitive to the growing feeling that they had outlived their usefulness and the mounting tide of criticism particularly in university circles with regard to their role, that they themselves suggested to the government that perhaps the time had come for them to pass out of the picture. In Dr. Bissell's term they had served very effectively at an intermediate stage.

The government in its wisdom has said no. It has reappointed the advisory committee. It says it is going to expand its personnel.

However, it has not, as far as I have been able to discern, clarified exactly what is going to be the function of the advisory committee now that The Department of University Affairs has been set up.

This brings us to a second aspect about which we in the New Democratic Party have such serious misgivings that they go to the point of being opposition. This is to the government's proposal for a capital aid corporation, as a device, for making money available on a loan basis to the universities

to meet their current needs and then to cope with the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think we should make it very clear this does not extend to current needs. This is for capital.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry. I meant current expansion needs, the present expansion of the universities. Again, if it will not provoke them to some sort of frenzy—some of the government backbenchers to my left here—I want to make a couple of quotations from J. Bascom St. John. He has reflected on this issue with regard to the role of the grants committee or this capital aid corporation. On April 27, Bascom St. John said this:

All submissions for capital assistance will be made to the new department and only on recommendation of the Minister will loans be made by the new capital aid corporation. Surely this will not provide the assurance of autonomy that the universities desire nor does it assure the public that the government realizes what its responsibility is in this vital field.

The following day he had this to add:

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that the Premier has stated with unquestionable sincerity that there is no intention of interference with the autonomy of the universities, it remains true that The Department of University Affairs will exercise such an interference every time it says it will not approve a request from a university. The government has kept university affairs in politics by the method it has adopted. Under the scheme it has adopted the government will be directly involved in specific decisions on each and every building project and with the administrative budget of each university.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, Bascom St. John has contended, and I am inclined to agree with him, that the government's decision that the size of grants is going to rest now with the Minister instead of with the university advisory committee presenting recommendations to the Minister, is going to result in an intervention in the independence and the autonomy of the university each time it is done. When one takes into account along with that, Mr. Chairman, that this capital aid corporation is going to be administered by a committee of five—why in heaven's name you need five people to make decisions with regard to what grants are going to be made to universities, I do not know; indeed, it reminds one of an earlier comment—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman that the hon. member has been quoting, Mr. St. John, and I think he raised this in his article as well, if I recall it correctly. I should point out that the Crown corporation will not assess the applications for loans. It will not make the decisions. Its function will be the same as with any other Crown corporation, to market the debentures and look after the financial aspects of it.

I question the thought that Mr. St. John expressed that this in itself was any infringement on autonomy at all. I cannot follow this argument, because to me it is strictly a financial matter. The Crown corporation is responsible for the making available of the funds and the marketing—or however these matters are done, I am not that familiar with it—of the actual bonds or debentures. These gentlemen that you refer to are not related in any way to the project or the type of application or the monies being lent to the universities.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister has really raised a new problem and that is that all these men are going to do is administer a corporation which will decide how much money will be sent out once the decision has come from the Minister. As Bascom St. John has quite rightly suggested, this is a bureaucrat's dream that you should have five people assessing what the Minister has already decided, when all you need is a good-grade clerk and stenographer who is going to see that the cheques are made out and mailed after the Minister has made his decision.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be a financier, but if you are going to market \$2 million or \$3 million in debentures to cover this, there is no problem making out the cheques. But I suggest there may be some problem in arranging for the money. This is the duty of this corporation and I suggest that a clerk, with due respect to the ability of the clerk, whoever he may be, is not really up to doing this kind of task.

Mr. MacDonald: I can come back and quote Bascom St. John for his own defence.

The above procedure, as a means of financing university groups, seems to be a bureaucrat's dream—wasteful and expensive to administer. Surely in all of the administration of The Department of the Treasury, once you have decided—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, there is no cost of administration. It will be con-

ducted from the Treasury in exactly the same way the Ontario Municipal Loan Development Fund is operated.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: And this will involve no other personnel. The decision is made and then the financing is done. Now I read Mr. St. John's article. He is a little concerned about the complication of the bill. The complication of the bill comes about because in order to sell a debenture it is necessary to have statutory authority to do certain things. In other words, a clerk cannot sit in a back room and sign a debenture and proceed to sell it. It is a technical matter, you know this, and the man who buys a debenture is looking for the security for the money he is putting up. He wants to know: Do you have legal power to sign this debenture? Are these people properly authorized? Where is the statute? And so on and so forth. To any lawyer who has practised in the financial world, this is standard form. You may wonder sometimes when you buy a debenture yourself or a share of stock, with all the material that appears on it, but this is to meet certain legal requirements and really, in fact, is an administrative problem. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the purpose of the corporation in assisting in the financing.

I will have something to say about this later on. I do not want to get into the purposes of the corporation, but I do want to point out that many of these things are purely technical. We are following the form we have used in dealing with the municipal fund, which is now a revolving fund in that so much goes out and so much comes in on a continuous basis. This is the purpose for—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to spend too much time on this because I want to get back to the real problem of the relationships of government and university and this is an administrative detail. But I want to touch on the proposition that the Minister is going to make the decision as to how much money is going to be out, and then the collective decisions are going to be handed over to a group of five who are going to cope with the problems of raising this money. Certainly they need statutory requirements, this is obvious. But why do you have to have a separate body to raise each allotment of money that is required for the government? You must have any number of officials in the Treasury, because this government is going to finance the refunding and the repayment of these loans through grants

to the universities later. This is Parkinson's law in full force here, in terms of setting up new organizations to do each job.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to the main point. That this administrative detail, and the government does not think it is complicated, is of secondary concern. The main concern is the proposition which, once again, Bascom St. John has put it in these terms:

In effect, therefore, the total a university has to spend in any one year is decided by the government, not by the university. It is not surprising that universities feel that they are losing their freedom and autonomy. This is an intolerable situation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if I may. Mr. Minister, please! I am trying to get my sequence of thoughts down here. You have had your chance and you will have a chance again. I welcome some later explanation of it.

But I am submitting to you that in the particular technique that you have chosen, you are going to not only give the appearance but it will be a reality of intervening in university affairs. It will be an unnecessary intervention because there is another way in which it could be done.

I want to turn now to that other way. In fact, if I may just conclude by going back some months when Bascom St. John was projecting what was going to come from this government following the Throne Speech, he had a very harsh comment. This is back on February 10. He said:

The problem facing Premier John Roberts is gigantic and we have a great deal of sympathy for him, but he is headed for disaster, educational or political, if he does not make a clean break with past methods and past mentalities.

And I submit to the hon. Minister, in recapitulating what I have said so far, that in perpetuating the advisory committee—which is rapidly losing the confidence of the people involved—you are perpetuating these mentalities. In perpetuating this kind of a procedure by which the government is going to make the decision on grants you will be intervening in university affairs each time you are doing it. You have chosen a technique which is going to be interpreted, and quite rightly so, as an unnecessary intervention into university affairs.

What is the alternative? Mr. Chairman, there is an alternative. It is a tried alternative. It is the alternative. I will not repeat

by going back into the Robbins report that the hon. member for Brant quoted at considerable length. It is the university grants committee. Now the grants committee is not a perfect technique. There were growing suggestions before the Robbins report came out that even the university grants committee in Great Britain was, behind the scenes, influenced unnecessarily and to a considerable degree by the government. But it still lessens to the greatest extent possible the intervention of the government in university affairs, an objective which you have set for yourself. I credit you with sincerity in stating it, but what I am now deploring is that you have chosen techniques that mean that your sincere objective is not going to be fulfilled to the extent that it might.

But let us not go over to Great Britain. Let us come back to Ontario, because here you have a group of people who are very interested in this matter—the council of university faculty members. They have come up, without going into the detail of quotations, concerning their position with a double suggestion—that there should be an academic advisory committee, which is going to look after all matters other than grants to the universities, and that you should separate the two functions.

You should not have the same body trying to do the two jobs. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, in my view this is the kind of body that would be one of the many sub-committees to a continuing committee of investigation into education which I suggested to the hon. Minister earlier in the estimates.

Along with your academic advisory committee you would have a grants committee. On this grants committee you would have people who have university administrative experience, just as you would have people with academic experience on the other. But they would be people who could speak from a knowledge and not just the certain detachment of having been Premier of the province in years gone by and coped with the problems, or having been a publisher and conceivably sat on the board of governors of the university; but people who are personally familiar with the field. This the government has chosen not to do. The Minister is going to make the decisions with regard to the grants, conceivably with some advice from the advisory committee. I do not know whether they are going to have a continuing role in this connection.

In this respect, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the government that I think they are wrong. I think that they should establish

a grants committee that could be interposed between the government and the universities. It would, as has been spelled out in the experience in Britain and as spelled out by the university faculties brief here, sit down with the universities, assess their overall needs and come up with an aggregate figure which they will present to the government. If the government says we cannot meet that figure, then they go back and reassess what kind of pro rata reduction in the overall grants they are going to have to make to meet the needs of each individual university.

In this way you will eliminate, to the extent that it is humanly possible, the contention that there is intervention in university affairs. You have not done it and, therefore, you have not fulfilled the sincere objective the hon. Minister has proclaimed on a great number of occasions.

Mr. Chairman, there are two other points that I want to touch on briefly, primarily to request comments from the hon. Minister.

I was interested in reading the Robbins report their emphasis in providing opportunities for higher education to foreign students. The last time I raised this in the House I immediately got some interjections from certain quarters of the House. If we are going to be crowded in getting our own children into the universities, are you suggesting that the foreign students will go there first? I hope that we can be civilized and mature enough not to sink to this kind of attitude.

I would agree that Canadian universities in the overall picture today have an obligation as a member of the world family of nations to provide opportunities for higher education to university students from abroad. In Great Britain, it is some 10 per cent. Indeed it rises to something over 30 per cent in the post-graduate courses, if I recall the figure correctly. However, I will say this to the hon. Prime Minister and to the hon. Minister: I think that this government has a very strong case—I am curious to know of either the hon. Prime Minister or the hon. Minister whether they have presented this case at Ottawa at the federal-provincial conferences—that Canada's contribution in providing opportunities for higher education to foreign students is obviously part and parcel of our external affairs programme. And, therefore, the universities of the province of Ontario should be reimbursed to the extent that they are providing these facilities. This is not a new suggestion on my part. I made it last fall during the election campaign as part of a general plea that, if the government could not

meet the needs of the universities adequately, they should go to Ottawa and lay it on the line. Either meet them adequately here or go to Ottawa and ask for assistance.

Without getting into the broader issue, I think we have a solid case with regard to foreign students to go to Ottawa and say this is part of our relationship with the Commonwealth and with the rest of the world through the United Nations. Therefore, Ottawa can—without getting into constitutional problems of provincial jurisdiction over education—make this kind of a grant. I ask the hon. Minister, when he comments later, will he indicate whether or not that kind of grant has been explored with the federal government?

The second issue I want to raise with the hon. Minister because I, personally, am as worried about this as I am about anything on the level of higher education. I do not know what the answer is to it and I am interested to know whether the hon. Minister can answer it. We can build the buildings; we can find the money if we are determined to do it; but we cannot acquire the staffs that may be necessary to teach this tidal wave of students that will be with us—not just in 1965, but for the next generation or more through to about the year 2,000. This is another point that Dr. Jackson has emphasized.

Some years ago, as Dr. Northrop Frye commented in an address that he gave down at the Kenneth E. Norris memorial lecture at Sir George Williams University this past winter, back in the depression years a university teacher had a very lowly status. He—Dr. Frye—put it in rather a colourful way. He said that during the depression “the younger university instructor had approximately the social status of a door-to-door pencil salesman.” He contrasted that with the intensely competitive position that the university teacher finds himself in today. In fact, his description, in an equally colourful way, was that the situation of the instructor today is a very different one. Instead of having a status of a door-to-door pencil salesman he now has, or soon will have, approximately the social status of a free taxi in the pouring rain.

This is something of which we simply have got to take greater cognizance. I give full credit to the government in its post-graduate scholarship—the \$1,500,000 that was made available last year and the \$2 million that is going to be available in the coming year. I will say that on this occasion the government perhaps is as close as they have ever been to

claiming that this was a programme without parallel on the North American continent, or even the universe, in that grandiose fashion to which they sometimes lay claim.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think we might as well face the fact that salaries to university teachers in the province of Ontario are from \$3,000 to \$10,000 less a year than they are in the United States, as pointed out in the faculty brief.

Indeed, as the hon. member for Brant noted, one of the ironies—showing that we still have not escaped completely the status of the depression years—is that there are universities in the province of Ontario where this year, in negotiations for salary revision, the faculty association has set as their objective that they will get salaries equivalent to secondary school teachers in the province of Ontario.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) might be rather startled if he knew which university it is.

This just reveals how much further we have to go. In the brief of the faculty, they emphasize the watering down of the standards in university teaching. The fact that so many of the newcomers are just lecturers, that there are so many fewer PhDs means that they simply are not going to be in a position to meet the needs, to meet the rights, of the students. You have a "body" before the class, just as we had bodies when we were taking crash programmes to get public and secondary school teachers in the province of Ontario, but we are not going to have adequately qualified people.

What is the answer to this? I concede to the hon. Minister that this is perhaps the main responsibility of the universities, or is in the main the responsibility of the universities.

The government has made its contribution in part through the post-graduate scholarships, but does the hon. Minister think, for example, that there is any possibility of recruitment from other areas of the economy; for example from industry, in some areas where qualified people with post-graduate qualifications could be recruited?

I have wondered, and indeed I discussed this at one time with Dr. Jackson who seemed to be inclined to think that there was something in it, that if one were really to fine-tooth comb the community, we would find that there were many people who had post-graduate experience; graduates from universities in Europe who could be drawn back into teaching at the university level, perhaps with some limited amount of post-graduate work to get back into the field again.

In this context I think, for example, there has to be something done to shake the academic world out of a pretty deeply imbedded prejudice against women as teachers at the higher educational level.

But all of these, I have a deep seated feeling, are only gestures toward meeting a desperate need, a need which is revealed in the fact that a year ago there were 2,100 teachers on the staffs of Ontario universities and it is estimated that by 1970 they will need anywhere from 7,500 to something over 8,000.

Now does the government really think that the steps they have taken, and that the universities are taking, are going to provide this staff? Because if they do not think it is going to be provided it is rather idle for us to build the buildings and to crowd the students in when perhaps all we will have is mass TV circuits to provide the freshman class and not be able to meet the needs of honour students and post-graduate students and all those other areas that make a university into something more than a glorified secondary school.

I solicit the hon. Minister's comments on that last but most important problem in higher education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavour to answer as best I can the, shall we say technical, questions posed by the hon. member for York South and by the hon. member for Brant. The hon. Prime Minister will be dealing with the overall policy or the principles expressed in the bills.

Dealing with the last question raised by the hon. member for York South, he will be interested to have the following salary figures from the University of Toronto. The deans at the university are earning roughly \$17,868; the professors with administrative duties around \$17,152 down to associate professors at \$10,000; assistant professors are at \$8,000 and lecturers at \$6,600.

I think there is no question that it would be very foolish for me to stand up here and say that we will not have a problem with staff, because I think it is quite obvious that we will have to exert every ingenuity to see that we have sufficient staff in the universities.

The graduate fellowship programme is almost doubled this year and I think we can draw some very substantial encouragement from this. Yet the one problem we face is that there is no guarantee that these people who hold the graduate fellowships are necessarily going to remain with universities. But I think hon. members would acknowledge

that this is a very forward step. In my questioning of Dr. Jackson yesterday I specifically asked him about the staff situation and he felt that we had made tremendous strides in this regard and that there was a possibility with the graduate fellowship programme that we would go a long way to meeting the staff problems.

I think that it is also possible that we can recruit staff from other jurisdictions. As a matter of fact the University of Toronto is recruiting staff now in Great Britain, as I am sure the hon. member knows. I have discussed the other aspect with Dr. Jackson, the possibility of there being a number of people in business and industry, and I think this is an area too that could be, and probably should be, explored.

I suggest to you that the numbers of students in the graduate fellowship programme are significant and I think we can draw some real encouragement from this; but to say that this alone will solve the problem, Mr. Chairman, I would not say.

Dealing with the question of non-resident pupils, I think the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) asked this question last year as to the percentage of students from outside the jurisdiction who were attending the University of Toronto. I do not have the specific information here, but I think it was in the neighbourhood, roughly, of from eight per cent to ten per cent. Now whether this applies generally across Ontario, I do not know. I would think, for instance, at the University of Windsor there would be a fair percentage of, say, American students. While the provincial average may not be eight per cent or ten per cent, I would agree, Mr. Chairman, that there should be a number of outside-the-jurisdiction students attending our universities.

I think we do have an obligation, and we have recognized this in that we are permitting 20 per cent of the graduate fellowships for non-resident students. In this way we hope to encourage students from outside the province to come here for their post-graduate work and we are hoping, of course, that as a result they will remain here in our universities and this is a very genuine attempt to meet the problem.

I wish to deal with the segment that the hon. member read of Dr. Jackson's address. It was a very excellent speech he made. I was at the educational association gathering—it was the day after the election, sir, if memory serves me correctly—and seeing as the hon. member has quoted one section from it, I want to just quote another for the

record, because I know he would be interested in having this part quoted.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I know which one that is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Dr. Jackson says here, dealing with forecasts:

I urge every province to make such forecast and then publish them together with their proposals for meeting the needs so revealed. May I remind you that our province, Ontario, has done so and that our government has issued a comprehensive statement of policy on the matter? Knowing the comments made from time to time about staid, conservative Upper Canada, I may be granted a moment to gloat and to frame a challenge to each of the other provinces to match, or surpass, if you can, our efforts!

Quebec may have already done so, and that is one of the things I wish to investigate later on. Still, there you have it; the picture of prospective university enrolment; Ontario as a model, and as a challenge.

What more could you ask for in one afternoon? I just want that to be part of the record.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, all I can say, in the kindest way possible, is that he is a civil servant and he has to live with you people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for Dr. Jackson. The hon. member expressed the same regard, and quoted from certain sections of his speech. I thought it only appropriate that we quote other sections as well.

Dealing with the matter of projections, Mr. Chairman, this is an area that I think we must be concerned about. The advisory committee has been going primarily on what we refer to as estimate No. 5. I hope I have cleared up, to a degree at least, the problem in the minds of the hon. members with respect to 1964. I think this has resolved the problem about the estimate. The hon. member for Brant asked for this. The 1965-1966 estimate is 54,500; 1967-1968, 73,900; 1969-1970, 88,200, and 1971-1972, 94,200. I am not prepared to say here this afternoon that these figures are the maximum figures. I think that we must accept the fact that they could be higher than this. We must make our plans accordingly and at the same time keep in mind that we do not want to over-extend or to waste funds in so doing.

I quite appreciate the suggestion made by

the hon. member for York South that there is no question that one should not use these as the basic figures. This, of course, is related, in my opinion at least, to the other areas of post-secondary education—the number of students in two or three years' time who may be proceeding to institutes of technology rather than to the universities. This is another area that of course requires study and it is very difficult to determine the exact number. I think it is impossible other than through some form of intensive study and investigation.

Regarding the question of the statements made by certain individuals as to the "shortfall"—I think this has been the popular term used by two or three people commenting on the adequacy or inadequacy of the government's contribution to universities—I have only this to observe, Mr. Chairman, that in the areas of operating grants, in the 1963 grants the universities were given, depending on how you once again want to construe the figures, between 90 and 95 per cent of their total request for operating purposes. This year, 1964, they are once again being given somewhere within that neighbourhood for operating purposes.

The question of capital, Mr. Chairman, becomes difficult, and while I appreciate Dr. Hagey's views in these matters, I would suggest that some of the observations he made and those which appeared in the *Ontario Mathematics Gazette*—I read it very carefully—are made on the basis of misinformation. I think quite frankly that some of the material presented by the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations also was prepared without the full information being available to it as far as capital grants are concerned.

I think this is one of the obvious benefits of the method of financing for capital purposes through the Crown corporation, which the hon. Prime Minister will touch on. That is, instead of the universities coming year by year for a specific allotment, they try to forecast years in advance. They can do this on a continuing basis so that there will be a more comprehensive or intelligent approach to the whole question of capital spending. I would observe to you, without getting into any details, that all the capital available to the universities was not spent when they made their last submission, and this is natural because some projects move more rapidly than others. I think this in itself, Mr. Chairman, would indicate where the idea of a "shortfall," if it were to be called this, might occur in the minds of some people. In fact,

when it comes to the actual construction or the availability of projects, it may not be the fault of the lack of provision of finances as far as the government is concerned.

This is one of the very difficult areas. The advisory committee has contributed, I think, Mr. Chairman, very substantially to the development of universities here in Ontario. I think that while there are many problems to be faced, all of us can take some credit at least today for what has been accomplished. We do not have perfection by any means, but nonetheless we do have a system here that I think does some credit to the entire province.

I have not answered, I am sure, all the specific questions. Perhaps when the hon. Prime Minister has dealt with the overall policy in relation to these, if there is some further information about other specific items that I can give you I will be happy to do so at that time.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to particularly speak about the new department that is being created, which is part of this debate, and also the Ontario University Capital Aid Corporation. I made some comment about the corporation and perhaps I could deal with that first.

We have followed, as I said, the pattern of the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation and while this may appear cumbersome there are very good reasons for it. It is not an exercise in Parkinson. It will involve no new employees as far as the government is concerned. It is just a method of accomplishing what we want to accomplish and the first of these purposes, of course, is to spread the capital cost of our universities over a period of years. I think this is good financing. I think we all realize that we are in an area, or in a situation, where we have to spend very large amounts of money very rapidly. Yet it is not necessarily correct that these should be paid for out of current revenue, nor is it correct that some of the cost of these university facilities in the years ahead should not be borne by those who will benefit from the institutions.

In addition, this corporation will be able to provide funds as they are required without any relation to anybody's particular fiscal year. This, of course, is part of our scheme for easier planning on a long-range basis for our universities. We will make money available to the universities all year around. What happens to them now, and what has happened to them in the past, is that out of current revenue the amount they are to receive is allocated to them. They ask the

government for it as they require it, and when we come to the end of the fiscal year the balance is paid to them. They have, in each year, received the amount that is allocated to them, whether in fact they have used it in that year or not.

You can see this is not a particularly wise way to do business and with a corporation of this type which has funds available to it without relation to our particular Budget here or without relation to the university budgets, money will be available to them all year around. Money will then be available to them on two bases: one, individual project basis, and two, individual project within a term of years. This is what the hon. member for Brant referred to when he spoke rather disparagingly of the fact that two years ago we said, "Well, at least we will guarantee you the amounts that you have had so far in order that you may go ahead and plan."

I think we have to go back and take some sort of an historical look at the development of our university situation in this province if we are to understand and if we are to see the advantages of what we have done. I covered this at some length some days ago, but there are parts of it at least that I will repeat because to me, in any event, there has been a very definite development here. As I pointed out, it goes back to the 1940s when Dr. Wallace was appointed from Queen's. That was the beginning of it and it was a very simple beginning indeed. Subsequent to that, Dr. Althouse, who was chief director of education here and I think a man recognized as one of the leaders in education in our province, took on this task and he followed Dr. Wallace who unfortunately died.

His job in The Department of Education was to co-ordinate university efforts, and to advise the government on what action it should take in the university field. To assist him as the task grew larger, a technical committee was appointed which did not really consist of men who had any particular skill in the university field. I believe that this was pretty well left to Dr. Althouse, but these civil servants were appointed with the idea of analyzing and taking apart the needs and translating them into finances in order to advise the government.

At this time there was encouragement given to the universities to expand. Of course it is necessary to take a look at the programme the universities submit, and it is necessary to take it apart to see whether it is perhaps reasonable or unreasonable. This is the great dilemma in which we find our-

selves when we start talking about the government, which is responsible to the taxpayers providing literally hundreds of millions of dollars every year. Yet in order to preserve autonomy, the idea is advanced that perhaps the government has to take complete control out of its hands and pass it over to an independent body in order that there be no suggestion of any infringement of academic autonomy, or university autonomy.

All I say is that this poses a problem that is well set out in the Robbins report. If you refer to what the government in Britain did, their arrangements are really quite interesting. This is the difficulty that we face. If you look at the history of what we have developed—and this is the reason that I sketched it out the other day and the reason I am mentioning it today—you will see that we have followed a pretty regular pattern of development here.

I concluded with Dr. Althouse, chief director of education within The Department of Education, advising the government and using the work of a technical committee in order to advise the government at one juncture on what he was advising in another stage.

The next step came in 1961. I was Minister of Education myself at that time. I made the recommendation to the Prime Minister of the day that I felt, in any event, we needed a committee to advise the government on university affairs that was made up of people from outside, that is, from outside the government service. Here was born the advisory committee as we know it today.

While it is easy to come along and criticize this committee, in my opinion, and I think it is shared by many people, it has done really quite an enormous task for this government. I think that we should all be grateful to these men. While they may not be men who have been active in the immediate operation of universities, they have all had experience in this area. Certainly they are all men who have had a great deal of experience in administering this type of concern. I personally refuse to cast them aside by just simply saying this man works here and this man works there and this man does something else, as if they did not bring to this task a great deal of very public spirited effort—because they do. I think that they have done a large task indeed.

When we decided that we considered it to be wise to establish a Department of University Affairs in conjunction with this, I

could see another change coming over the advisory committee on university affairs. This I spelled out, perhaps in not sufficient detail, but in any event when I introduced the bill on first reading, in the explanatory remarks I made I said that it was our intent to extend the functions of the advisory board. I went into it in some detail. I will go into that again as well.

The advisory board has been carrying a great load of investigatory work. Indeed, in some areas, administration will be taken from them or they will be provided by services to do these tasks. This work will be done administratively by the new department. I am referring to such things as an analysis of financial statements, and an examination of four- and five-year programmes.

I think we are all aware of what a committee like this can and should do. Its major functions are very great indeed. Some of them have been touched upon by the hon. member for Brant. I must admit that in none of these areas did I make notes on what he said, but he mentioned several things that he felt should be left entirely to the university and in this way I would have no quarrel with him whatsoever.

We, as a government, have no intention whatsoever of interfering in any way with the independence and the autonomy of our universities. We must solve this problem of how we are going to provide very large sums of money, indeed, for our universities. The hon. Minister of Education may choose to give his breakdowns, but I do not have them here. What we are spending for university education in this province on a per pupil basis, both for maintenance and for capital, is something that I think all the people of the province should be very interested in because the figures are truly enormous. Regardless of the fact that your figures indicate that university personnel are underpaid, and I do not think that our record as a government indicates we favour the underpayment of the teaching profession, there is an absolute in this which we must look at. This I will again say is the problem we are trying to solve with the machinery that we are setting up.

In connection with the expansion of the advisory committee, I said it is our feeling, in the light of the already significant contributions it has rendered, that we must continue to derive the benefit of the experienced insight and wise counsel of the advisory committee on university affairs.

I would like to refer to some of the remarks

made by the hon. member for Brant when he said there was some unwillingness to communicate, or that there had been some matters that had been done in secrecy. There really has not been anything secret about the function of the advisory committee on university affairs. Really, this government has accepted its recommendations pretty well as a whole. We have given it a free hand to make the decisions which we see have to be made. In order to preserve academic autonomy, or university autonomy, we may take the advice of the committee. We have established the committee for that purpose. But ultimately we are the people who have to bring in these amounts and present them to this House to be voted. That, of course, will be the function of the Minister of this department.

I had better speak first about the composition of the commission. I have been in touch, of course, and I have had many conferences with many people in the university field. But in order to get at this specific problem, in the last five or six years—longer than that really—but all the time we have been developing this particular organization, which is embodied in these two bills, I have been discussing matters concerning the university affairs committee with various people from the university world, both on a formal and an informal basis. I have had many discussions and, by and large, I think that what we are proposing meets with approval.

I do not know if you can meet that ultimate point of autonomy unless you are prepared just to turn the whole thing over to one group. I do not think this can be done. I think there is an area in here in which we can work out this problem. After all, if we have a university advisory committee—and I realize that the people in the academic world are very interested in serving on the committee—I can see the contribution that they can make. Certainly they will be represented thereon.

I also noticed, in discussing the subject—and I had a long meeting with the committee that presented this brief from which you quoted—it seemed to me that some of the problems they are facing are not with this government, but are with the administration of their own universities. I am quite certain that they will work these things out among themselves, but the logical progression of this advisory committee, in my view, Mr. Chairman, is into the area in which we are putting it. When it is expanded I can see that much of the work it will have to do has to be done by subcommittees of the committee itself. In other words, there is such a vast amount of

research and examination of future programmes, the question of a medical school comes up.

I think we are all agreed we cannot have three universities deciding at once that they are going to each establish a new university. This makes no sense at all. What we need is a group of men who all belong to the university world, plus a leavening of men that belong perhaps to the business world but have connections with universities, and I might say have spent three or four years working on these problems. Surely they will sit down and do the necessary research, and have it done by scholars or whoever must do it, so they can advise this government where we might best put the taxpayers' dollar in order that we have the proper medical care, in order that we have a flow of doctors coming into our society. And of course this applies to dentists, it applies to all the other faculties and disciplines.

So in my view, I see the advisory committee expanded and functioning with the hon. Minister of Education and with this loan fund. I see it all working as a unit in order to provide a vastly more efficient method of dealing with the problem that can only get larger and can never get smaller in the foreseeable future.

I think that in this framework we can achieve what obviously we are all after, because I would disabuse anyone's mind of the idea that secretly we want control of the universities while publicly we say we do not. This is quite wrong. I see the necessity for a university to be completely independent. I think that we have discussed this. I have said it on many occasions and I will say it again. As we put the three items together, then I think we can achieve what we are after.

I would just like to refer to the Robbins report, because it is very interesting—and this is in relation to a point raised by the hon. member for Brant. The Robbins report really recommended on and dealt with four possibilities, none of which exactly fits our situation in Ontario. And of course I think that this is something we must bear in mind. I suppose there is always something about far fields looking greener. We might think that there is something special about a report drawn up in the United Kingdom, but I think their percentage of young people of the age we were discussing, is about half of what it is here.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The figures are not comparable.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is some time since I checked this out, it is some years ago. No, they are not exactly comparable, no figures are.

Mr. Bryden: No, but there is a big area of incomparability here.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There is, and I think that there is a fairly large area of non-comparability between Canada and the United States. I think there are many people who would be classified as perhaps having a university degree there that we would not necessarily—

An hon. member: Flycasting!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, flycasting; I know of one university where you can get a degree in flycasting. That would be a very nice thing to have. I just served an apprenticeship myself, I did not go to university to learn that.

But the point is these things are not comparable. There is rough comparison, in that the British have faced a problem there that is greater than we have faced in this country because in fact over the years they have not done as much about it. I think our neighbours to the south perhaps have gone a bit further in their approach than we have, and perhaps the good old Canadian compromise might be the best course of action after all. I just warn anybody against accepting: (a) the figures that you see with complete faith; and (b) let us not assume just because it was done some place else it is any better than we can do here ourselves.

In any event, the Robbins committee dealt with four different things that might have happened and the four of them are really quite interesting. The first was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who at that time had the responsibility for university matters, that ministerial responsibility should be given to him. They rejected this idea because they thought as Chancellor, who, of course, is the chief financial officer of the government, he could not serve.

I do not know whether they thought there would be a conflict of interest there or not, but the term used is that it would be anomalous for a Minister to hold the responsibility for being guardian of the public purse and at the same time a special claimant on that public purse. Certainly there are going to be very large claims on this portion of the public purse in our future, and this of course is of concern to anyone who has the responsibility for raising money as well as spending.

Then they considered the Lord President of the Council, but he was rejected because he was a Minister without portfolio, and that is of no significance here. Then they thought of the idea of a Secretary of State for Education. Now here is the point that is raised, and this is why the debate takes place as to what is the proper thing to do. The committee rejected this idea despite weighty arguments in its favour, particularly those arguments which concerned a unified approach to and control of education.

Here we get into the whole area, and believe me the debate goes on in Ontario about this, as to whether the universities should be out from under The Department of Education, whether we should have one Ministry here; and I believe the term used by the hon. member for Brant was that we decapitated education. Well, this debate went on in the United Kingdom as well. It was argued that a single Ministry for Education would be too wide to be effective, if you had one to look after everything, and that dealing with universities called for an organization and approach quite different to those which were used for state schools.

In other words, here is a point on which it would be difficult to compare and apply the same principles in respect to operations of one of our state secondary schools as against operating one of our universities. There is much virtue in this argument as I see it.

Third, a university's responsibilities include more than education. There are people who certainly argue this, and of course it all depends how broad the term education is. If you include research perhaps that is so. But in any event, the committee finally decided, after considering these things, on the fourth consideration; and that was they would establish a Minister of Arts and Science. And this is their final decision. There was one note of reservation expressed by one member, otherwise they were unanimous, and this Minister of Arts and Science was to be a single Ministry to control all education.

The Robbins report, of course, has received very wide publicity both in the United Kingdom and here, but the interesting thing is that the Minister of Arts and Science, even though recommended by the committee, was not really received with any unanimous favour. It was the subject of a good deal of controversy. In the controversy were brought up these arguments I have mentioned.

In any event, the next interesting thing, in my view of this story anyway, is: What did the government finally do? It was only in February of this year that the Prime Minister

decided, and I am quoting from *Hansard* of February 6, in which he said:

After taking full accounts of the views that have been expressed I have concluded that the right course is to have a single Minister with total responsibility over the whole educational field who should be Secretary of State to education and science. Under him there will be a single department which will include two distinct administrative units and will give the organization something of a federal character.

So there we have the final decision.

Now in view of this debate, I think it might be wise for me to say that in the opinion of the government, sir, the present hon. Minister of Education should be the Minister of this new department we are creating. This means that perhaps we will have separated the two functions. I agree with the statements made that the administration of university affairs should be separated from the administration of our elementary and secondary school affairs.

We are, in my view, in a formative state in this matter. That is why I have sketched out the history of our committee. You can see that really this committee that is now functioning only goes back to 1961. I think that with this organization, we will be able to get at this problem. I would hope that we will be able to give to the universities that which they require and I might say that I have had few, if any, complaints about the establishment of a separate department. In fact, I cannot think of any individual who has approached me to disagree, and I have discussed this with many people in the university field, naturally. I have heard from nobody that he disagrees with the idea that we would establish a separate department here to look after the university affairs of this province.

I think the hon. member for York South was quite right when he pointed out in his remarks that the advisory committee itself has become aware of the weight of the tasks being carried. It has become aware of the necessity for a greater organization in order to provide the research and the analysis it needs. It has made that feeling known to the government. The committee has been enlarged in order that its duties may be shared more broadly among the members. With the introduction to that committee of people from the academic world and people from the world of university administration—and I think to some extent there is a difference between these two—and with the

introduction to that committee of people who are more intimately associated with the affairs of our universities, if we can put this together with the experience we presently have, then I think that the advice that will be given to the Minister, and which, of course, he will have to translate into action here, will be proper.

I do not anticipate that we will have any difficulty other than the normal difficulties of any human organization. Nor do I think that there will be any difficulty in maintaining that ultimate independence of our universities. I would point out to you, that if there has been any suspicion in anybody's mind that what this committee was doing was in any way secret, I will arrange to have that dispelled. If there is anything that is bothering anybody, we will know about it and surely this will be finally the true test of whether we can create an organization to produce the results I want, and we all want.

Finally, I would just say that I was interested in the first point the hon. member for York South made when he referred to Dr. Jackson's report. Dr. Jackson is not really a civil servant. He is employed by OCE, which is controlled by the University of Toronto. However, that is beside the point. His independence is something that I admire and find to be very refreshing. You quoted from his report and I am not taking issue as the hon. Minister did with the amount you quoted from what he said, but I think you pointed up the real dilemma when you remarked that he said the social pressures were so great they would break down the university doors and open the floodgates. You quoted him as almost saying, or indeed saying, that this social pressure would evidence itself in our society through the action of government. This is being typified by a remark that I made once when I said something to the effect that I thought a good passing mark back in the late 30s when I was a student should be as good now as it was then, namely, a 50 or a 55.

But here is the point we face. We have social pressures that must express themselves through governments and over here we have universities that must be autonomous. Somehow or other, we have to translate social pressures into action and maintain autonomy. This I do not suggest for a second is a simple task, but I am convinced in my own mind that with this arrangement that we are setting up and which will be shortly functioning completely, I would hope, we will be able to solve this very difficult problem. I am so confident that we can, that I would also

tell you that if it proves not to be that way, we will simply have to change it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before the discussion proceeds under this vote, may I ask your guidance on a matter of procedure? The hon. Prime Minister has given us a statement quite appropriately, I think, with regard to the intentions of the government. But for future guidance in the discussions of the committee, may I ask if it is considered in order to discuss the principle of Bills 126 and 127 or should we, as I would think myself might be a better way, reserve that sort of discussion until the bills are actually called for second reading?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, it was my thought that these things were so inextricably bound together that if you wished to discuss the principles, because that really has been what I have been discussing here, although perhaps—

Mr. Bryden: Well, I was ready to make an exception for you.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I am prepared to make an exception for you. There was an arrangement. We had a discussion. The hon. Minister of Education had a discussion before in which I understood it was decided that they could all be discussed at one time. If you prefer it the other way, it does not matter to me. Personally I think the discussions are so tightly bound up I would say that both must be taken together—as the hon. member from Brant said and the hon. member for York South said—and the principles of these bills dealt with as well as the particulars and many other things. There was a crossfire, so if you wish to speak to the principle of the bill in this debate in committee it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, in view of the flexibility provided by the hon. Prime Minister, I would like to go back to some of the remarks by the hon. Minister of Education.

I am taking another aspect from the question of the hon. member for York South. This is in connection with, not foreign students coming to Ontario, but students from Ontario going overseas. I do this, sir, because of a letter I received from a young person who had won an Ontario scholarship. He went to the London School of Economics and he wanted to make use of his scholarship there. As I understand it this is restricted so that he cannot use it there. It would seem to me that we should have a broad view about education. These young people going

abroad are really emissaries for us and they come back again. Why not have it recognized that education transcends national boundaries and have them go? That is my first question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there are two purposes behind these graduate fellowships. The first is, of course, to try to keep the graduate student at the universities here in this province so that he will, we hope, be encouraged to become either a lecturer or eventually a professor at the university. But the other, one of the very prime objects, of course, is to build up the graduate school at the universities here. You cannot build up a graduate school in our universities in this province by awarding fellowships to students to attend graduate schools in other jurisdictions. This is why, to date, we have kept the graduate fellowships for Ontario universities, but at the same time we permit 20 per cent to be awarded to non-resident students.

But I think the hon. member can see the merit in our attempting to build up graduate schools in this province, so that in perhaps a few years it will not be necessary to go to the London School of Economics to get this type of course. This is one of the basic objectives of this programme; not just to provide the fellowship to the individual, but also to build up the graduate faculties here at our various universities.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate the point of the hon. Minister. I do not know if we have statistics on the people who have gone for graduate work outside Canada and the number who are attracted back. I am sure that with new conditions, principally, with respect to staff if we can attract leaders in their field—I am thinking both of academic as well as from industry—that an excitement is aroused. I am referring now to the remarks of the hon. member for York South. One of our dilemmas is trying to attract more staff to provide better training.

I cannot help thinking of the excitement that can come to young people if they know that an acknowledged scholar is the head of a department. I would like to bring up this point about the previous stereotype of the lecturer, or assistant professor during the depression days. When you talked of honouring the people who have made a contribution, I cannot help thinking of Professor Ned Pratt, who passed away recently. Perhaps I can speak with some personal feeling on this because I took courses from him. A man who has been an acknowledged poet of Canada would seem to be appropriate.

Amongst the people to whom we should give acknowledgement, to attract more people to university life, I think that we all recognize that we should give a prestige and a status to the university circle.

I would like to come to another point, which was one about which I got more correspondence than anything else. This was when I first entered Parliament and when the hon. Prime Minister—who was then the Minister of Education—and I had raised the question of night universities. From across the province I got letters from people who told me that because of the narrowness on the part of university requirements, they therefore were unable to enter university. They had to get other requirements.

The other barrier, they said, was that they had families. I realize that is not your responsibility with respect to the families, but they had families. They had economic necessities, but at night they would want to have the opportunity of getting accredited courses with a substance. I remember the hon. Prime Minister had mentioned a night university was going to be formed. We know that developments have taken place, but somehow I do not think these evening classes are still as yet reaching to the needs of the people. I do not think they have been getting the accredited aspect that some of the people want.

I think that we should, as the hon. member for York South has said, make use of people, for example, from Europe who have had an academic background. He was referring to using them for teaching. I am thinking of a number of these people who could be used, if they could get more and have their background accredited. I think of the example that after the war many went through DVA courses. We were older, but suddenly the doors were open for us to take training at a university. I am sure, sir, there are opportunities now that people would grasp if we had more availability of evening universities.

While I am on this subject one of the aspects I noticed when on the manpower committee was the question of opportunity for a young fellow who, because of family circumstances or some other reason, had started to work. He had acquired a skill and then he hoped to be able to move up the ladder and have this experience and these skills recognized and up the ladder into university.

The concern of the manpower committee was that there were culs-de-sac all along the line. A young fellow may have taken training and then there was no recognition. For example, after technical schools or Ryerson,

there is no recognition from the universities and colleges.

I would hope that in some way and I realize all that the government can do, is to try to suggest and encourage universities to open their entrance requirements and to be more flexible. I would hope that some young fellow who has had to start life, and is first class at some skill; that this does not mean that he has got to keep in this particular type of vocation. But that he can move on right through. If he wants to, the avenues are open to be come a PhD. I wonder, sir, if you would mind commenting on those questions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as far as the night courses are concerned, the hon. member is well aware that most of the larger universities have extensive night class programmes. Many of them have special provisions as far as entrance requirements are concerned which deal with, say, mature students. I am not sure whether we are getting into one of these great areas of academic autonomy when we start discussing if the government should be telling the universities whether or not they should alter these requirements.

As I tried to explain earlier in my estimates, we are endeavouring now to relate the secondary schools, the vocational centre and institutes of technology so that, through some form of progression, a young person will know what the avenues are. Of course, once again we get into the situation of whether or not the institutes of technology should be related to the university courses. I think, Mr. Chairman, there would be no point in my making any observations on this at the moment. I think it is obvious that we want to keep as many doors open as possible and make our whole educational programme as flexible as possible in the future. I think this should be one of our very obvious aims.

Mr. Thompson: If you would stress this point it might be helpful, to stress that there should be this flexibility all the way up.

One last point I would like to mention. A number of years ago I had the opportunity to visit a number of educational TV stations in the United States. As I say, that was a number of years ago. I noticed, for example, in Boston, that in relation to Boston University, and indeed in a number of the other cities, they were able to put on educational programmes—in physics, for example—they take the best minds who could translate their knowledge through teaching. Apparently they had magnificently stimulating programmes

which went on at 6.30 in the morning. Apparently the audience was very extensive and it showed the thirst for knowledge on the part of many people.

I realize this raises questions, but some of the universities were teaching a correspondence course in relation with these TV courses. The hon. member for York South raised the question about losing the atmosphere of the camaraderie within a university. On the other hand, I would think that with challenges of a modern society it is better perhaps to be able to thus expose the brightest minds to the people. I am raising again the question of educational TV, which was talked about in the schools in connection with universities. Just looking at the whole area, I wonder if the hon. Minister, for example, has quoted the experiments which Dr. Shrum in the new university in British Columbia is considering to carry out. This is one of them. What his opinion is of these?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Those experiments will be at the new Simon Fraser University, not the University of British Columbia and, Mr. Chairman, as I recall some of Dr. Bissell's statements, he has indicated the possibility of the use of television.

I think, as the hon. member for York South pointed out, maybe he was talking about two different types or classes of student. With the younger people right out of secondary school, I think it would be most advisable, if at all possible, to have them within the university atmosphere. I do not think there is any question about this. When it comes to adult education—maybe television has more possibility in retraining and the like—and therefore I think the medium might have more extensive use. As you will recall, the University of Toronto is making provision for closed-circuit TV at their new Scarborough campus.

This whole area of educational TV at the post-secondary level certainly is worthy of exploration, but at the same time I think there is much to be said for trying to get as many, of the young people particularly, into the university proper.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, it is six o'clock. Is it your wish that I should wait until after dinner?

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 o'clock, I will now leave the chair and we will resume at 8 o'clock.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 5, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	2827
Department of University Affairs, bill to establish, Mr. Robarts, second reading	2838
Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Robarts, second reading	2838
University of Guelph, bill to incorporate, Mr. Robarts, second reading	2838
Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, concluded	2839
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2858

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

On vote 518:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I have several questions for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

In the presentation of the estimates we had an effort by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) early in the debate—and it was transferred to a certain vote, although probably it should have been before we dealt with the votes at all—he presented a question, maybe he was flying a kite, in regard to community colleges. His proposition seemed akin to some of the ideas that this party, and particularly Mr. Wintermeyer, had presented to the people of the province. Has the hon. Minister made any comments about the suggestion of the hon. member for Russell or was he speaking just as a message to the people? Would the hon. Minister comment on his—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I know exactly what the hon. member is asking—

Mr. Troy: I want the hon. Minister to give some comment on the suggestion that the hon. member for Russell made to the House and to the people of Ontario. It was reported all across the country in the press.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I recall the statement, or at least the suggestion made by the previous leader of the Liberal Party, he was referring—

Mr. Troy: No, I was talking about the hon. member for Russell.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, but you were relating it, you said it was like the suggestion—

Mr. Troy: Well, akin—you can have kissing cousins, you know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps what the hon. member for Russell was suggesting, in a general way is not really related to what the former leader of the Liberal Party was suggesting. He was suggesting a state university with branches in various sections of Ontario. I think also that he was suggesting that this state university would have entrance requirements of 50 per cent and that this is how we could solve the university problem.

As I understood the remarks of the hon. member for Russell, he was, perhaps, dealing with a different area. If we look at community colleges, as I understand them, they fill two or three functions. One could be academic, related eventually to some university situation. They could be terminal courses; they could lead to a degree in technical or vocational courses, and as is implied in the name "community" they are related to the needs of the community where they are located.

They form what I refer to as another type of post-secondary education that is not directly related to the university field.

As I indicated on a former occasion, we have looked at these situations in two or three other jurisdictions. They vary from one state to another. In some areas they are junior colleges which are strictly academic. In some communities they are, as we have said, community colleges, and are quite different from what might be called junior colleges.

The only observation that I have this evening, Mr. Chairman, is that some three months ago, when speaking to the registrars of the universities of Canada, I suggested that we should be exploring some other type of post-secondary institution that was not, at least initially, at the university level.

Now this is, I think, the only comment I could pass on to the House at this time that might relate to the remarks of the hon. member for Russell.

Mr. Troy: In addition, have you thought of the junior college type; say, for first and

second year of a college course, with students going on from there to one of the larger universities. I know that has been discussed in my section of the province and has been endorsed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is the area in which the university presidents—I think the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) brought this to the attention of the House—were initially opposed to junior colleges. Whether we agreed or disagreed is not the point. I think this was their initial reaction to junior colleges which are academically orientated. They deal almost exclusively with the academic side of post-secondary education.

What I am suggesting to the House is that one area we should explore is the type of institution that has an interest in areas besides the academic. I think that really they could be coupled in the same type of institution or the same institution.

Mr. Troy: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in giving his statement this afternoon referred to The Department of University Affairs. Did he mean, when he was talking about the hon. Minister of Education, did he mean the office or the particular person who is now the Minister of Education?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The present hon. Minister of Education will be the Minister of the new department.

Mr. Troy: The present one?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The present hon. Minister of Education will hold the portfolio.

Mr. Troy: And in addition will hold—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He will hold two portfolios.

Mr. Troy: Is that to be a permanent—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As permanent as anything is in the world of politics.

Mr. Troy: That is quite right, it is a very uncertain thing, as the hon. Prime Minister very well knows from the past session.

Does the hon. Prime Minister think—I have great respect for the attainments and the qualities of the present hon. Minister of Education, but he is being saddled, sir, with another very important task in addition to his present duties. The hon. Prime Minister says this is one of the most important portfolios in his government and—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If I were not completely satisfied that the hon. Minister could handle these responsibilities I would not give them to him.

Mr. Troy: If the hon. Prime Minister were not so satisfied—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: Probably the hon. Prime Minister had such meagre reinforcements that he could not get anybody else to take it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): We have a million of them.

Mr. Troy: Well, what is a million? This levity is usual on these night sessions.

Unfortunately, through pressure of other business, I did not hear the answer of the hon. Minister to that very fine presentation from the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine) concerning Ottawa University. Of course Ottawa University is no different from some of the other universities across this province, like the University at Sudbury and so on. Was the hon. Minister's answer that it was still government policy that there would be no support to what is called in English the denominational colleges and "en français, Le confessionnelle"? I know that we cannot relate Ontario to some of the poor little provinces of this Dominion.

I know that in my native province of New Brunswick it does not make any difference who operates the institution, they still get support from the government for their operation. It is also the same way in the secondary schools. Right through the whole secondary school course, it does not make any difference whether it is operated by a religious order or not.

Then again, I cannot understand, when grants are given in this province under The Department of Health to institutions that are operated by religious orders, where the distinction comes in then in the schools because they happen to be operated by a certain denomination. For example, in my own area of northern Ontario we have Laurentian University, with its companion colleges: Thornloe, which is an Anglican institution; the United Church's Huntingdon; and the University of Sudbury, Catholic. But still we are so hidebound in this province that we cannot do anything for denominational ones.

The strange part about it is that if we did not have those you would be forced to spend

maybe a whole lot more money than is spent now to get the same type of education.

Has the hon. Minister, since the weekend, had any second thoughts?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we need to debate this again. The hon. Prime Minister gave a very full, comprehensive answer to the hon. member for Ottawa East stating the government policy. I am sure that the hon. member for Nipissing will be quite interested in reading this reply in *Hansard*.

As I recall the gist of the hon. Prime Minister's reply to the hon. member for Ottawa East, this was still the policy of the government.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in looking over these estimates, I find very little reference, if any, to the whole problem of research. We have had a number of discussions in this House in various estimates on the matter of research. But I think one of the fundamental functions of a great university is the matter of pure research and research into all kinds of subjects which have relevance to industry and to the society in which we live.

Now, certainly, as far as Canada is concerned, perhaps the University of Toronto is in the forefront in this field. But it is so far behind other great universities in other jurisdictions that I wonder if any real thought is being given here to building up great research centres in some of our universities. It may well be that the hon. Minister is thinking in terms of private subsidy for this purpose, or it may be that it is in some of these estimates and he is leaving it to the universities themselves to allocate the funds that are necessary. But it just seems to me that this is an important part of the function of a university which should not—at least in this debate—should not go by without some reference being made to it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member will appreciate that when it comes to research this is an area that I think is definitely within the academic autonomy of the university. Our operating grants are given to the universities without strings attached. They receive substantial sums, some of them, from the National Research Council, and some from private industry and so on. I think we all agree that universities should carry on extensive research and with this we have no quarrel. But in these estimates, on the individual items, we have paid about 90 per cent of the total requests for operating costs, and

this they have been paid with no allocation, as far as we are concerned, as to where they should spend the money. This is an area in which the universities, I can assure you, have great interest and are certainly developing capabilities.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, there are two private bills standing on the order paper that relate to the whole matter of university affairs. They relate to only one aspect of it, and perhaps a limited aspect, but it is one that I consider to be of importance.

It is normal practice in this House that private bills, when they are reported out from the private bills committee, go on the order paper and come before the House for regular processing in the form in which they are reported. Once they are reported out they usually go through the various stages in the House with relative despatch. In fact, all of the private bills that were reported out this year long since went through all stages and were assented to, with three exceptions. One of them is the bill relating to the city of Toronto, which seems to be bogged down in committee of the whole House. I do not know why it bogged down there, and I do not know if it has anything to do with Maple Leaf Gardens, but I will not inquire at this stage because it is obviously not related to the vote with which we are dealing.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the other two are not related to the vote either because they are in the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) and they were dealt with by him and the private bills committee. I cannot see their relation to this vote.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, they are clearly both related to university affairs. In fact, opinions were expressed by a representative of the university affairs committee. One of them is Bill No. Pr11, An Act respecting Westminster College in the city of London. The other is Bill No. Pr14, An Act to establish Rochdale College.

There is no question that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs also had an interest in these bills and expressed his opinion at the committee level. We all know that he had that interest and we know what his opinion was. That is not a subject for debate here. But these two bills are part of the total picture of university affairs in this province. We may have differences of opinion as to the merits of the bills but that is another matter.

As to their relevance to this vote I do not think there can be any doubt.

I was pointing out, Mr. Chairman, that all other private bills, with the exception of the three that I have just referred to, have long since been assented to.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on another point of order. I cannot see how we can discuss private bills on this particular estimate. I would like your ruling on that, sir.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am not discussing private bills.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! I wish to inform the member for Woodbine we are dealing with vote No. 518 and with Bills No. 127, 126 and 133 at the present time if he wants to discuss it.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, sir, I am well aware of that fact. I am not discussing the content of the two private bills that I am referring to, but I am interested in vote 518 which is entitled "grants to provincial and other universities," and which we were advised would be an appropriate place to discuss the entire question of university affairs. What I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if I may, since we are in the final stages of this session of the Legislature, is whether there is any serious danger, as appears to me, that these two bills are simply going to die on the order paper?

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, just another point of order.

This is a very fine line, Mr. Chairman. I will agree we are talking generally and in a very broad way about universities, but the hon. member is getting on to two very distinct private bills. I think the time to deal with the private bills is when they are called for discussion, and not under this vote, that is for sure.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, and I think it is a fair question, is it intended that they will be called for second reading? If it is, then that is the end of it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! It is at the discretion of the Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, all I can say in this dispute is I think the hon. member is completely out of order. He is trying now to control the business of this House which is the prerogative of the leader of the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I can see, Mr. Chairman, that I have touched an area that is even more sensitive than I had thought. I take it the hon. Prime Minister refuses, under the guise of alleging that I am trying to control the business of the House, to answer a straightforward question as to whether or not he is going to call the bills.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! We are on vote 518. Please continue.

Mr. Bryden: I suppose I can put my own interpretation on the refusal to answer the question. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a most remarkable situation when bills that are reported to this committee are not called.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! I wish to inform the member that he is out of order with respect to those other bills. We are on vote 518.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I have no option but to accept your ruling but I would suggest to you that it is an unduly narrow ruling. The matter I think is of real importance and apparently—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! The member is out of order.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): That is the expert on the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! Continue on vote 518, please.

Mr. Bryden: I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling. I really do not think you need the assistance of all these other gentlemen who are fairly free with their assistance but not very free with their observance of the rules of the House.

Another point that I would like to raise in relation to this vote, Mr. Chairman, is the question of university fees. The University of Toronto has announced that it is making a significant increase in fees for the coming year, and other universities have indicated either that they are doing the same sort of thing or are contemplating doing it. I think it is regrettable that what the government has heralded as a new development in the administration of university affairs should be signalled by an increase in fees that students must pay.

We have heard a great deal and have had much sober consideration of the whole problem of numbers that is facing universities.

Some of the new departures in policy are made necessary as a result of the challenge of numbers. I would like to put forward the proposition that though we are faced with real problems of numbers and may have to use methods that we, in some cases, may not entirely like, to control the problem of numbers, one system of control that we should not use is a means test system.

It is the view of this party and it has been for a long time that university fees should be abolished altogether. If it is necessary to limit the number of students entering university, such limitations should be purely on the basis of capacity of the students and their academic qualifications. That should be the only factor operating in our opinion.

I am not suggesting that we can eliminate fees overnight but at the present time we are going in the exact opposite direction. We are far from eliminating them. They are being increased. I would like to put before the Minister-to-be of the department which is to be created shortly, that a basic objective should be to reverse this trend and to ensure that sufficient funds are made available so that fees can be reduced and ultimately eliminated, so that all students of merit will be able to attend university, regardless of their financial means.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that the mere elimination of fees will not accomplish that objective. There is also the problem of living costs. That is another problem that will have to be considered. It is to a certain degree being dealt with by provisions that have been made with regard to scholarships and bursaries.

However, a first step, I think, in eliminating the price tag is to eliminate the fees. At least make it possible for people to go through our educational system from kindergarten as far as they can go and obtain benefit without having to pay any fee for the privilege of doing so.

I know that arguments will be put forward that, notwithstanding university fees, some students of limited means or practically no means still manage to get to university. That is quite true. I realize that is the case. But it is a real problem for those students. It means that they have to spend a lot of time that should be devoted to their studies on the mere problem of earning a living and raising sufficient fees to get to the university. There is no question in the world that the dollar barrier discourages a great many students who could benefit from university, who could complete their courses successfully and would thereby be able to make a greater

contribution to society. I believe a major function of the new department should be to take steps to ensure the elimination of fees at the earliest opportunity. I would appreciate it, if the hon. Minister sees fit, if he would comment on this point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On the question of fees, I think the hon. members might be interested in some examples, taking just two or three representative institutions here. In the University of Toronto, the fee for the arts and science course, and I think this is perhaps the easiest course to compare with other institutions, is \$410. You can go to McGill University and it varies from \$525 to \$590; Bishop's University is \$480 to \$520; Mount Allison is \$500; New Brunswick is \$475; Windsor here in the province is \$465.

As I intimated, and perhaps the hon. member was not here when I made this observation this afternoon, we are considering the possibility of increasing the bursary amount because I feel quite frankly there are very few students, and I will use the term you used, with merit—who are prejudiced from obtaining a university education because of the fact that they cannot afford to pay the fees. The bursary system is, I think, quite generous. The scholarships are also quite generous and we are considering, if the overall fee increase—for the sake of argument—is, say, \$50, extending our maximum amounts on the bursaries by this sum. The federal government, it appears, is going to participate in the student aid programme. I am sure when it establishes its limits for student aid loans and if they are administered by the province, we shall certainly bring it to the attention of the federal government so that it will take into account the fee structure as it exists in each province. I think this would be a very natural thing for it to do.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister if he has any figures on the percentage of university students who upon graduating in Ontario leave and go to the United States?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this figure and we are trying to find out. It does not really relate to The Department of Education as such, but I am also interested in this figure. If we have it before the next session, I will certainly make it available to the hon. member. We do not know from our information, certainly in The Department of Education, what this percentage is. I would say this though, that we undoubtedly lose a number of young people

with ability to the United States and other jurisdictions and this is regrettable.

We think we will retain a number of these people here through our graduate fellowship programme. We are quite encouraged by the number who might otherwise have gone to graduate work in the United States but who are remaining in this jurisdiction. It is a very substantial number. We also have, of course, a number of people coming into Ontario from other jurisdictions, which, to a degree at least, makes up for the loss of talent that is leaving. But to be specific I do not have any estimate. It would only be a guess and would not be a good guess. I shall try to get this over a period of time for the hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister have any figures as to the percentage of students either in the province as a whole or in one university, such as the University of Toronto, who receive the assistance of scholarships or bursaries?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is very difficult to get. I think we could get it by specific inquiry to the universities and I will undertake to secure this information for the hon. member. Actually, the vote during the department's other estimates on scholarships and bursaries indicates the amount that the province is expending, but this sum does not include the scholarships and so on given by the universities themselves about which we do not have specific information. I think it is perhaps possible that the new department will have this type of information available and certainly I can find it out from one of the institutions. The same information might apply to the others as well.

Mr. Bryden: I do not wish to put the hon. Minister or his department to a great deal of trouble, but I think it would be fair for me to say that only a small percentage of the students actually attending get that form of assistance. Would that be a fair statement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is difficult to break this down, but for instance, in 1962-63, there would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 5,000 to 5,500 students with types A and B bursaries. As far as the government scholarships are concerned, perhaps between 600 and 700. This does not include the many other private scholarships or endowments that these students receive. We do not have this information from the universities available, but as far as our own bursary programme is concerned, it could be roughly in the neighbourhood of 5,500.

Mr. Troy: We heard much about academic freedom in the discussion of the estimates of The Department of Education. Is there academic freedom, too, for students who want to attend a certain university? For example, supposing they live in northern Ontario and they want to attend one of the universities of southern Ontario, but we have a university we will say, for example, in northern Ontario, that is getting grants from the government. Would the government say to the student up there, "Now we have a government-supported university in northern Ontario, so you must go there"? Is there any likelihood of any situation like that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this has not been considered and there is no geographic allocation for students in this province. The student is free to choose the institution he prefers to attend, subject, of course, to his admission at that university. There is no geographic boundary as far as admission is concerned.

Mr. Troy: Thanks very much. I listened to the statement of the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon and also replies of the hon. Minister to the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for York South. The hon. Minister has mentioned several times this phrase "grey area." I think on this side of the House some of us—I know I do—still think with the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, not only today but earlier, that we are a grey area in regard to this new Department of University Affairs.

It seemed to me that the hon. Prime Minister in his statement still avoids stating clearly just what the function of this strengthened and augmented university advisory committee is going to be. He has said that no complaints were received from the universities in regard to this new department, and of the setting up of a Department of University Affairs. Naturally there would be no complaint from the universities, because I am sure that the universities themselves are still somewhat concerned, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that they were correlated in The Department of Education mostly with secondary education. Certainly the pro does not like to be related with the amateur or a semi-pro, and so on. Naturally there are no complaints, because we do not know just yet how this strengthened university advisory committee will work; what its function is going to be or how this whole thing is going to work out.

Certainly I think everybody in the academic field, and even anybody not in the academic

field who has any common sense, will agree that it is a very good thing that the government is bringing into the committee people that have some knowledge of university affairs on the academic side as well as the administrative side. That is all to the good. I do not know just what the function of the Minister is going to be. The hon. Prime Minister has said that he is not going to impose the will of the government on the universities. But just who is the boss and who is going to give the orders to the universities? The committee? The Minister of the department?

Is it going to be that this strengthened committee, which is all to the good, will recommend to the Minister the amount of grants the universities should get, and the Minister will say: "Well, I am sorry you want a hundred and fifty million. We cannot get that. We may have to put on another sales tax if you want to get that, or some other, a further gasoline tax perhaps. We cannot give you that now, but maybe you will get it later. But we can give you a hundred million."

If this committee, which is made up of the people that are on it now and those that have experience in university affairs, can then say: Well, this is what we want. Then who is going to make the allocation? Is it the Minister who makes the allocation? Or is it the little group that becomes part of The Department of University Affairs? Or is it the committee?

I may be somewhat dumb in this, but I notice there is an air of "What the dickens is he talking about?" Have I not made all this clear? I do not think the hon. Minister has. I believe, too, there have been here, since the estimates of this department have been before the House, those who are concerned with this new department and people who are on the staffs of a university. I think naturally they are concerned. Anybody connected with university education is concerned.

Actually, I do not think we have the full answer yet from either the hon. Minister or the hon. Prime Minister. They talk with rather soft voices, as if "Now this is it. Just everything is going to be fine. We are not going to interfere with the academic freedoms. You have your economy and so on."

But we have not got all the answers nor did, I think, the hon. member for Brant. The hon. Prime Minister said he had taken notes of his remarks, but I do not think he answered the important things, nor those of the hon. member for York South.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to speak on this again. I am sorry if the hon. member did not understand me the first time around. I would be very happy to say it again.

This is really the third time around, because I made a rather full statement when I introduced the bill at first reading. However, as I pointed out this afternoon, the advisory committee on university affairs which I just do not disregard as they appear to have been disregarded by others, I think that they have done a very fine task indeed. They have been in business, if I may put it that way, since 1961. During that time they have established five new universities in our province. They have reorganized—

Mr. Troy: The hon. Prime Minister said they did not do it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They established a scholarship, bursary and loan assistance fund. They established temporary accommodation—

Mr. Troy: We are not talking about that. It is the new one.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They established the Ontario New Universities Library project. They established the graduate scholarship programme which I think—I know—has been commented upon. It is quite unique, not only in Canada but in North America. The extended graduate programme is also one of their brain children. I mention these things just to illustrate that this committee, in two or three years, has done a pretty large job.

Mr. Troy: Nobody denies that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am going to make this clear to the hon. member so he will understand what we are doing.

Then I said that the committee indicates in its own report that some of their tasks have become pretty heavy from an administrative point of view. We have provided them over the years with economists and with accountants who have drawn up the forms. I do not know whether this is generally known in the House or not, but when the universities apply for the grants they are going to require, we have a standardized set of forms that has been devised over the years so that we are working with standard financial figures.

We have provided them with economists and with accountants in order that they may do this technical work, because there is a lot of work in it. There is a lot of analysis. This has nothing to do with an infringement on

the economy of universities, at least I cannot see that it is. But there is just a lot of work in dealing with \$100 million when you are distributing it. I do not think the hon. member really meant our elementary and secondary branches were the amateurs and the semi-pros, and that the universities were the pros, but in any event—

Mr. Troy: Being an athlete himself, the hon. Prime Minister understood.

Hon. Mr. Roberts:—in any event, it took us some three or four years to devise this scheme to meet the needs for grants in our elementary and secondary schools. I point out that these things are not simple. They are very complex. The committee itself is concerned about the complexity of some of this type of work, and some of the executive functions that they found they were being asked to do. For that reason, one of the functions of this new department will be to provide the university affairs committee with the necessary staff to do this work. This is associated entirely within universities.

This new department will be able to employ people of its own. It will be able to use the facilities of other branches of government. All this work can be lifted from the committee and put into the department in order that that department may do what might be termed the slugging. Then an enlarged committee will have the function of conducting studies in conjunction with the department, sir, because the Minister will once again provide them with the research people they may need to do this. There is a host of statistical information that we require.

The hon. member for Woodbine just asked for some statistics. We do not have them here. We should have them here. I mean, this is the work that has to be done. Now all this has to be lifted from this committee, because it has not the facilities to do it. I said this afternoon that it would be enlarged.

I foresee it functioning, perhaps breaking down into subcommittees, to study the various matters that will have to be considered. Then it will advise the government. Its purpose is to sit as an independent body between the government, as such, and the universities. This is quite clearly recognized. I felt, from the remarks of the hon. member for York South and the hon. member for Brant, that we are seeking a means of removing the affairs of the universities from anything to do with politics. This is what we are seeking to do. But the Minister of the department finally decides how much money this govern-

ment is going to spend. This is his responsibility to the government.

I pointed out this afternoon, in addition, that in the past we have accepted the recommendations of the advisory committee on university affairs in regard to sums and amounts of money that it has asked for. I would point out to the hon. members that it was the advisory committee that gathered the presidents of the universities together, not the other way around. It was the advisory committee that had the studies done by Dr. Jackson, realized the situation, brought the presidents of the universities together and said, "Now here is the problem that we, in co-operation, have to solve."

This is the procedure that these affairs took. I assume that the committee will function in that way in the future. It is going to look ahead. It is going to see what developments are needed. Are we going to go into this junior type of college that has been debated here? Are we right in saying that we should expand our present institutions for a while instead of establishing new ones? There are a whole host of things. I listed all these some time ago when I spoke. I could go through this again. But you can see the very wide range of activity that must be carried on.

There are all kinds of decisions to be made here that in my view must be made by co-operation. There is no question of anybody coercing anybody as to where we are going to put a medical school, where we are going to put the next dental school. Things of this nature surely must be worked out by the committee and this is what I see its function to be. This is why we are treating it the way we are and strengthening it the way we are, so that the committee will do the research and we in the government will make available to it the facilities it needs because it cannot make these things available to itself. Then it will make its recommendations to this department and the Minister of this department is then responsible for coming to the government.

The hon. member asked the question, what would happen if the committee came up and asked for \$250 million, and in our desire to tax or for whatever reason, we had only \$200 million? I am quite sure that we would say to the university affairs committee, "Look, we do not have \$250 million. We have \$200 million, so go back and see the people most concerned and sort out who is going to get what, and then come back to us." I just point out to the hon. member and make this as clear as I possibly can, that this is the func-

tion we see this committee performing. Quite frankly it is there to separate the affairs of the universities from any possibility of political influence in their development. But as a government we are still responsible for the spending of the tax money that we raise.

Mr. Troy: Then what will be this committee's responsibility regarding grants?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, yes, that is what I am talking about. The committee already does this. The committee has already done this in the past, that is why I mentioned the standardized form that we have so that each university submits its requests for funds on the same forms. Then comparisons can be made, for ease of administration and ease of analysis. These forms have been developed over a period of years while this government has been making grants. All this work is done in this committee. Then it makes its recommendations to the government and heretofore these recommendations have been accepted.

Mr. Troy: What will be the function of the Minister of that department?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am personally glad that the hon. member for Nipissing precipitated the hon. Prime Minister into making what he described as his third explanation of this matter. I think his third explanation threw some additional light on the matter. I am not suggesting that the previous ones were deficient, but this is a new development and new concept and I think it can stand a certain amount of discussion.

I had planned to speak on the second reading of this bill; I think perhaps I will say what I have to say right now. I had planned to indicate—and perhaps I was a maverick—that I am opposed to the principle of the bill. I think I will still vote against it if it is necessary to do so. I will say that the explanations the hon. Prime Minister has given have allayed some of the worries I had about the matter, but not entirely. The situation he describes is what I would consider to be the best possible solution to a difficult problem of balancing on the one hand the government's responsibility for the expenditure of funds, and on the other hand the independence of the universities.

I do not think, though, that the legislative framework we are creating is the kind of legislative framework that is best suited to achieve what the hon. Prime Minister describes as the purpose he has in mind. He

regards the university advisory committee—I think he even used the word—as a “buffer” between the universities on the one hand and the government on the other hand. That, I think, is a proper role. That is the sort of body we should have, whether we call it an advisory committee or a grants committee or a grants commission, or whatever you like. I think it is desirable to have such a body between the universities and the government. It will in effect negotiate with the universities to try to sort out their demands and to produce a certain degree of harmony in them, and will negotiate on the other hand with the government with regard to the total amount of money available.

I would judge, certainly from the last statement that the hon. Prime Minister made just a moment ago, that the government will likely deal with this only in terms of aggregates, that it will agree to a total amount of money that it can see fit to recommend out of the appropriations of any given year and the committee will be responsible, in effect, for allocating the money available among the various universities. I think that was what he was saying. I think that is the way it should be.

But if that is so, then why should not our statute law provide for that sort of arrangement instead of having a statute to set up a Department of University Affairs? Why do we not have a statute to set up what I would call a university grants commission as an independent commission, which would have the type of functions that the hon. Prime Minister has suggested for the advisory committee? If such a statute were passed, there could be no doubt as to what the chain of communication was. As it stands now, we have a Department of University Affairs, or will have if the bill is passed and I have no doubt it will be. And there will be, although it is not formally provided for, an advisory committee.

But there is no clear-cut assurance in the law that the department itself, and thus the government, will not take upon itself the task of dealing directly with the administration of university affairs. After all, let us face it, the agency that is putting up the money, or most of the money—and the government is now I think putting up most of the money for the universities and it will continue to put up more in the future—is the agency that ultimately has control unless some special procedure can be devised.

It is necessary for some agency to consider the overall planning of the development of university facilities. It may become necessary, Mr. Chairman, for an agency to consider

the question of standards to decide whether a particular institution is eligible for grants or not. All of these things become part of the responsibility of administering grants. I am suggesting that it is not desirable for this to be in the hands of a government department and that is the way the proposed statute will have it. There is only one body that will be responsible and that will be The Department of University Affairs.

I quite believe that the hon. Prime Minister has no intention in any way of interfering with the freedom of the universities, but statutes usually live long after their authors and we have to think of this in terms of a long-term development. We have in this House during this session had more than usual attention devoted to the whole problem of maintaining freedom in our complex modern society.

I am going to suggest to the House, Mr. Chairman, that the universities are traditionally, and I hope in the future will continue to constitute, one of the greatest bastions of freedom. A genuinely independent university in which there is genuine guarantee of freedom of thought, freedom of inquiry, and freedom of experimentation, is an essential to the maintenance of freedom.

Fortunately, in this province we have not in the past had what I would call serious threats to academic freedom, certainly not sustained threats. There have within my memory been some instances where members of university staffs have been under the threat of dismissal because their views were considered at the time to be heterodox. Some of those views now would be considered pretty orthodox; but that is the way ideas develop, they are heterodox at one time. If there are no pioneers who are willing to advance ideas that are unpopular then no ideas would ever come forth.

The universities are and should be a breeding place for new ideas, new developments in thought. As I say, there have been instances where professors have been threatened with dismissal. I do not know of any case—I certainly cannot recall any case—where a professor actually was dismissed and I am not suggesting that such a thing is likely in the immediate future. What I am suggesting is that this is important enough that we should do everything possible in our power to ensure that it never will happen.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What happens internally in the university by the dismissal of a professor is surely not related to any interest the government may or may not have.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I attempted to suggest a moment ago that control over the purse can be an all-pervading control. I am not suggesting that this government at this time has any such idea in its mind. I am suggesting, that though this sort of thing is nearly as dramatic as the challenges that at least some of us saw to the liberty of the subject in certain legislation that was before this House at one stage—which I will not discuss now—in the long run it can be far more insidious. It can extend from one little encroachment to another one, each one imperceptible in itself, until there is a high degree of state control over the operations of universities.

This is a danger I see, this is the reason I had planned to state that I was opposed in principle to the bill and I am still opposed in principle. I believe that the framework that the hon. Prime Minister has suggested as the one which he is trying to establish is not provided for in this bill. This bill provides for something different.

There is no provision for a committee or a commission which will be a buffer between the government, the state, on the one hand and the universities on the other. There is no provision for that in the bill. I think there should be such a provision. I think if we provided by statute for a university grants commission it would be unnecessary to have The Department of University Affairs. The commission could do the job of working with the universities in planning their development and in trying to harmonize the various claims they make and, on the other hand, of negotiating with the government with regard to sums of money. I think that is the way it should be done. I regret that we have taken the other approach of setting up a government department.

I am aware that the university presidents have welcomed, or at one stage at any rate indicated that they welcomed, the government's decision to set up a department. I can only conclude that they are so desperate to get money, and I can understand why they are desperate to get money, that they are not prepared to consider all of the implications.

I would like to emphasize that I am not accusing this government of having the slightest idea of interfering with academic freedom. I am suggesting, however, that we have before us, or will have before us shortly, a bill which could in time produce that very result. I think there is a better way of doing it. I think the hon. Prime Minister himself indicated the better way and I think that is

the way the statute law of our province should be framed.

There is frequent objection to the establishment of commissions. I think that a wholesale condemnation of commissions is ridiculous. I think maybe that proposition will be agreed to. There are proper areas where commissions can operate and there are areas where they should not operate. This is one where we should have a commission.

I suggest that we have already several precedents right in our own province. I take one as at least having something in common with this problem, and that is the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. It would have been possible, it is technically possible, for the funds which the government makes available for hospital services in this province to be administered by a government department. But the government of the day saw fit, and I state rightly, to entrust that responsibility to an independent commission operating under certain statutory rules. The independent commission becomes a sort of buffer between the hospitals on the one hand and the government on the other. I am suggesting that principle is far more important in the field of university affairs, where the whole question of academic freedom is involved and I would think that the example that we have before us in the Ontario Hospital Services Commission is an example that we could follow, with adaptations, in this field.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill that is now on the order paper and will be called for second reading shortly.

I would like to make it clear, sir, that in expressing my opposition I am speaking for myself only. I am not necessarily, although I may be, speaking for other people within the New Democratic Party and others. I would point out that although my hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald) expressed a qualified acceptance of the bill, the difference between him and me is something of a difference of degree. He expressed the same sort of reservations as I did.

He arrived at the conclusion that on balance it was desirable to support the bill. I arrive at the conclusion that on balance it is desirable not to support the bill. Even though I am the only one in the House who takes that position, I wish to record it.

I would have hoped that the government would have chosen the other method of dealing with this very complicated problem, the method which I think is completely inherent in all the remarks that the hon. Prime Minister made.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister, in connection with the scholarship and bursary loan system fund, are there ever any suggestions or inducements that those people who are successful in getting bursaries or scholarships or money from the loan assistance fund perhaps owe somewhat of an obligation to the province from which they get this money; and that through services or income taxes, which they undoubtedly will pay to the state from which they come, that perhaps they should stay here for a period of time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would say that the obligation that exists under, say the scholarship or bursary funds or under the Ontario Graduate Fellowships, would be a moral obligation only.

Mr. Whicher: I will accept that this is a moral obligation, but is it ever pointed out to the students that there is a moral obligation to stay here, that we need these people; not only for the services that they render to the province from which they come, but we need the money in order to be able to provide additional funds for students in the future?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is very difficult to communicate to everyone. Under our fellowship programme they are informed and it is indicated by their acceptance of the fellowships that they have a genuine interest in teaching. They do not swear that they will become teachers, but I think it is brought rather forcibly to their attention that this is one of the prime purposes of the fellowship programme, to interest young people in teaching.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister ever worry, or the government worry, about the number of students and graduates of the university whom the taxpayers of the province have educated and who leave this province and go, not to other provinces in Canada, but to other states in the United States?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think we are all concerned about losing any young person of ability to some other jurisdiction. I think this is a concern, yes.

Mr. Whicher: Is the hon. Minister prepared to do anything about it? I, sir, as an individual, am very concerned that there are thousands of students who are leaving here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I think we all agree with the right of the individual to make his

choice. We have discussed this at some length in other areas. I think that surely we must maintain this view: That the individual must have freedom of selection. We point out to him the benefits he is receiving under this fellowship programme. We ask him to declare his genuine interest in teaching. I suggest, really, that this would appear to be as far as a person can go in dictating to an individual what his future career will be. I think it is obvious that we want to retain these people here. But at the same time I would suggest that, as a government, none of us would want to be responsible for saying to any individual that he must stay here.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I did not suggest that we should say that they must stay here. The hon. Minister has mentioned the teaching profession. Is it ever pointed out to graduates of medical schools that we need these doctors, whom the taxpayers of Ontario have educated, in the province of Ontario, and that we would be very happy to see them stay in the province from which they got their education?

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that while I would be very much opposed to making them stay here; at the same time I say that this province if not now, five years from now, will not be able to continue to afford, in dollars and cents, to educate these students and to have them go, particularly, to the United States of America where, perhaps, they can get higher salaries than they do here. We simply cannot afford it, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman. I am worried about this situation.

Vote 518 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in conformance with the procedure we agreed upon, I move second reading of Bill No. 126.

THE DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 126, An Act to establish The Department of University Affairs.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL AID CORPORATION

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 127, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, before I move this amendment, when this bill reaches the committee stage I will offer amendment to clause (b) of section 12, which is really an amendment for clarification. There is some doubt as to whether clause (b) says exactly what we mean it to say, but I will not make this amendment until we reach the committee stage.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 133, An Act to incorporate the University of Guelph.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): On the second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker. The staff of the new University of Guelph—will they be civil servants? Will The Department of Agriculture continue to hire and pay the professors and staff of the new university? Will they have the same freedom that the University of Toronto staff has? And other universities? What is the situation in regard to staff?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I dealt with this question. I said that, for the moment, they would remain where they are now. This includes the research branch, the three colleges and the administration. But it is our intent to change this. The practical difficulties of so doing are many. We want to get the university established. Then they will have to sit down, the administration of the university, with these people and work out the details of such things as pension arrangements and salaries. It is quite complex, but we have to start somewhere. We start with the bill, but I can assure my hon. friend that this is our intent and this will be done. This will be a university in fact as well as in name.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, on this bill I would like to voice a word of appreciation on the incorporation of this University of Guelph. As the hon. members know here, it has a longstanding reputation in our community as OAC. I am sure, sir, that the citizens of Guelph welcome this university into their midst and that the president, who will take office, and the board of governors will certainly contribute to the making of an outstanding institution of higher education.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order. House in committee of supply. Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (continued)

On vote 209:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, vote 209 is the vote dealing with the securities commission. I have had two occasions now on which I made some general remarks on certain actions that I think should be taken by the securities commission.

I dealt with the question of disclosures, the importance of legislation to make sure that there should be adequate disclosures. I have dealt with the importance of a code for takeovers being made a part of our law, and I have dealt with several other related subjects in this regard.

The reply of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) to this moment has been that there is a committee and that they meet frequently and have all these matters under advisement. I would hope, as I said yesterday, that we will hear at a very early date what the result of their deliberations are, and just what action the government is going to take.

I emphasize again the importance of the remarks made by the committee headed by Chief Justice Dana Porter, in the report of his Royal commission to the federal government.

I think that the chapter in that lengthy report should perhaps be a guidepost for the committee and for the hon. Attorney General in bringing in new legislation.

It is to be regretted, and seriously regretted, that we have no statement of policy before this House at this time in view of all

the discussion that has taken place concerning the field of securities administration.

But this evening, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with a specific incident which relates to the sorry state of affairs in our securities administration. And I think it can highlight better than any general statements that I could make the sort of thing that persons concerned with administration of companies, persons who are interested in the affairs of companies which trade on the stock exchange, worry about. The lack of action that is taken by the securities commission and the lack of recourse available to persons who find themselves in the position of this gentleman, are painfully obvious.

I am referring to a letter, or a series of copies of letters I received from a gentleman by the name of Mr. Robert A. Hill. I note on the bottom of a letter addressed to me and dated April 8 that there is the memo that a copy of this correspondence has been sent to Mr. R. W. Knox-Leet, who is the registrar of the Ontario Securities Commission, 145 Queen Street West, Toronto. So that anything I say should be within the knowledge of the securities commission.

Subsequent to certain telephone interviews that I had with Mr. Hill, and certain earlier correspondence, he wrote to me, as I say, on April 8, and said this:

With regard to your letter I copied all of the correspondence in my file which bears directly on the question of voting of street certificates. Also where possible I have drawn on my associates in the proxy situation to supply what material they have in their possession.

In chronological order these letters are:

1. A letter from Robert A. Hill—

that is the gentleman who has been writing to me:

—to the Bankers Bond Corporation dated February 14, 1964.

2. A letter from Robert A. Hill to Cairdner and Company, dated February 14, 1964.

3. A letter from Bankers Bond Corporation to clients, dated March 6, 1964.

4. A letter from Bankers Bond Corporation to "blank"—

and in this case the name has been deleted at the request of the person to whom it was addressed, dated March 9, 1964. In this regard, the investment firm receiving this letter—the one I just referred to as No. 4—made a copy available and requested its use or reproduction be confined to subject content only.

5. A letter from S. W. Corfe, to the Ontario Securities Commission, dated March 14, 1964. "Mr. Corfe advises me that an identical letter as that sent to the Ontario Securities Commission on March 14 was sent to the Toronto Stock Exchange. The reply from the Exchange has been lost and reference would have to be made to Mr. W. L. Somerville, Jr., executive vice-president of the exchange, for a file copy if such is desired. Generally the reply, as I recall, was sympathetic and indicated that the matter had been under study for some time by the exchange committee.

6. A letter from the Ontario Securities Commission to S. W. Corfe, dated March 17, 1964.

The letter goes on to say:

Other letters which I have and to which you are most welcome are concerned specifically with the merits or otherwise of West Indies Plantations Limited management.

I do not propose to discuss that subject tonight, Mr. Chairman. The company involved is West Indies Plantations Limited. I have no personal knowledge of their affairs, nor do I think the conduct of their affairs or the ability of their management is really a topic that should properly be discussed at this time. The issue is availability of information to those who might be interested. That is the only issue and that is the issue to which I am confining my remarks.

I believe that—

Mr. Hill says to me in his letter:

I believe that these other matters lie outside the issue at hand.

and I quite agree with him.

With regard to the annual meeting of West Indies Plantations Limited on the 26th of March, 1964 it was evident that the voting of street certificates for management would make it virtually impossible to unseat the management. We had planned to pursue this vital matter with the two directors of West Indies Plantations Limited, who are also executives of Gairdner and Company and Bankers Bond Corporation, at the annual meeting, and so advised West Indies Plantations Limited's solicitors and president at a meeting on the 24th of March, 1964. The two directors in question, however, were not present at the annual meeting of the 26th of March, 1964.

Many firms enact a company by-law prohibiting voting street shares. Also, as

I understand, certain stock exchanges formally recognize the inequity of this situation and prohibit member firms from voting street certificates without written instructions from the beneficial owners. This is as it should be and I wish you every success in your endeavours.

Yours truly,

Robert A. Hill

As I say, a copy of this letter was sent to Mr. Knox-Leet, the registrar of the Ontario Securities Commission.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, the dispute involved in this matter was an effort by a certain group to change the board of directors in West Indies Plantations Limited. And to do so, they wanted the opportunity to put forward their case to all the shareholders. Very briefly, sir, they were denied the opportunity to find the names and addresses of the shareholders. Again, very briefly, they appealed to the Toronto Stock Exchange. While I do not have the copy of the reply from the exchange, the exchange apparently expressed sympathy and said they were looking into it.

I do have the reply from the securities commission which said, in effect, "there is nothing really that we can do."

Let me go on and read the rest of the correspondence in connection with this matter. In the order that I listed these various documents, the first letter from Robert A. Hill to the Bankers Bond Corporation, which would seem to be a logical and reasonable type of request to make, says this:

Dear Sir:

With regard to the above company—

and that is West Indies Plantation Limited:

—my associates and I are soliciting proxies from shareholders in order to nominate a new board of directors at the forthcoming annual meeting of the company.

If I may pause and just make a comment on that, I would suggest that this is the sort of thing that people do. As recently as last September 25 when various groups lined themselves up, one as against the other, there was no unanimity. Eventually the people who had the franchise were allowed to vote and, eventually, they made their decision. But the various groups did not have one hand tied behind their back. Each one of the groups which thought it had a cause to advance and thought that the board of directors should be the people that they advocated, at least had access to the voters' lists and to the people who were going to

participate in the election. This letter goes on to say:

We are most anxious to reach all shareholders in this matter and in examining the share register note that a substantial number of shares are currently registered to brokerage companies of which you are one. Presumably these registrations in many instances would be names other than those of the beneficial owners. We wish to locate these individuals to appraise them of the present situation and would greatly appreciate any assistance your firm can give.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that this would seem to me to be a most reasonable and logical request.

It is important that we obtain this information within this week. We thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours truly,
Robert A. Hill

A similar letter was sent under date of February 14, 1964, to Gairdner & Company. I think it is almost identical, but I have a copy of it here and in case anyone wants to refer to the copy, certainly it is available to them.

Those two letters went out from Mr. Hill to Bankers Bond Corporation and to Gairdner & Company on the 14th of February.

The next letter, that I referred to in the list that I previously gave, was a letter from Bankers Bond Corporation to clients dated March 6, 1964. I have a photostat of that letter here and it is on the letterhead of Bankers Bond Corporation Limited, Government and Municipal Corporation Securities, 44 King Street West, Toronto. It is dated March 6, 1964, and it is addressed "To Clients." I am not superimposing any other name, the actual address is "To Clients." Those two words are used.

West Indies Plantations Limited

Our records show that you purchased Class "A" and/or common shares of the above company from us in street form. Unless these shares were subsequently registered in your name you may not have received current information about the company. Therefore we are enclosing a copy of the 1963 annual report and a copy of two letters from the President, Mr. E. C. Bovey.

In recent weeks the owners of Leeward Island Developments Limited, a private land company with small holdings on the east side of the Island of Montserrat, have

been soliciting proxies in an attempt to gain control of West Indies Plantations Limited. This subject is discussed in detail in the enclosed letter. However, if you have any questions or wish additional information we would be pleased to discuss it with you.

We are not at all impressed with the people behind this attempt or with their methods of operation. In our opinion the precarious financial position of their own company and the nominal amount of their investment in your company as disclosed by the share register hardly recommend them as a candidate for the board of West Indies Plantations Limited.

We are advising our clients to return their proxies in favour of the present management and unless we receive specific instructions to the contrary from the beneficial owners we propose to vote the stock registered in our name in support of the present management.

The annual meeting will be held in the Ontario Room of the Lord Simcoe Hotel at 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 26, 1964.

Well, the first three paragraphs of that letter, I would think, certainly express the opinions of Bankers Bond Corporation Limited, and I have no opinion as to their assessment of the merits of the people who wanted to propose an alternate set of directors. That is their opinion, and for better or for worse it might be right, it might be wrong; but as I say I do not propose to discuss the merits of it. But the second last paragraph of this letter I think is worthy of repetition and it says this:

We are advising our clients to return their proxies in favour of the present management—

so far, so good:

—and unless we receive specific instructions to the contrary from the beneficial owners we propose to vote the stock registered in our name in support of the present management.

Now, there are a great many street certificates. Bankers Bond Corporation apparently had some information about who appeared to be the beneficial owners. Bankers Bond Corporation, as is their right, gave their advice, made certain recommendations to these people, but then they go further to say: if we do not hear from you we are going to usurp your rights to make a decision and we are going to vote the way we think you should vote. This is the objectionable factor in this story.

Then the next letter in this story is dated March 9 from Bankers Bond Corporation to

the addressee whose name I am not at liberty to reveal, and it says this:

Dear Sir:

Re West Indies Plantations Limited

Our records show that you participated with us in the original distribution of the above company's units consisting of one Class A share and one-half common share. We therefore are enclosing for your records a copy of the material mailed to all registered shareholders late last week.

And I would presume that is a reference to their letter of March 6 together with the accompanying material.

Additional copies are available if required. In addition we are enclosing a copy of our letter to clients who purchased shares in the above company from us in street form. You will note from this letter that we propose to vote the stock registered in our name in support of present management at the forthcoming annual meeting. We have been told by our solicitors, and by Borden, Elliot, Kelly & Palmer, solicitors for West Indies Plantations Limited, that it is perfectly legal to do this unless we receive specific instructions to the contrary from the beneficial owners.

I am not going to quarrel, Mr. Chairman, with the opinion that they received from their solicitors, nor with the opinion that Borden, Elliot firm gave them. I am suggesting that very probably those opinions are correct and reflect the present and very unhappy state of our securities laws.

We hope that you too will support the present management with your proxy. We will be conducting a proxy solicitation campaign on management's behalf and any help you might give with your own clients would be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions please let us know.

Yours very truly,

And then it is signed.

The next letter that I have is the letter of March 14 addressed to Mr. R. W. Knox-Leet, the registrar of the Ontario Securities Commission, and it says this:

Dear Mr. Knox-Leet:

I write to you as a shareholder of the above company to confirm our recent telephone conversation. A group of shareholders are attempting to replace the existing board of directors of the above company. Proxies have been solicited and to date better than 30 per cent of the shareholders have deposited signed proxies with us. In addition many more shareholders

have pledged their support to us but wish to attend the meeting in person. Bankers Bond and Gairdner & Company, who made the original offering, have sent out letters stating that they intend to vote all shares registered in their name in support of management where there are no specific instructions to the contrary. We have requested and have been denied the list of names and the opportunity to correspond with the beneficial owners of these street shares.

That probably is the key sentence in this story.

We have requested and have been denied the list of names and the opportunity to correspond with the beneficial owners of these street shares. As you know the majority of brokerage houses will not vote any shares held in street form without express instructions from their client.

I checked that paragraph, Mr. Chairman, and I find that this is the general, common and accepted practice on the street, that the majority of brokerage houses will not vote shares held in street form without instructions from their client. I think this is the way it should be. It is unfortunate that the law does not reflect this, but most brokerage houses feel that it would be unfair to vote street shares unless they have specific instructions. The letter goes on to say:

It seems possible and highly probable that the intentions of Bankers Bond and Gairdner & Company to do the opposite in this instance will override the wishes and interests of the majority of the shareholders.

We feel in this instance that in the interest of the majority of shareholders Bankers Bond and Gairdner & Company should not be allowed to vote any stock unless it is beneficially owned by them. It hardly seems equitable, if the wishes of the majority of the shareholders could be thwarted by two brokerage houses. We are not asking you take sides in this matter—

nor, and may I underline this, Mr. Chairman, am I suggesting to the House that anyone take sides in this matter:

—but we are asking you to give all shareholders equal rights to decide for themselves. The annual general meeting is to be held on March 26, 1964, and any action you can take in this matter will be greatly appreciated by us and the shareholders.

We enclose for your information a true copy of a letter sent to us over the signa-

ture of Bankers Bond, Gairdner & Company and Atlantic Securities, which sets out their policy regarding the voting of street certificates.

Then finally the last letter in this story is the letter of March 17 addressed to Mr. S. W. Corfe, the gentleman who signed the second last letter, in reply to his letter of March 14, and it says this:

Receipt of your letter of March 14, 1964, together with the enclosure referred to is acknowledged with thanks. This material has been perused and it is evident that the right of the shareholder to vote his shares in accordance with his own desires remains.

If I may editorialize at that point, certainly no one denies that this is so or that this should be so.

And further, that he has been put on warning by Bankers Bond Corporation Limited *et al* as to how his shares will be voted in the event that he takes no action to express his wishes.

And that, sir, is the sentence or phrase to which I take particular exception, because it seems to lend the blessing of the securities commission to this bald statement of fact that it is sufficient to put a group of people on warning that if they do not do something positive someone is going to take action in their name.

Finally, the last paragraph in this letter is this:

On the basis of the information available it has been decided that this is not a matter requiring any action by the Ontario Securities Commission at this time.

Sir, I have taken some time in reading all of these documents into the record because I think that they are indicative of a most unfortunate approach of the securities commission to problems of this sort. I do not have an exact copy of the letter written by Mr. Somerville of the stock exchange in reply to the correspondence, but the information I have is that his reply was sympathetic and the advice was that the matter has been under study for some time by the exchange committee.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that this story highlights the lack of control and interest certainly, that the Ontario Securities Commission has in matters of this sort. The fact is that when a fight like this takes place one would think—and it should follow almost axiomatically—that the shareholders who want to, can and should reasonably express their opinions in light of the decisions they make

after receiving whatever information is available.

The fact is in this case that a group that was not happy with the existing management group wanted no more than the right to correspond with the beneficial owners and was denied this right. I say, sir, that this is wrong in light of all the democratic principles we have. This is wrong in light of the business practices that we have understood should have existed and did exist in relation to the management and control of such companies. I say, sir, this is wrong in that it encourages continued control by the in group without the outside group having the right to do or say anything about it.

The rather sad part of this whole story is that in the words of Mr. Knox-Leet, as expressed in his letter, the securities commission apparently has no interest in this.

Mr. Chairman, it is fine to say that the rules of our securities administration should be changed, and I have said that on three occasions in this session of this Legislature. It is fine for the hon. Attorney General to come and say we have a hard-working committee meeting regularly and in due course something is going to be done about it. But I would suggest it is the responsibility of this government in view of all of the criticism that has been levelled at our securities administration to indicate in which direction it is prepared to move. As late as this evening, in the face of all of this criticism, neither from this hon. Attorney General nor his predecessor (Mr. Cass), have we had one single word of guidance as to what the approach of the government is.

I say it is a very sad commentary on the affairs of our securities market when the registrar of the securities commission is prepared to say, in effect, "It is tough. It is just too bad and we are not really interested and we do not propose to take any further action at this time."

Surely, Mr. Chairman, this government has a real responsibility to ensure that democratic procedures exist in all of our affairs, and certainly in affairs as complicated as matters affecting securities and corporate control. The government has a special duty to make sure that it leaves no stone unturned to protect the rights of every shareholder, particularly of minority shareholders who have no ability to protect themselves in any other way than to appeal to governmental authority.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the story, and I say the story reflects more clearly than any general statements I could make, more

clearly than any statements that any financial writer in our newspapers could make, even more clearly than the statements made by Chief Justice Dana Porter and his committee, the lack of interest, the lack of concern and the lack of desire to reform expressed in our securities legislation by this government.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one brief comment following along on what the hon. member for Downsview has said. Some two or three years ago the whole role of the stock exchange and the securities commission and their relationship was one of fairly lively discussion in the press—it was started by a series of articles in *Saturday Night*. We had the then chairman of the securities commission before us, the standing committee on government commissions, and the point that became very clear there—and I submit it to the hon. Attorney General in the overall investigation we are making of commissions and the failure to protect the rights of individuals in his many capacities—was that we delegate certain powers to the Ontario Securities Commission from this Legislature. It is its responsibility to exercise those powers. The then chairman of the securities commission in so many words said in effect, “We leave a considerable proportion of the job that is ours to the stock exchange. There is no point in both of us doing the job. They police their own members.”

There are some people who believe that to a considerable extent the stock exchange is something approaching a private club. It certainly claims to police its own members, but here we have illustrated in the story that the hon. member for Downsview has spelled out to the House an illustration of how a very important principle, the delegation of power that belongs to this Legislature, is delegated in the first instance to the securities commission, which by default leaves the exercise of this power to the stock exchange, and the stock exchange does nothing about it. Therefore, the normal requirements for the normal rights of a holder of stock in the company are frustrated in this fashion.

The hon. Attorney General rather blunted our tendency to an all-out attack on the securities commission and the Toronto Stock Exchange in the introduction of his estimates by saying there is a committee looking into this. I just conclude by suggesting to the hon. Attorney General that here is one area to which I think he, as a new holder of this post, should give some consideration and should make certain that there is some

clarification of the situation. I assert without any fear of contradiction that it is a very bad principle that we who are the trustees of the legislative power in the provincial Parliament of Ontario should be delegating power to a body which does not exercise it and in effect hands it on to another body which in turn does not exercise it, and thereby the rights of the individual stockholders are not upheld.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat what I said last night and which has been referred to, except to this extent, that I did say the committee—a very capable, distinguished, competent committee—has been studying these matters. I referred to the subjects it was studying: proxy solicitation, insider trading and information to shareholders. As I stated last night, it has been meeting weekly since last November and studying these matters and has sent out questionnaires and briefs and so on and expects to report very soon.

I think I do not need to repeat that. Nor do I wish to say that the matter related by the hon. member for Downsview transpired before I came on the job; I do not wish to use that as an excuse but it did so happen. I must confess that particular matter which went to the securities commission has not come to my attention. I think I can hardly be expected to reply specifically to that instance on this occasion here tonight. But I would say this further that The Corporations Act, which is not actually a matter of the securities commission—a separate Act; not The Securities Act but The Corporations Act—by section 313, requires:

A corporation shall cause the following documents and registers to be kept: the letters patent; supplementary letters patent; copies of bylaws; a register of shareholders or members in which are set out the names, alphabetically arranged, of all persons who are shareholders or members or have been within 10 years shareholders or members of the corporation, and the address of every such person while a shareholder or member, and also the number and class of shares held by each shareholder, the amounts paid up and remaining unpaid.

And then a register of directors, and then section 317 requires:

That information shall be open for inspection and the company is subject to a penalty if it is not open for inspection to any shareholder, and that material must be kept at the head office of the company, with certain exceptions where they have another office.

So that with respect to those shareholders who are registered, there would be no difficulty whatever in ascertaining who they are, and where they are for 10 years back. With respect to those who have not registered their street certificates—and they are all, I think, generally urged to do so—there is a section in The Corporations Act, section 76, and it provides as follows. Incidentally, these three sections to which I am referring—313, 317 and 76—all bear, I note, at the foot of the section, the year 1953. They have apparently been on our statute book as part of The Corporations Act for some 11 years.

Section 76 provides, and is headed in the margin:

Unauthorized voting.

A company may by bylaw provide that any person who is a broker, broker-dealer, sub-broker-dealer, or salesman within the meaning of The Securities Act, shall not vote in person at a shareholders' meeting, or appoint a proxy to vote at such meeting in respect of shares, unless he is the beneficial owner of such shares, unless he is authorized so to do by the beneficial owner of such shares.

The section starts out by saying:

The company may by bylaw provide that such voting shall not take place—

I think this section clearly implies that if the company does not pass such a bylaw then it is proper to vote such shares by the broker, or broker-dealer on behalf of the shareholder and that, I presume, was the basis of the opinion of the very eminent firm of Borden, Elliot, Palmer and Company.

First of all, the point is that this is a matter governed by The Corporations Act. There are certain safeguards as to obtaining information as to who are the shareholders of the company, but as to the voting of those shareholders who do not see fit to register their street certificates, the law which has stood on the book for 11 years allows the voting of such shares. This, I say again, is one of the subjects which is being studied by the committee which is working diligently, meeting weekly, and will report soon. I trust that when that report comes in, if this is one of the subjects which is recommended for action, action can be taken.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me merely say this: I did not for a moment disagree either with the legal opinion given by Borden Elliot or by the other firm of solicitors who were not even named. I am satisfied, the hon. Attorney General has given us chapter

and verse confirming the opinion that they gave. I do not care whether those sections have been on the statute books for 11 years or 111 years! I would think that the hon. Attorney General, as a man who believes in the preservation of democratic rights, must be shocked at this sort of a story. I would think that the hon. Attorney General would make it his business, as the man who advises the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) on legal matters, to see that this situation is remedied at the earliest possible opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I would accept that and I would only say in reply: The Attorney General has not been in this House as long as some hon. members and this is the first time that he has heard of this matter. I pointed out that this has been on the books for 11 years—

Mr. Singer: I agree, I agree! I made the point last evening. It is unfortunate that this hon. Attorney General must be the recipient of this type of criticism. It is unfortunate because some of the things, sir, that we on this side of the House want to say must be said notwithstanding the fact that the hon. Attorney General has been in his portfolio such a short period of time. But we cannot accept such an excuse which might mute our criticism merely because the government has seen fit to change portfolios. We shall not miss the opportunity to do our duty and to criticize. So in addressing criticism to this hon. Attorney General, or to any other hon. member of the government, we have to address it to the hon. member who happens to be in the particular portfolio at the moment we have the opportunity to address the criticisms. This is the only way we are allowed to proceed and this is the only way really that it should be.

Just one final remark on this. I would hope that when the hon. Attorney General has a chance to examine this particular correspondence pretty carefully—and I would expect he would—that he have a look at the letter written by Mr. Knox-Leet, and particularly the last paragraph which says:

On the basis of the information available it has been decided that this is not a matter requiring any action by the Ontario Securities Commission at this time.

I would have thought this sort of inquiry or complaint, addressed to Mr. Knox-Leet, might have awakened in his mind some sort of feeling that there was an inequity being done by the present form of our statutes. Perhaps he might have said: "A case has been made

and I will refer it to my superiors in order that they might review the legislation."

I think when a civil servant takes it upon himself to say that this is not a matter requiring any action at this time, that he is taking too much unto himself. It would appear—and I do not know Mr. Knox-Leet personally—that he is an intelligent and an able man. He must have been to obtain this appointment. However, when this sort of thing comes forward, he should have been sufficiently alert to say: "Well, maybe there is something in this that is wrong, and let me refer it to my superiors and perhaps they might make an inquiry and, if anything is wrong, then the political people who have the responsibility will perhaps correct it."

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let us have the record straight, at least to this extent, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps Mr. Knox-Leet might have seen fit to refer to the matter, but it only happened some few weeks ago. He wrote his letter in the month of April, but let this be clear on the record, that what was done in this whole situation was done according to and within the limits of the present existing laws of this province.

Mr. Singer: Within the limits of the present existing laws, yes; but not within the limits of equity or justice, and not within the limits of what appears to be the accepted practice on the street, which is much fairer than the existing law.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might go along with that, but I just do not want the impression to go abroad that a wrong was here condoned because your statutes, which perhaps you had some hand in making, permit this sort of thing.

Mr. Singer: I chose my words very carefully and in case there is any doubt in anyone's mind, at no time did I say, Mr. Chairman, that any law had been broken.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right!

Mr. Singer: I thought I was as fair as I could be, I accepted the opinion of the solicitors as referred to in this correspondence, and the hon. Attorney General has the statute right in front of him, he confirms my thinking. I did not suggest that at all, but what I did say was that the government should and must be concerned about these things and must take action.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Downsview has raised

a number of points this evening and earlier in his introductory remarks on the hon. Attorney General's estimates. He has raised a number of important matters relating to the securities commission, or the securities branch. I will try to avoid repeating what he has said.

He put before the House in some detail information contained in a series of articles which appeared not long ago in the *Toronto Daily Star* regarding some practices that are permitted in the Toronto Stock Exchange and comparing our regulation of exchange activities in this province with that in other jurisdictions.

The hon. Minister has pointed out that a committee looking into these matters has several of them under advisement right now. I cannot understand, Mr. Chairman, why we need a committee to decide whether or not we are going to do what was done long ago in other jurisdictions.

One of the diseases around here, in my period of observation, is what I would call committee-itis. We have even got to the point, sometimes, where we have set up committees to study the reports of committees. I do not really see the point of this committee. I think that it would have been possible for the government to have brought in legislation at this session, not necessarily on all areas concerned, but certainly in areas where there is solid experience in other jurisdictions to go on.

For the last couple of years we have not heard the sort of lurid tales of the fleecing of the victims down on Bay Street that we used to hear, the tales of the boiler shops and the racketeers hiding behind the shelter of the Toronto Stock Exchange. Things have been relatively quiet in the last two or three years. Partly, no doubt, this is because there has been a considerable degree of cleanup down there. But I suspect from recent developments, Mr. Chairman, that one of the main reasons we have not been hearing these stories has been that we have not had one of these feverish situations where there was a major strike in a mining field in northern Ontario. Now we had one of those recently and it seems to me that we saw a repetition of the same old thing.

Indeed, I saw a reference in the paper a few days ago to a businessman who said that the Toronto Stock Exchange is little more than a high-class gambling casino. I am not sure that that is an accurate description, Mr. Chairman. I must say I am not a frequenter of gambling casinos, but I would think that in a high-class, well regulated gambling casino one could feel assured that the wheels

are not rigged and the dice are not loaded. After what I saw a short time ago down on Bay Street, I am not so sure that one can always say that about the Toronto Stock Exchange. I think that there was a real basis for believing that the dice may have been loaded against certain people.

I am no expert on this matter, but it appears to me that one of the reasons for this is the practice of the stock exchange of listing penny mining stocks and retaining their listing even when there is no activity in them. This is a wide-open invitation to individuals, who are mainly interested in stock promotion, to get control of a company quite cheaply and have a listing ready-made on the Toronto Stock Exchange. They can evade the scrutiny that is now, I understand, the practice in the stock exchange when one applies for a new listing. If you just buy over one of these inactive companies, and if you get a nice deal like the Timmins one, you can really start booming your shares that represent no genuine value at all, drive them up for a period, then unload them and let them drop. I do not know that this is done from boiler shops any more. Perhaps the people who are doing it are more respectable than boiler shop operators. But it seems to me that the same old thing goes on whenever the opportunity presents itself.

Another phase of this matter, to which I would like to make some reference, Mr. Chairman, is the whole question of stock options for company executives. As I understand it, the stock exchange has certain rules on that. Perhaps they are not absolute rules but they are guide lines limiting the percentage of shares that can be offered in options. Also there is some control over the price at which they are offered to executives. But I see in a recent item in the press that the rules have been bent in at least one case. I hesitate to mention the specific case because I have had occasion to refer to a prominent individual in this organization not long ago and I do not want to create the impression that I am specifically pursuing him, or his organization. This just happens to be an example where the rules were not complied with as they were written and the stock exchange took the position that their requirements were not rigid ones; that they were subject to some elasticity.

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is that the offering of stock options to executives is really a device whereby the management group consolidates its control over a company. I am a person who is concerned about the ability of small groups to seize control of companies and use the control they have

over those companies to get control over others. I have referred to this matter in the past, mainly under the estimates of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko).

It is a matter, Mr. Chairman, in which he has little, if any, interest at all, I would judge. But I think it is a matter that we ought to be concerned about. Those gentlemen who claim they believe in free enterprise and in competition, I think, ought to be concerned about the rapid speed at which control over our economy is falling into fewer and fewer hands. The stock option is a ready-made device to expedite that process. The employees who are given these options are not employees. They are management people. They are in the management group in the company. They are the people who are already in control, and they simply strengthen their control by getting shares at favourable prices for themselves.

One other phase of the same problem I would like to mention is the practice whereby the funds of company pension plans and other employee benefit plans, but mainly pension plans because that is where significant investment funds are accumulated, are used to buy the shares of the company concerned. I do not think that should be permitted. It is not permissible for the officers of a company to buy shares of the company out of the company's own treasury, for the very obvious reason that that would enable them to use the company's own funds to strengthen their control. I really do not think that the use of company pension plan funds to buy shares in the company is essentially different. It is a device whereby the management, which really has control over these profit-sharing funds and pension funds, can use funds accumulated from the employees and the company to buy shares to intensify their control.

These are two areas that I think should be investigated, whether under The Securities Act or The Corporations Act, or both. I do not know, but I certainly think that some change should be made with regard to both of these matters.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the hon. member, in the case where a pension fund is managed in large part by the employees, is the hon. member expressing an opinion that they do not have the right to buy the shares for their pension fund from the company in which they work?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. Attorney General that it is not all that easy to determine.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just in that case. Is that wrong?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that it would be good practice to require that the funds should be invested in other securities. There are not many cases where the employees have any real control. The companies name representatives and then they name employee representatives. They are all named by the company. Where there is a union organization, I think there is a possibility of genuinely independent employee action, but few of those plans are operated in that way at all. They fit into a totally different type of picture. The kind I am talking about are profit-sharing plans which are frequently combination profit-sharing and pension plans.

The so-called employees' voice, which is represented as employee control of the funds, is a fraud. It is not true employee control at all.

Vote 209 agreed to.

One vote 210:

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister a problem under this vote which occurs in towns of Ontario. That is the high cost of policing these towns. Of course the hon. Minister is quite well aware the town has the right to do its own policing, or enter into agreement with the Ontario Provincial Police. We find that we have towns with 2,500 population, other towns with 3,000 and the cost of policing them with the provincial police, which I do not say would be any dearer or any more costly than if they did it themselves, is running in the neighbourhood of \$25,000.

These towns have few sources of revenue. With the demands of many other services required, they are finding the policing of these towns a great burden. I believe we are coming to the time when some assistance should be given to these towns. A good police force is required because of tourists and other individuals coming to that town. We also find some municipalities outside of these towns are policed without any cost to them. I know the hon. Minister is quite well aware this has become too great a burden. I think the costs of policing should be absorbed by the government. This would be a great benefit to these towns and give them another life of hope.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thank the hon. member for the remarks he has made on this subject. I take it the hon. member is referring to the

cost of policing in those municipalities that maintain their own police forces. I am sure the hon. member is aware that some thirty to forty municipalities are now policed by the Ontario Provincial Police. I think those municipalities, without exception, seem quite happy with the arrangements they have entered into.

The recent report of the police commission has suggested one field in which costs might be saved. That is amalgamation of police forces. This does present some problems and may take a little time. But it is one of the subjects that was given to the police commission to study. It is under consideration by the government itself as well as by the commission.

I might say, too, that I have had, since assuming this portfolio, interviews with three municipal councils, one as late as today, about their police matters. The matter of cost is only one of the factors. It was more a matter of whether they should have a council committee or a police commission with a magistrate, a judge, or at least a judge or the reeve and one other member who was usually a magistrate. These sort of things. But I know that the matter of cost is becoming more and more of a factor and burden. The subject of it will be given full consideration.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I do not think it is a fight, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to make this point. I would like to follow up on the same subject. The hon. Attorney General did say that the municipalities that have the provincial police policing them in the small towns are quite pleased, without exception. I think those were the words used by the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As far as I am aware.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to relate one case to the hon. Minister particularly. It pertains to the village of Crystal Beach. There are provincial police in the province and in these estimates a figure is shown of approximately \$20,300,000. There is no assistance given to these municipalities that are not—

I would like to get the attention of the hon. Attorney General. I think I am entitled to that much of a concession. I do not want to be rude about this, but I think he should hear this particular case.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was trying to listen with one ear.

Mr. Bukator: Well, at least that is better than none at all.

The village of Crystal Beach has five regular police protecting the village year-round. They have approximately a thousand voters. Now, in the summertime they have to take on eleven part-time provincials for their park. I realize this is quite a hardship for the hon. Minister's department because somewhere he has to find these men. In the summertime it is found, too, that they are needed much more on the highways maybe, so you can ill afford to devote them to municipalities. I am quite sure the hon. Attorney General would be happy if the municipalities could police themselves because he has a place for his police.

But the thing that I am trying to bring to the attention of the House is that if a municipality has an influx of population, such as happens in a summer resort, they need these extra police. These people come from all over the province as well as from our neighbouring country, too. This creates a hardship on the municipality that has no industrial assessment whatsoever and only small commercial assessments.

These municipalities find themselves overburdened when it comes to paying for the provincial police that they must have. Mind you, it takes five regulars and eleven extras in the summer.

I do not believe that the municipality should have to bear the cost of those extra eleven men, because the people who come into that area come from throughout the province. Therefore it would appear to me that it would be good business for the province to pick up the tab for that because, if they were not on that job and they were working through the province, the government would have to pay their wages anyhow.

Now then, these municipalities are geographically situated in such an area that people do come to enjoy the summer resorts, the parks. They come from throughout the province. It would appear to me it would be good business for the hon. Attorney General's department to look very closely at a problem such as the one I have related. I am sure there are others. As a matter of fact, I am acquainted with one or two more, but I was using this as an illustration. If they must bring into a municipality eleven extra police for the summer months to take care of the people who come from throughout the province to that area, and create a condition where the costs are borne by that municipality, it hardly seems fair. I would like some comments from the hon. Attorney General if he has had any experience since he has taken office on that particular problem.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would not like to engage in a debate with the hon. member for Niagara Falls on this subject. But I would draw to his attention that the situation of the municipality is parallel to the situation of the province, only on a smaller scale. We have had very serious discussions with the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police, with members of his staff and with members of the police commission, on this very subject. But particularly, it pertains to the Ontario Provincial Police.

Here you have a situation whereby if you increase your force in summer, which is a very difficult thing to do with competent officers and constables, and you have to increase it by hiring, say, six men for every one of your regular force, what do you do with them in the winter-time? How do you train them to be competent policemen for three or four months of the summer? Then what do you do with them? Can you replace men of this type—a law enforcement officer—for a part-time job and turn him loose in the fall and hire him back in the spring? This is a difficult thing to do.

The force is being augmented, however. I think, as the hon. member and the hon. members of the House are aware, in situations where there is a very heavy summer traffic and summer visitors congregate, additional provincial police are provided for traffic patrols, and to as large an extent as is possible, to assist in those areas that need policing. But it is the municipality—and I do not want to debate the matter—but it is the municipality where the tourist, or the visitor, or the camper congregates which gets the benefit, in that location, of his presence there, and of his spending, and of his visiting, and staying in the locality.

It is all very well to say the province gets the benefit of the tourist traffic. True, it does. But it gets it by the sum total of all the little places, or the big places, where the visitors go and stay. If a municipality has its regular police force and, in the summer, its ranks are swelled, tripled or multiplied, perhaps it is fair to suggest that the increased revenue for the three or four months it is crowded with visitors should be charged, to some extent, against the cost of extra policing.

It is not a problem that I want to shrug off, Mr. Chairman. I want to find out if it is a difficult problem.

In discussing it with the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police a few days ago, we discussed this very thoroughly. Additional men are being taken on and the reason is

because the force needs, generally, extra recruitment at this time. Those men now in the winter months, are being used to give them training at the college at Aylmer and at the police college facilities here on Sherbourne Street. So that all this has been thoroughly thought of insofar as is possible. A realistic plan has been worked out to try to meet this situation.

But I do not think you can ask that the province assume the whole burden.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) has just been good enough to remind me that the unconditional municipal grants which the government makes, go, at least to some extent, toward the cost of police forces in the town. I think that is about all I can say to the hon. member on this point at this time.

Mr. Bukator: The points you make, especially the third one about the unconditional grant, as I understand it, having some 12 years experience in municipal council, are that where you used to give them the one mill subsidy away back and they could do with it what they liked, now you give them \$2 per capita and they can do with that money what they like. So a place like Crystal Beach, for instance, with 2,000 population, would maybe get \$4,000. That does not pay for eleven summertime police.

I come from a municipality that originally had its own police. I think maybe this should be made public, that we found that around election time the local police were wondering whether, if the council personnel should change because the electors had changed their minds, the police would have a job or not. They would come to see whether, if there was a new reeve and council, they were secure in their positions, because they might fire the policemen. Many times issues were made and elections were fought on the fact of whether they would or would not keep their local police if they were in office. But when I was in council in the village of Chippawa, we found that you would get away from that political pressure by having provincials in the village. They are doing a good job. But this is a municipality that has that population year-round. There is very little fluctuation there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Could I ask the hon. member—did he mention the population of Crystal Beach as 2,000?

Mr. Bukator: About 2,000 in the winter months.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: About 2,000. Would you be good enough to tell me how much it is increased in order that you have to hire eleven additional policemen?

Mr. Bukator: It gets to at least 25,000 people a day there in the summer months.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Do you not get any revenue from them?

Mr. Bukator: I would say several little businesses do, yes, but how does that affect the man who has a home, who has done an ordinary job, who pays his taxes regularly? This expenditure is added to that individual for something that he has nothing to do with. He has his home in the municipality where for nine months of the year he enjoys himself very well because they are about normal, but for three months or four months there is an increase in population from 2,000 to 25,000. These 11 men you bring into that area—the provincials—why do you bring them in? You, the province are paying them their wages. And so you would just bring them from one area into another. I say that these people who come from throughout the province are taxpayers and should bear part of that cost, and not one little municipality that has no industrial assessment whatsoever. This is the point I am trying to make.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Surely the hon. member must realize that if you have a provincial police force as it is today—I think the number is 2,541 in uniform—and if you needed 11 extra men to police that little village, you could not find them out of thin air on the provincial police force. You just cannot, if they are now occupied on traffic and patrol and the usual police duties before the tourist influx starts. Where are we to find the 11 extra men that you need?

Mr. Bukator: You get them—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would have to pull them out of the hat and I am no magician.

Mr. Bukator: Before you came someone else did pull them out of the hat and they did come in and they did a job and they were paid for it by that municipality. The fact I am trying to establish is that where they come from I do not know, they are there annually. The fact remains that they come in every year for that period of time. I do not know where you people dig them out of, what hat you get them out of, but I tell you you do a good job and this I give you credit for. I do not know why the people of that small municipality should be burdened with

that extra tax and this is the only point I am trying to make. I have said nothing against these men. They do an excellent job.

They are not influenced by local small-town politicians, which again is good, because you have a commission, you have a judge, and you have a magistrate and you have the mayor or the reeve of that municipality who sit on that commission. This is excellent. They are not dictated to by small-town politicians. But the fact remains that there is a village of people who just cannot carry that burden. I will tell you that the business people of that area do benefit, naturally. They try to make in three or four months what will keep them all year. Some of them do well enough that they go to Florida for the winter months. They come back in the spring and open up some old shack. The taxes on that to the municipality are very little, even though they have the business tax. But this is a problem that you have to wrestle with.

If I were standing here before you arguing on behalf of the village of Crystal Beach only and that was the only place where you had this problem, I would say it is no problem of yours. But this problem is throughout the province where you have a summer resort area. I think it will bear a good look at it. You are new in the position, trying to do an excellent job as I have observed your actions, but there is one for you to wrestle with and I hope another year you can settle this problem. I just wanted to bring it to your attention because if you have nothing else to do at least this will give you something to worry about.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, he certainly must think I am quite a wrestler. If you are going to multiply your force by 11, increase it by 11, and this is true all over the province, I must ask your help to tell me where I am going to find some 2,000 extra policemen—

Mr. Bukator: I am very pleased that you asked me to give you a hand.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Actually, I am only doubling the present force, which is 2,500. I will have to get 10,000 more if we are going to do this summer policing for you.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to answer—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I can wrestle successfully with that.

Mr. Bukator: Just one other point and then I will quit on the subject. You asked me to help you. I think that one of our hon. members

here, from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), made an exceptionally good point. I do not think he meant to take municipal police out of municipalities. I do not think that was his intention at all when he argued in committee, I believe, pertaining to small municipalities having provincial police. I think the provincial police are doing an exceptionally good job and this is quite a concession for me to give the government credit for anything. I think the provincial police are doing a good job.

I think you should add to your forces. There are people who do get sick even in police forces and there are people in summer months who must have vacations. I think all you have to do is add to your forces and you may settle some of your problems. I realize money is a problem too, but if municipalities are policed properly and the money comes from throughout the province instead of hitting individual municipalities, I think possibly this would settle the problem. That is why I say some concession is needed other than the \$2 per capita unconditional grant. This is not sufficient.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, I notice that the high officials in the provincial police and the executives and others, maybe inspectors and sergeants, may wear glasses. However, I understand that if an applicant for recruitment wears glasses this is a bar—despite the fact that he may be a graduate, have a matriculation certificate, be physically up to five feet nine inches tall or whatever it is, and of the right weight and so on.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I understand from the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police that on recruitment his vision has to be 20/20. I shall have to ask him for information. Perfect eyesight is necessary on enlistment, the commissioner tells me. After that, unless his eyesight became very bad, it does not affect his promotions.

Mr. Troy: Thank you. I do not know if the hon. Attorney General in his capacity as a prosecuting attorney or as a defence counsel has even been in the circuit court in Nipissing. If he has been, he has seen the building which is the headquarters of the inspectorate for the district of Nipissing. If he has, he would have realized long before he became the Attorney General, sir, that this is not the type of building that should be the headquarters for the Ontario Provincial Police. It might have been all right years ago, long before the bypass was constructed in North Bay, but now there would have to

be arrows all across the city to let people know where the provincial police are stationed.

I want to ask the hon. Attorney General when there will be a new inspectorate headquarters in Nipissing. There are all kinds of lovely detachment buildings but here is the inspectorate under which the provincial police all the way from Parry Sound right to Kirkland Lake operate. Does the hon. Attorney General have any idea when we may expect a new building?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I cannot answer as to the time when that new building which the hon. member so longs for will be achieved. There is a very substantial building programme to provide quarters for the Ontario Provincial Police, with the names of the places and the amounts required for those structures here in my hand. On the next page is found the extended building programme in view. But dates have not been set, or amounts provided, for this construction. It may be of some comfort, however, to tell the hon. member that this is not an alphabetical list; that North Bay, whatever it may mean, is ninth on that list and, much to my sadness, I see Sault Ste. Marie last on the list. This is not an alphabetical list. But I have no answer as to when North Bay might get that building.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, in the northern Ontario detachments, in each one of them, are there personnel who are bilingual? Is this the practice in northern Ontario, particularly where there are so many French-speaking residents?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The commissioner advises me that one of the problems is to get sufficient recruitment of bilingual applicants, particularly French Canadian personnel who speak French, in order to make the detachments, in the areas where there is a considerable French-speaking population, bilingual. An effort is being made to achieve this. It is a matter of recruitment.

Mr. Troy: Is there any medical-legal expert in northern Ontario who can conduct an autopsy in the possible case of a capital murder charge or non-capital murder? The reason why I ask is because there was a very tragic incident in the riding of Parry Sound recently. The body had to be brought all the way down here to Toronto for an autopsy because, apparently, there was no medical-legal expert who was qualified to conduct an autopsy in such a situation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am aware that there are a number of qualified persons in the northern Ontario area but I cannot give the hon. member the locations. There might be a special case where a particular medical-legal expert might be required. But in most of the centres there are physicians and surgeons competent to conduct pathological examinations and autopsies.

Mr. Troy: Pathological examinations; but tell me where—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I cannot, at the moment, tell you where the experts there are. But I know there are some.

Mr. Troy: I do not see, in any of these votes, that particular committee or group that I think are still under the hon. Attorney General's department. That particular branch that has to do with literature and obscene literature. Under what vote would that be taken? Would it be public safety, or official guardians or local masters? Which one?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I can find that for the hon. member. We passed it last night, apparently during your absence, but—

Mr. Troy: I was away on the nation's business and I am sorry—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can possibly find it before the evening is over.

Mr. Troy: Just for my own information, so that I will be watching for it next year, under which vote did it come? God willing, I will be here next year.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can tell the hon. member now. I believe it is vote 205, item 5.

Mr. Troy: Vote 205, item 5. Is that under law revisional committee? Have they made a report, sir, this year? Has that committee made a report?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That committee reports rather informally from time to time. I notice considerable material in my office from it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the crime report of the Ontario Police Commission, we had considerable discussion on the use of wire-tapping. I think it might be accurately stated that we were discussing there the underlying principles of the use of this. There was, obviously, sharp division. I do not intend to review that

aspect of it, though. I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General, with regard to the use of wire-tapping in Ontario at the present time, where is it being used now and under what conditions is wire-tapping used in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As far as I am aware, it is not being used. By that statement, I have only a reported statement. I have not any direct report from the Metropolitan Toronto Police. I am not aware of it being used in any other municipal police force. The commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police assures me that his force is not using it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, is there any law that permits the private use of wire-tapping?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Does the hon. member mean where you do not make actual contact with the telephone wire?

Mr. MacDonald: Not in the police force—private individuals.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Does the hon. member mean where you do not physically touch it? Is the hon. member talking about electronic devices?

Mr. MacDonald: The use of electronic devices; either the new style or the old style.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know. I do not know the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can resolve this here tonight. But I think the time has come for the government to cease what I would describe, if I may use that very wonderful word, as its hugger-mugger approach to this issue. I have made it my business to inquire particularly in some police sources, and I am not going to divulge them because they have to be very quiet on the issues. I want to suggest to the hon. Attorney General that wire-tapping is very widely used—maybe that is an exaggeration—but it is used fairly extensively. In fact, this is where its use first developed extensively, in private business. It is used by private business concerns to get information with regard to their major competitors and trade secrets.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is used, of course, most secretly then.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I presume it is used most secretly. I will come to that point in a minute, if I may just complete my story.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thought I might just give the hon. member this as we went along. I have this information from my legal staff, in a note telling me that The Bell Telephone Act and The Ontario Telephone Act both prohibit wire-tapping.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know to what extent, but that is the note that I have in my hand.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. This was discussed at some length, the legal position of it, in the crime report of the Ontario Police Commission.

Secondly, I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is no doubt about it, wire-tapping is used by those who are involved in organized crime. I do not think anybody disputes that.

Thirdly, I am informed that wire-tapping is fairly prevalently used by private detectives and that this government licenses private detectives.

Fourthly, the hon. Minister might be interested to know that—and this is from an unimpeachable source—as a matter of fact, Canadians are sent out of this country to take courses in the use of wire-tapping.

Finally, I am interested in the comment of the hon. Minister a moment ago, that the commissioner of police says that there is no wire-tapping. I talked to a rather important police officer—I will not identify him nor in what police force he was. He was very coy at the end but you could read between the words. Certainly there are indications that it is being used. So it will be denied by the commissioner as he apparently has just denied it now, and it was denied by Chief Mackey.

The *Globe and Mail* carried a story, which the hon. gentleman has undoubtedly seen, on April 1. Reference has been made to it in earlier debates in which Albert Warson, who is a very experienced reporter on the police beat, reviewed this whole picture in the light of the recommendations that came down in the crime report. In the course of his article there are two paragraphs. Let me read them:

The Ontario Provincial Police have some of this electronic apparatus and are considering acquiring more sophisticated models.

It rather strikes me as futile for the Ontario Provincial Police to be buying this expensive equipment for fun, or for experimental purposes, in leisure time or for some other purpose than using it. The next paragraph is:

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police force has this equipment and uses it for investigations in Ontario and elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the hon. Attorney General that the government's position at the present time comes pretty close to being in the position of the prohibitionist in his attitude toward drink. You are against it and you make it illegal, and then you wink at or turn upon its use.

I do not know whether we can resolve this issue as to the fact of its use at the present time in police forces—quite apart from the desirability of it. But sometime, instead of pursuing the hugger-mugger approach, I submit we have got to do it, as I submitted earlier in the debate. Maybe next session we can have the appropriate people called before a committee of the Legislature and we can get the information. I have reason to believe what I have suggested is true, and if it is the case that wire-tapping is as widely used as I have indicated, then I submit that the hon. Attorney General should examine the situation in relation to the principles that we were discussing.

Is it wise, like the prohibitionist in his attitude toward drink, to say, "I do not like it, it is illegal; I make it illegal and then wink at its use"? Then its use becomes more or less clandestine even when it is used by the police. Or is it more appropriate, and I pose it as a question for our consideration, to follow the advice that was given by the Lord Beckett commission in Britain, by Attorney General Kennedy in the United States and by our own police commission, that instead of winking at its fairly widespread and clandestine use, you lay down the circumstances under which it can be used? Then there is control of it, the use of it is going to be a permission granted for specific circumstances, and the need for its use under those circumstances has to be submitted to the appropriate authority before the permission is granted.

But I do not think the hon. Attorney General—being a person who is honest in his approach to facing the facts—when he has been in this office somewhat longer than he has been, can ignore the fact that wire-tapping is being used. I submit, from information from people who know, that it is being used by the police forces, too.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say this before we go further on this vote. I know there is considerable opinion in favour of the thought. Some jurisdictions use it, but I am in some difficulty at the moment, at least—it seems to me the argument is somewhat specious that says because private business uses this in a clandestine way, because criminals use it,

because private detectives use it secretly, governments may use it.

Mr. MacDonald: They do it under your licensing.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, but we do not license them to do this—anyway, you argue that because these people do it, the government should then do it. I think this is almost analogous to saying that because people buy lottery tickets the government should go into the lottery business. I do not think the two things necessarily make an argument for the government doing these things.

I know there is some merit in the argument. I am not going to say more about it tonight. The hon. member has suggested perhaps after I have been here longer I would have more time to think about it and study it, I might approach his thinking more closely. That may be so.

Mr. MacDonald: I would like to add if I may, I am not for the moment advancing any thinking at all.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): What are you doing?

Mr. MacDonald: I want to clarify the facts as to the situation in the province of Ontario at the present time and I am submitting to the hon. Attorney General that wire-tapping is in widespread use in many areas.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment at this point? I am not sure of the law myself but I do know the Bell Telephone Company had secret microphones planted in the calendars on the desks of its female service representatives in its office. I do know that some used car dealers in London have planted microphones in small "closing rooms," and that the salesman deliberately leaves the cubicle and goes into the sales manager's office, where the two of them listen in on the conversation between the car buyer and his wife and assess their desire for the car and the ability to pay and all this kind of thing.

I do not know if this is legal or not and perhaps I could ask the hon. Attorney General to comment on that. Then I want to ask one or two questions about police wire-tapping.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know what comment I should make on this fabulous story. I have never heard of such a thing going on.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Things were nice and quiet in the Soo, were they not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If I had the facts and someone suggested this was illegal—if I could find some law and had the facts, and the law said it was wrong—then I suppose it would be my duty to prosecute.

Mr. White: It is easy enough to determine because it is going on all over the place all the time. It is a matter of concern to me because these devices are becoming more and more easily available. I think that some American magazines offer these listening devices and these different kinds of peeking devices. I am just wondering if we should not attempt to control the sale of that kind of equipment which intrudes on the privacy of citizens.

Getting back for just a moment—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Could the hon. member let me have the details of this at some early date?

Mr. White: With the greatest of pleasure.

I wanted to deal for a moment with police wire-tapping. It certainly is going on, there is no question about it. As a matter of fact, the *Globe and Mail* or one of the other Toronto newspapers has photographs of the equipment being used by the Toronto police force. I suspect that the use is fairly widespread in police forces. To ignore it completely, to let it be used unrestrainedly by policing authorities seems to me to have dangerous possibilities.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear! Now here is a rational voice, for once, among those back benchers.

Mr. White: It may be that no wire-tapping at all should be permitted by the police. I am not entirely sure about this. It may be that it should be used; that it might be used in legal fashion with a court order. If this is the case I suggest it should be a senior court order and that the authority might be given by a Supreme Court judge to a police force for a particular investigation only. I think the whole matter deserves to be clarified, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the hon. Attorney General would look at it very carefully.

Mr. MacDonald: Good, now we are a wee bit ahead.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise, with the hon.

Attorney General, a question that I feel needs some clarification. It is in regard to the rights of the police, particularly the Ontario Provincial Police, to confiscate negatives of pictures taken by newspaper photographers, or in fact by the public.

This question arose out of an incident on or about January 29 of this year on No. 8 highway. Apparently a student of McMaster University, who was out on an assignment for the *Silhouette*, the student paper of that university, happened upon an automobile accident on No. 8 highway on this particular date. He took a picture of one car involved in the accident. Apparently there was a person in the car who was badly hurt at the time, or perhaps fatally hurt.

The policeman on the scene attempted to wrestle the camera from the student and, finally, he agreed just to take the film. The student surrendered the film. I was asked by the director of the paper from McMaster to raise the question and I did. On February 3, before the orders of the day, I posed this question to the then Attorney General:

Are the police within their power when they confiscate films of pictures taken by citizens at the scene of an accident? In the case of a recent seizure of a film, will the hon. Attorney General assure the House that it will be returned to its owner?

Now the answer to the first part was "no" and the answer to the second part was "yes". Subsequently the film was returned to the student. The student did, I understand, request from the commissioner of provincial police an apology for the incident. I believe he was told that they would not apologize and this was subsequently quoted in the press.

But the real point involves a further press report attributed to Inspector Robbin of the district headquarters in Burlington. The question posed to him was to the effect as to whether confiscation could be applied to pictures taken by newspaper photographers. The inspector simply repeated "It is all under consideration."

I think this should be made very clear to the public, and particularly to this House, whether they have the right to make seizures and confiscations of such films. If we get this kind of an answer from the then Attorney General, and we have press reports coming out that certainly create some confusion, then I feel that it should be clarified one way or the other.

It was reported in the press the policeman might have considered the picture to be in

bad taste and therefore he might have had that right. I think we have to decide when one considers something in bad taste as to whether or not that also gives them the right to infringe on the individual rights of the public.

I happened to pick out of the *Hamilton Spectator* a few days after this incident a photograph that was put into the newspaper captioned "Two Nuns in Hospital following Car Crash." It gives the names of the Sister and another passenger in the car. Certainly many would consider that sort of thing, in some light, in bad taste. Others would consider it worthy as a lesson to the public in regards to safe driving. I have certainly seen, myself, many pictures much worse than any I have seen in the public press that are used for safety purposes. They are put up in the factories to indicate the hazards of negligence.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): There never was any identification with those advertising pictures.

Mr. Gisborn: I did not say there was. And I did not say—well now, this poses a question. Does the hon. member want to take part in this debate and help me clarify the point I am raising? Has the Ontario Provincial Police the right to confiscate films or pictures taken by newspaper photographers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member, at the beginning of his remarks, stated that he had asked this question of my predecessor. He was told that the answer was "no." Would the film be returned, was the second part of the question, and the former Attorney General answered "yes"—and the film was returned. I do not think I can do better than repeat the answer he then gave.

I think there are more factors and features involved in this particular incident, apparently, than the hon. member knows or that he is revealing to this House.

I do not know whether you would call it a question of bad taste, simply and only, or not. But I am told that the situation was that there had been an accident; the body of a woman partly stripped of her clothing as a result of the accident was in the car, exposed. The police were investigating the case and the student came into the area where the police were. He was asked not to come there and not to interfere with their investigation. He persisted. He interfered with the investigation. He took the pictures. The police took the camera and the film under those circumstances.

My predecessor, sir, was asked: Did they

have a right to take the film? The answer was no, they did not. Will the film be returned? The answer was yes, and the film was returned. But I think, really, it is pretty hard to defend the action of that student in that particular incident. The legal rights are clear, but surely there is a limit to which that freedom can go. There must come, somewhere, a point where it becomes almost license. If an apology were demanded, I do not think I would be inclined to suggest that it be made to that student.

Mr. Gisborn: I would not argue, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Are you trying to protect him—to establish the right—

Mr. Gisborn: I would not argue, Mr. Chairman, with the remarks of the hon. Attorney General in regard to whether the taking of the picture was in good taste or not. But I certainly would argue with the comments attributed to the inspector of the provincial police when he was asked the question as to whether confiscation could be applied to pictures taken by newspaper photographers. His answer was that it is under consideration. This question is the one that should be cleared.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is not the matter now closed? Is there any still unfinished business about this?

Mr. Gisborn: The unfinished business, I submit—and I am following through a promise I made to the students of McMaster University that we would get this clarified one way or the other—is whether they have the right to take pictures—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, not that kind. The student should know better.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They have not got the right, I think, if the circumstances are such that they are interfering with the police investigation where such a serious thing as a death has occurred and it is necessary to investigate it and get all the details to establish whose responsibility it is. If a policeman asked me to keep out of that area, whether I have a camera or not, I think I would have to go. I think I would be wise to go. I think that would be my answer.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. Attorney General has all the details of the particular incident as it happened. The story I got of what happened at the scene of the accident does not comply

with what the hon. Attorney General has told me. I did not investigate that part of it. It is the principle of the incident that I am concerned with and I think the thing that has to be answered is, can the provincial police confiscate pictures taken by newspaper photographers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The answer was no, and I repeat it.

Mr. Gisborn: But it is not clarified by the remarks of the members of the force.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, if I could ask in connection with clarification, I have noticed that it has been reported in the paper that the deputy Minister of the hon. Attorney General suggested, in connection with the police, as I understand it, that the police need not advise anyone that they had the facilities of legal aid or a lawyer. I wonder, sir, if the hon. Attorney General would care to comment on that. What is his opinion of this?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I also read the newspaper remarks. I do not recall that I have discussed it with my deputy Minister. This was part of his newspaper interview in the course of the hearings of the committee in respect to legal aid. I think the matter came up as a presentation to the committee and I anticipate that that committee, which is still continuing its work, will shortly be in a position to report. I expect the deputy Minister will report on this matter, give the views of the committee and the presentation which was made. I have not discussed it with him, as yet.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, what would be the hon. Attorney General's opinion? I think it is rather important that there was some concern by newspapers. Assuming that this remarks was made by the deputy Minister, I wonder if this could be clarified. Should police officers suggest to anyone that they can have lawyers, counsel and legal aid and that it is available?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think that it is a new concept to this extent, that a police officer must, as a part of his regular duties, whether he is asked or not, tell everyone he arrests or takes into custody or accosts that he has a right to legal counsel. This is a little bit of a new concept. I think if the police officer were asked, "What are my rights? Can I get my lawyer?" he is certainly bound to answer "Yes."

Mr. Thompson: But what would you say if he was not asked? If a police officer were to see a man going to the court, for example, who looks confused and does not know his rights, would the hon. Attorney General suggest that this advice might be given to him?

In my own riding I have had situations of men who have gone before this court. I think of one example I had which shocked me very much. That was a young man who came from a country where there is a dictatorship and he told me after he had been to court here that under this dictator he thought he would get fairer justice than he did here. The reason he said this was because of the confusion that he had felt because he had received no legal advice.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He never really told you that, Andy.

Mr. Thompson: He most certainly did tell me this, and I can document this and would be glad to. It is one of the reasons why I am a strong advocate for some type of legal aid and I hope the hon. Attorney General is.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is one of the things that is being considered and will be brought forward but I would rather wait until the report is in and then come forward with recommendations.

Mr. Singer: Sir, my colleague raises a very interesting point but I do not know that it touches directly on the inquiry being conducted by the deputy Attorney General. That is, whether or not policemen, who often are an accused's only contact with the law through the whole procedure, should stand aside when an accused comes before a court and say nothing, and whether or not there is a duty on some law enforcement officer to say to the accused that he has certain rights and certain protections. Somebody should make these things clear.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): The magistrate always does that.

Mr. Singer: No, the magistrate does not always say that. The magistrate does not always say that and I am very glad the hon. member mentioned this. I am not sure but I think it was the hon. member for Halton who said that, is that right? I wish the hon. member for Halton would come with me some morning into A or B court at the city hall and see how many magistrates take the trouble to explain to the accused who come

before them that they have the right to legal aid.

I can tell you that there is one magistrate with whom I am personally familiar and that is Magistrate Bartrem. Perhaps this is as good an occasion as any to compliment Magistrate Bartrem. In his court in North York he does this carefully and painstakingly to make sure that these explanations get across. I think he carries on as a magistrate should, but many is the morning that I have spent in the courts at the city hall and this was not done, Mr. Chairman.

These accused come in and their only contact with the law is that they have been arrested. All they have seen really are policemen and suddenly they are pushed out of the pen into the dock. "How do you plead?" And nobody bothers to be of any assistance to them at all. Somewhere along the line I think there is a duty on law enforcement agencies and agents to make sure that people understand the right that they have. This is why I, with my colleague, am very surprised to see what the deputy Attorney General is purported to have said. I do not know if he said it. I think if he did say it, he was wrong and I would hope that these are not instructions that are given to the OPP and other police forces across the province.

Vote 210 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will meet at 2 o'clock, the usual time, and will have a night session. We will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests. Everything is now back on the order paper. Some bills came back only today so we must be prepared to meet any of the items that are presently on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 6, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	2861
Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts	2862
Recess, 6 o'clock	2902

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1964

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Cainsville Public School, Brantford, and members of the Women's Progressive-Conservative Association of Hamilton; and in the west gallery, students from St. Gabriel's Separate School, Willowdale.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House:

1. The annual report of the Minister of Lands and Forests for the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963.

2. The annual report of the Ontario Energy Board for the year ending December 31, 1963.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a question of personal privilege. This morning's *Toronto Globe and Mail* carries a story in which Dr. Morton Shulman, Metro's chief coroner, and Sergeant Cruickshanks, the constable in charge of summoning jurors at 86 Lombard Street, are credited with statements purporting to refute what I said in the House on Monday. I wish to set the record straight.

Dr. Shulman has done a creditable job of cleaning up a bad situation. I have no desire to get into a public argument with him. But when Dr. Shulman states that one of his first acts following his appointment in March, 1963, was to issue orders to end the practice of appointing veteran jurors, all I can say is that the records prove conclusively that the orders were not obeyed immediately, for the practice continued throughout the rest of 1963. If it has been eliminated this year, that is good, even if somewhat belated. I shall be glad to present to Dr. Shulman, or anybody else who is interested, a lengthy list

of veteran jurors who served duty in 1962, and who were chosen once, and sometimes more often, throughout 1963.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, let me cite just one case that Sergeant Cruickshanks disputes. I stated on Monday that the dean of the veteran jurors was D. W. Crawford, who had served five times during the year 1962-63. Sergeant Cruickshanks is reported as saying that he could only find evidence that Crawford had served twice in 1962. He contends that this was merely a mistake and, therefore, not too bad a record in the choice of over 500 jurors. Sergeant Cruickshanks is correct. Mr. Crawford did serve twice in 1962, on May 2 and November 8. But I shall leave the House, and the public to decide whether it was purely a mistake when I inform them that Mr. Crawford also served on three juries in 1963: on May 9, October 30 and November 14.

Sergeant Cruickshanks is also reported as contending that he never had a husband and wife serving on any jury he had chosen. True, no husband or wife served on the same jury. But in the two-year period which I investigated, there were eight husbands and wives who served on juries. The law of averages would not likely produce this result if the choice of the juries was a random choice among the hundreds of thousands available for jury duty in the Metro area.

The eight teams are as follows: John and Helen Brindley, of 420 Kingswood Road; Fred and Margaret Gourlie, of 439 Kingswood Road; Ross and Grace Urquhart, of 447 Kingswood Road; Nolan and Constance Blackburn, of 3 Claudius Gate; Jack and Joanna Knight, of 65 Dombey Road; Herbert and Helen Fuller, of 35 Seven Oaks Avenue; Stanley and Ruth Sherwood, of 133 Midland Avenue; and Stanley and Tilley Vitore, of 27 Tasker Road.

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that three of the husband and wife teams are from the same street.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order. House in committee of supply. Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, before the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) starts, I wonder if, for the guidance of hon. members, I might ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) if the House will be sitting tomorrow morning?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is my intention to sit this afternoon, tonight, tomorrow morning, tomorrow afternoon, tomorrow evening and then we will start Friday in the usual way at half past ten in the morning.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, since I did not participate directly in the Budget debate, I would like to record that I subscribe to all the traditional commendation that has gone on the record, and add a personal one recognizing the ability and long service of the honourable Speaker of this Legislature, and of you, Mr. Chairman, both of whom I regard as personal friends of long standing and of high repute.

A year ago in this House I referred to the fact that only seven of the 90 members elected to the 21st Parliament in 1943 remained in the Legislature. Now, a year later, they are but three—Grey South (Mr. Oliver), Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) and St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts).

I commend, sir, the efforts of the new hon. members, some of whom have shown very promising debating ability, and I wish all hon. members well.

In the period in which we live, we have been witnessing renewed growth in revenues and in expenditures at all levels of government and throughout the economy of the province.

Many of the departmental estimates which have already been dealt with reflect basic expanding expenditures. Some of them do not have sources of revenue within their own reach and are dependent on the consolidated revenue fund for their undertakings.

The Department of Lands and Forests is in a somewhat different position. This department is charged with the administration and management of the renewable natural resources of this province, with certain obvious exceptions—agriculture, for example.

I am told that at the Resources for Tomorrow Conference of 1961, when the subject of renewable resources was under discussion, some members of the steering committee thought that people should be included in

the term renewable natural resources but I say God forbid that we should have to have that responsibility in our department.

The total ordinary expenditures for the department is shown in the estimates as almost \$28 million. The estimated ordinary revenues amount to in excess of \$23 million.

We regard five of our branches as encompassing the main activities of the department in volume—fish and wildlife, lands, parks, timber and forest protection. As appears in the estimates, the expenditures relating to these five is almost \$19.5 million, or roughly a little more than two-thirds of the total departmental expenditure. Practically all of our revenues will come from the activities of these five branches.

The revenues from these five more than look after their costs of operation and contribute substantially on the black side of the ledger to assist in defraying the costs of the other large servicing parts of the department.

Mr. Chairman, we can wax quite eloquent in extolling the great potential of our province in the field of renewable natural resources.

I had a few experts doing some figuring for me to see if we could come up with a very general guess at the potential value of the standing forests. The standing timber resources of this province are estimated currently by our forest inventory at 150 billion cubic feet gross total volume. That is the new outer space type of mathematics, although as a matter of fact, you do not have to look to the stars these days for those kind of figures. You get them annually in the federal, and even in provincial, financial statements for the asking. I said 150 billion cubic feet gross total volume.

This would be approximately one billion, 800 million cords, which means Ontario can sustain an overall estimated annual allowable cut of 2.7 billion cubic feet—although, not all, by any means, in the economic area of development at the present time. But it does mean that there is, as demands and markets arise, ample room for tremendous expansion.

In the estimates of value based on factory and similar shipment returns for wood products, namely, forest and forest-based industries, I have had provided the very formidable figure of \$1.8 billion of value. This amount is bound, however, to be subject to some refinements because we do not have our figures for the current year. When you think of these figures and you realize that these renewable resources are there in

perpetuity if properly managed, you get a little better conception of what this means to our province.

Moreover, as more intensive management and improved methods advance, and as the operations become more fully integrated, these resources will increase in value.

Then what about the real value of fish and game in stream and bush? It is, of course, difficult to place a gross value here. Recent surveys indicate that the average resident angler in Ontario spends \$138 annually on the sport and resident hunters \$110. In our calculation, we have used a similar yardstick for non-resident anglers and hunters and have come up with an overall figure of no less than \$338 million. In addition, we have reasonably accurate figures for furs and commercial fish. Add all these together and we have the not insignificant figure of \$350 million on an annual basis in the fish and game sector of the provincial economy.

From wood products and fish and game products then, we have an annual dollar value of finished products of \$2.150 billion. This, Mr. Chairman, is a larger figure than five per cent of the total gross annual product this year for all of Canada.

This is big business. As a matter of fact some other research figures on the resident anglers and hunters of our country show that they consumed no less than 60 million pounds of game and fish in a single year—I do not have comparable figures in respect to some of the other forms of consumption but there may be some other departments which would.

Incidentally, the total distribution of fish from our 17 Ontario fish hatcheries was 72 million of eggs, fry, fingerlings, yearlings, and so forth. This represents a considerable amount of substitution of class in the hope of getting better end results. For example, we are now using far more yearlings for lake trout restocking and reducing the number of fingerlings.

If there are any unlucky fishermen in the Legislature, this figure of 72 millions of possible fish going in this year ought to be heartening to them for the future.

Hon. members have received a copy of the last annual report and some other material which was distributed yesterday. It included a photograph of the 47 current publications of this department. Those publications are available as required.

This department has been giving very serious thought and study to the ways and means of making the best possible use of Ontario Indian citizens in the management

of our natural resources. It is encouraging to see the increased attention being given to the general subject of Indian citizenship at various levels of government.

Bill 130 of the federal Parliament has been introduced for study and, when enacted, will create an Indian Claims Commission with wide powers to deal with claims, including areas where the earlier compensation or dealings may have been so inadequate or sharp as to constitute unconscionable dealings. This bill has been referred by the federal government to numerous groups for study and comment and my department is personally, at the request of the hon. Prime Minister of this province, preparing a submission.

I had the personal advantage and experience of visiting, early in January of this year, a number of our most remote Indian settlements in Ontario and seeing first-hand conditions as they exist, and the way in which some of the problems of existence are met on a day-to-day basis.

I can assure all hon. members of the House that there is plenty of room for improvement. I want to assure the House that The Department of Lands and Forests intends to do all in its power to work with all those who are like-minded in this field.

I would particularly emphasize that there is a very good working relationship between The Department of Lands and Forests and the Indian Affairs Branch at Ottawa. Both the former Minister in charge, the hon. Mr. Favreau, and the present Minister, the hon. Mr. Tremblay, have shown very keen interest in this co-operative effort.

In pursuance of what, I think, are very worthy objectives, we have in our department set up an advisory committee on Indians to the Minister, which committee is composed of eight Indian citizens of Ontario.

I hope, shortly, to be able to announce in connection with that very famous Algonquin Park, the creation of an award or membership which may be known as the "Order of Algonquin." This should, in time, rival the "Order of Good Cheer," which originated with Champlain in Nova Scotia. I can visualize some extremely interpretive pageantry accompanying this award.

I now want to say something which is not in my text, but which I regard as a first priority in human relations. I have been concerned, as I have stated and as you know, with the employment and the living conditions of the Indians in Ontario; and in particular with those living in the far northern settlements. These people are the finest woodsmen in the province, superb fire

fighters and of the greatest importance to us when serious fire conditions develop.

We have, in the past, employed many of them after special training in modern methods and equipment. This year we plan to develop this programme further and include, in our attentions, the use of standby forces, on a rotation basis, of several hundred Indians. These forces will be located at strategic points across northern Ontario, ready to move into action should a serious situation develop. In addition to the training programme, these men will be employed on forest management programmes when fire hazard is low.

This is the key sentence. Their pay will be in line with the high standard of work which they perform. We will recognize that they have a particular technique and we will pay for it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is my intention to develop this programme this year and in ensuing years to make the fullest possible use of our Indian people in the management of our forests in Ontario.

Now a word about timber. Our greatest material asset to be managed and administered is timber. The current year has been a very satisfactory one, with an overall five per cent increase in the cut on Crown lands.

Seventy per cent of all timber cut from Crown lands is pulpwood. Almost all the balance is sawlog material. I am sure all hon. members will be interested to know, too, that from 12 per cent to 15 per cent of the overall cut in this province comes from private lands.

Ever-improving methods in the industry are causing more and better end-results to be obtained from the same quantity of wood—more use of the raw material and less waste in the woods. In a word, it means better utilization.

And one can give a quick example of that in the development of the chips industry in the last few years. Today there is enough tonnage from chips to be the equivalent of a single good sized pulp and paper mill in actual production.

During this current year, there have been announcements of several new developments involving millions of dollars in expansion in the pulp and paper industry in Ontario. The sawmill industry is moving at a sound level of production, with its share of the increase indicated from the current year's figures, last year's figures particularly. Chips and veneer are two of the outstanding new uses of this industry.

Some critics have stated that our methods have resulted in tying up vast areas and curtailing possible expansion. They talk from a base of misinformation. Quite contrary to their allegations, good management practices are maintaining us in a position to provide for any reasonable, properly planned, economic expansion in the foreseeable future for both the pulp and paper and the sawlog industries.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a very important situation and one for which there has been a lot of hard work done over the last several years to bring about the possibility and the actuality of being able to make such a statement.

Those who have had experience over the last half-century in the uses and abuses made of the timber resources know what can happen if a policy were to permit acquisition, without comparable utilization, for quick capital gains unrelated to any accomplishment or adequate consideration. On the other hand, the objective is to distribute so that all planned economic wood undertakings can have access to a fair share of the product required. Our policy has always been to assure continuity of that availability for stability in any given area.

Ontario has no law prohibiting free movement of its timber in Canada. There is a control over export outside of Canada from Crown lands. Nearly all the timber that is exported from time to time, under permit, is of species which constitute a surplus. There has been a constant decrease in the export to foreign countries of unprocessed timber from Ontario. The province's control is confined, of course, to Crown lands. It has no control over wood from private lands.

While I am talking about restrictions on exporting of renewable resources, you will recall that a few moments ago I said that there were certain experts who consider that people should be classified as part of our renewable natural resources. If that were ever to happen—and I have already said I hope not—then the Minister of Education of the day might welcome some similar type of export restriction on that form of renewable resource, particularly if he has a spending budget comparable with the one passed in this House yesterday.

I want to say a word or two about provincial parks. The provincial parks as reorganized into a branch of this department are not yet ten years old, yet the expansion of provincial parks from an original six parks into a province-wide system of 86 operating parks is, I think, a fine accomplishment.

I would like to pay tribute to the staff of the department not only in connection with parks but in connection with all the other work I have been speaking to you about and which will be apparent as my estimates are dealt with. Mr. Wheatley, the parks head, has been incapacitated now for several weeks. We all hope that he will recover his health before too long. We have 2,616 of a permanent staff and I would thank them all for their very good work during the year under review.

I take this opportunity also to extend to Mr. A. S. L. Barnes and all the members of the staff of the conservation authorities branch, all good wishes in the new department, and to thank them collectively for the very excellent work they did when a branch of this department.

A noteworthy accomplishment this year was the recognition by way of the McKee Trophy award of the contribution of the deputy Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Frank McDougall, to civil aviation.

Last summer we had a record attendance of 8.5 million visitors to all provincial parks and no less than 840,000 campers used the tent and trailer campgrounds. It is a wonderful thing to be healthy and be able to get outdoors in the open air and enjoy the pleasures offered by Ontario's parklands.

The 14,500 campsites providing approximately five times that number of woodland beds for every night throughout our summer period are an open invitation to thousands of families to live out next to nature for at least a few days in the year at a nominal cost and be healthy. More comfortable commercial facilities are available to those who wish to use them. These facilities, too, are taxed to the limit in many areas of the province during the rush season.

I am glad to be able to say that based on our surveys, the expansion that is proceeding is making provision for the summer tourist and vacationer demands. We realize that these demands will constantly increase, particularly in this mechanical age of shorter and shorter work hours. This park expansion will, therefore, continue at a rapid pace. I do not propose to go into any detail at the moment but I would like to mention three great projects.

Not too far from here we have Wasaga Beach, for which further use is indicated and studies with respect to additional beach recreation and expansion are going forward.

Two other sites are also in the making for parks. Point Farm on Lake Huron is a grand site where over 100 years ago the then

commander-in-chief of the American army came with a gunboat, pleasure bound. In view of some of the Fenian raids of that era, he caused a calling out of the armed forces to repel the rumoured attack. However, General Sherman enjoyed a few days' vacation on this very site.

Several hon. members of this House will be particularly interested in this park acquisition and we all look forward to its growth and development with great interest. It is not far from Goderich. It has a beautiful beach and ravine area with a certain amount of traditional old buildings and old landmarks that should be of great value in the building up of the park.

Travel with me for a moment down to Prince Edward county, near Wellington, in the east, and I will show you a great length of sand banks owned by the Crown and now about to be developed into a vast day-use bathing area. Highway 401 makes this area readily accessible from places as far away as Metro Toronto for a day's outing or more. The scenic beauty of Prince Edward county will come to be appreciated more and more as this development proceeds, and I am sure the hon. member for the neighbouring riding of Hastings West (Mr. Sandercock) will agree the beauty of Prince Edward is well worth seeing by everybody in the province.

These are but a few of the wonders that will be available for future generations in this province.

Despite heavy current commitments for property acquisition, I am glad to be able to say that there will be no change in park entry and camping fees in provincial parks in 1964. I was going to ask the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) to take particular note of this. He is not in his seat; perhaps he has run out of steam in this early part of the summer season, but he is not with us at the moment. In any event his hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald) will perhaps convey this to him, because when I read this letter I will make a comment that I would like to be conveyed to him.

One reason for this decision is contained in this letter. In my view, it interprets in a remarkably clear manner the viewpoints and the problems and the outlook of a low-income family mother, a city mother, and her view of the outdoor provincial park facilities. She writes me:

I would like to protest the raising of camping fees from \$1 to \$2 a night. I am just one of many with a growing family who find camping a way of giving my children a holiday. Food alone is more costly

when camping because you don't have ovens, or the same facilities. Also I find things more expensive when not close to the chain stores. To camp for an average two weeks—

and she is referring to the fees in the parks:—for around \$7 to \$10, comes to \$14 or \$20 a holiday. This to us is top price. To have to put out that amount for one week will, I sincerely believe, render it impossible for our family to holiday this year.

I understand it has something to do with a wood shortage. Surely they could charge an extra quarter to anyone wishing to build a fire. This would cover the cost of wood.

I understand also the association of tourist owners are pushing this raise in fees. They do a good business for a few months in the summer and most of them have other interests to keep them going the rest of the year.

If we could afford to rent a cottage, or even stay in a tourist home, we would do just that. It would be far superior to the inconvenience of camping. However, camping is much better for children than running city streets. It is not my idea of solid comfort but at least my children have managed these last few years to get away from the city. Whether they do this year, depends on your decision.

This, I say, I would like to be brought to the particular attention of the hon. member for Scarborough West, because this is an act of this government which he so frequently in this House has accused of callousness and thoughtlessness for the people generally.

Our revenue, actually, from this source amounts to about 70 per cent of the operating costs. And I think ultimately and looking into the future, we would hope that eventually the parks will be self-sustained.

This year junior ranger camps, 66 in number, will be housing the full number which is provided for in the estimates if the House passes the vote. It is 1,600 this year, which represents almost a 20 per cent increase over last year's authorization. It is a pretty popular business and I am sorry to say I cannot place them all in filling the full 1,600 complement.

The number of applications this year exceeds by a considerable amount the number of places available. Boys of 17 years of age, coming from all parts of the province, meet in these excellent camps, do useful work, learn about conservation and the outdoor life, and with it all earn what for many of

them may be their first work pay for approximately two months of the summer.

Now I turn to the lands branch. This branch is continuing its survey of marine resources, supervision of summer resort lands, public land sales and land rentals, and land-use planning for public lands for recreation and other purposes. It is working in close conjunction with the parks branch in a number of these areas.

Some idea of the planning for land acquisition and the availability of suitable areas can be gained by a quick glance at the compilation such as I have in my hand. This is one of half a dozen or more inventories of different areas in the province covering in the main some 440 to 450 possible sites and representing nearly one million acres of land. All of it is documented in volumes similar to this. We also have a map of the province pinpointing such areas and a glance at this map shows that the work is a very extensive and all-inclusive one.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word—and I am nearly finished—about forest protection.

The forest protection branch has one of the largest and best equipped fire-fighting forces of its kind in the world. A coloured film has recently been made, *Flames in the Forest*, which shows the work of this branch under operational conditions. Many sections of the film represent photography of live forest fires and actual fighting of them, including the use of the department's air services.

So vivid is this film in its depiction that copies have already been provided to each of our 22 district offices. If any hon. member wishes it shown in his riding, I suggest that he contact the local district forester and make arrangements accordingly.

The great north country of Ontario is still not too well known to many. To really know Ontario you must know and understand the north. I know it is the desire of the hon. Prime Minister and the government to use the facilities of The Department of Lands and Forests to bring this vast area to the closest possible perception of the hon. members of this Legislature.

With this in mind, preliminary plans are being made for a tour of the north by the hon. members during the life of this Legislature. This was discussed at the recent meeting of the standing committee on resources the other day. The air arm of Lands and Forests can play a big part in rapid transportation. It may be that it would be preferable to move in this way a substantial part of the hon. members' tour and in that

case the department with its air-minded deputy and staff will do its best to make the undertaking as useful and comprehensible as possible.

On vote 1101:

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, in rising today to discuss the estimates of this department in a general way, I am reminded of the fact that it is the responsibility, in fact the duty of the Opposition to scrutinize the operations of the government and to criticize where criticism is necessary. Moreover; I would emphasize the fact that in my opinion, this criticism should be constructive, and even more important, responsible.

It is easy, Mr. Chairman, to make wild accusations of dishonesty, incompetence or wastefulness. It is somewhat more difficult for an Opposition member—and this fact I do not regret, and with this government I am proud of the fact—to analyze a department of this size with the limited time, resources and research facilities that I have at my command. This I would suggest is perhaps one of the most dangerous weaknesses in our system, when one considers that I am, in fact, faced with the combined resources, knowledge and experience of, in effect, the whole of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Fortunately, in some jurisdictions, this is somewhat not the case but I am the first to admit, if the history books are correct, that we on this side of the House might well have brought this situation on ourselves. Nevertheless, I prefer to live in the present and try to make history rather than relive it, atoning perhaps, for the errors of the past.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third year in succession that I have been the lead-off speaker for my party in the debate on the estimates of this department. This fact, indeed this honour, weighs heavily on my shoulders and coming from my part of the country, I particularly recognize the importance of this responsibility. That there are others more qualified for this honour I do not doubt, as is always the case, but I am here and will do my best.

I might add that I find it somewhat ironical for me, a northerner by birth, by residence and by choice, to be placed in a position to criticize a department run by a Minister whose experience with the north came before I was born. I cannot personally believe that one who has not lived in the great north of this province can detect, understand and sympathize with the problems we are now facing. This, sir, is in view of the fact that in the operations of this department,

to a very large extent, lies the future of the north. Only to live in the north, as it now is, is to understand it and recognize the hopes and desires of all of the people, of every economic level, who now live there.

I have said this many times in the past and you, Mr. Chairman, will recognize the truth of what I say. Almost every settled community in the north and northwest is fundamentally based on the existence of one established primary industry. Each of these communities lives, progresses or dies as does this established industry. My hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Noden), more than I, has seen the economic repercussions that result when these basic industries are weakened or threatened.

We in the north have been somewhat overwhelmed by changing economic factors. I was taught some ten or so years ago in university that basic industries were established where the raw materials were available, where a power source could be found and the labour force was equally at hand. A market for the product was important as well but not so important as the other factors I have mentioned. Now the situation has drastically changed. Our raw materials are shipped in bulk to the heavily populated areas of the east and south, our power sources are siphoned off to the same areas and our available labour force drifts off to the metropolitan areas where the only available employment is to be found.

We find that the key to the establishment of a primary industry is an available market. In the heart of Metropolitan Toronto we have paper processing mills. Pulp rather than paper is shipped from our mills to processors in most of the great marketing areas of the world. While all of this is going on, our lesser primary industries are being squeezed, pushed and pulled so that they are fighting for their very existence.

Let me illustrate if I may. For years now, smaller forest industries, which are a significant factor in the economy of the north, have been operating on a day-to-day basis. They were unable to obtain any guarantee of an adequate supply of timber which naturally led to problems in financing, production and marketing. At the same time, many of our pulp and paper mills were given timber limits so large that they could not possibly exhaust their reserves for 100 years, assuming normal regeneration.

Faced with this dilemma, this government has, at least until now, been unable to provide any solution which would work to the benefit of all concerned. I have heard the hon.

Minister say that he now has a solution but so far we have no real indication that such is the case. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that now is the time for a full-scale review of timber limit grants in this province. It is shameful that much of our forest is wasted because it is within a private timber limit but outside the foreseeable harvesting area of the grant holder. In many cases, smaller operators are begging for the right to cut this very timber.

Mr. E. E. Grainger, vice-president of Abitibi Power and Paper Co., had something to say on this very subject at a recent forest forum on the progress of forestry in Ontario. Mr. Grainger estimated that only about 21 per cent of the department's calculated annual cut was being utilized. He indicated that in his opinion, we should be far more concerned with the reasons for our failure to utilize more of our forest resources than with slow regeneration in some of our cut overland.

At the same forum discussion, Mr. J. A. Brodie, a well-known official in this department, is quoted as saying:

We should be able to double the annual cut from our forests, provided, of course, that we can place the final product on the market at a competitive cost.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with Mr. Brodie? Trees are a crop just as much as tobacco, beets and what have you. Trees, like farm crops, are of little or no use if not harvested before maturity. This is the great tragedy of your forest industries policy today.

By the same token, we in the north are witnessing another example of government indecision in the conflict of interest between our Indian population and our tourist outfitters. In the past two years I have mentioned some of the problems that exist and indicated the hardship that results when the interests of these two groups are at odds. I have indicated that decisions based on political expediency are the rule, not the exception. I think I can say that there were signs of hope in the administration of the former Minister of this department. The former Minister showed a sincere interest in the problems of our Indians. He was not one to trade on the political inexperience of these, our oldest citizens. We must, I suggest, take a new look at those areas where Indians and tourists outfitters are competing in the harvesting of our natural resources.

On the subject of our Indians I should like to say a few words. I recognize the fact that I have talked at great length on this subject in this House as did Albert Wren, my pre-

decessor. I am not one who appreciates repetition, as is for example, my hon. friend from Woodbine. In this case, however, I feel that I must reiterate what has been said in the past.

We must recognize the fact that most of our Indian population in the north is living, at best, at a bare subsistence level. Moreover, we must recognize as a fact that this is a problem which should be of concern to our provincial government. We must not negate responsibility under the cloak of the separation of power found in The British North America Act. If our civil rights legislation is to mean anything we must start now to provide these wonderful people with the opportunities most of us take for granted.

I should like to draw the attention of this House to the refreshing, almost enlightening approach of the Manitoba government in the past decade. I doubt that many in this House, particularly in the Treasury benches, have heard of Mr. Jean H. Lagasse or of the Lagasse report. If such is the case, I would suggest with respect, as we say in the court-rooms, that this report should be on the reading list of almost all in the Cabinet who have a real interest in the welfare of our Indian population.

By way of information, I should like briefly to discuss this report and its ramifications. In 1956 the Manitoba Legislature passed a resolution requesting the government to consider the advisability of having a study of the difficult conditions under which the Indian and Métis population of that province was living. Acting on this suggestion, the Manitoba government appointed Mr. Jean H. Lagasse to conduct a study of the Indian and Métis population and to report on his findings. Mr. Lagasse was instructed to make every effort to determine if there might be any way to expedite the social and economic integration of these minority and underprivileged groups. Let me quote if I may from a short portion of chapter one of the report finally prepared by Mr. Lagasse:

On the one hand, there was pride in that these citizens belong to a people who had contributed greatly to the early development of the west. On the other hand there was regret, and perhaps guilt, because this population was now scattered in the most unproductive areas of the province, existing at best, in a condition of independence created by physical and cultural isolation, and at worst, in idleness, hunger and disease.

Those speeches also expressed the belief that, given an adequate programme of

understanding and assistance, the people of Indian background could still recapture the spirit of initiative and courage which they displayed before the coming of the white man or, in the case of the Métis, before Manitoba joined Confederation.

Finally, frequent remarks were made throughout the debate [in the Manitoba House] requesting that this study be as exhaustive as possible in order that it become the basis for a sound and, if necessary, an elaborate programme of rehabilitation.

In the interests of brevity, which is perhaps not a recognized attribute in this House, I would say only that the two central themes of Mr. Lagasse's report were:

1. The Indians and Métis have a lower standard of living than that acceptable to the rest of the Canadian population; and
2. A new approach must be used to solve their problems, as past attempts to assist these people had not succeeded in reducing the number living in substandard conditions.

The report went on to make a number of constructive recommendations, some of which I would like to draw to the attention of this House. It recommended:

That the provincial government appoint **an interdepartmental committee on Indian and Métis affairs** headed by a full-time chairman.

It recommended:

That the provincial government provide vocational training facilities especially designed for those whose educational background is not sufficient to qualify them for apprenticeship training nor for acceptance at the Manitoba Technical Institute.

It is recommended that The Department of Industry and Commerce assist in increasing employment opportunities in Indian and Métis settlements by strongly promoting:

- (a) The development of light industries in or near Indian or Métis settlements.
- (b) The creation of new markets for local resources.
- (c) The expansion of business enterprises presently operating in or near Indian or Métis settlements.
- (d) The creation of Métis- and Indian-owned business operations especially where local natural resources were available.

Mr. Lagasse went on to suggest:

That the provincial government assist Indians and Metis to obtain employment

by establishing a special service designed to:

- (a) Gather and maintain up-to-date information about job opportunities adapted to their skills.
- (b) Interpret to prospective employers the capacities of Indians and Métis for work.
- (c) Transmit information about job opportunities to unemployed Indians and Métis.
- (d) Assist, if necessary, in their transportation to the site of employment.

(e) In co-operation with The Department of Labour, The Department of Education and the Indian Affairs Branch, to provide a special training programme to equip Indians and Métis for full-time employment.

The report went on to recommend:

That the provincial government maintain an up-to-date record of the unemployed in Métis and Indian communities and of agricultural labour requirements with a view to securing maximum employment for that population.

It recommended:

That the provincial government establish a community development programme to help people of Indian ancestry solve their own problems.

That some of these recommendations have no application to Ontario, I concede. But what is important is that the then Manitoba government recognized and accepted a moral and social responsibility. It is time that we in this province did likewise. I suggest that we consider a similar inquiry in this province and a similar constructive approach.

We have, so far, in this province given little more than a token recognition of the urgency of this situation. Last year, for example, as a result perhaps of suggestions I made in this House, the hon. Minister advised that he had ordered the organization of a course for young Indians for a one-month period during the summer. It was the intention of the department, the hon. Minister said, to give these people training for future work in the department. We must recognize this as a step in the right direction as we must all concede that our Indian population is better qualified than others in many of the functions carried on by this department. I am sorry that I have heard no more of this venture and would be grateful if the hon. Minister could give me some report of the results as well as news of any similar projects he envisages in the future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something about conservation at this point, with specific reference to the conservation of our forest-based natural resources. I am cognizant of the fact that this is a field in which none of us sitting in this House is an expert, or perhaps even qualified to discuss. I acknowledge that even professional foresters are not in general agreement on reforestation or regeneration practices; and for that reason I will try not to indulge in the sweeping generalizations employed by the hon. members to my left.

But of one thing I am positively certain, Mr. Chairman. That is, that it is our duty to offer to our children the same opportunities that have been given to us. This, to me, is the true meaning of conservation. This entails a rational and reasonable use of those resources left to us, but which might not be available to our children if we do not use them wisely. So much now we are enjoying a prosperity for which our children will receive the bill. In good times, as I might call them, our province goes further and further into debt. I do not refer only to our financial position. I refer as well to the short-sighted exploitation of our forest products. Trees or forest products unwisely disposed of are as much a debt to our children as is our provincial debt.

Of this proposition there can be no argument, as most of us have seen the results of government weakness in the past.

I will briefly review, if I may, the history of reforestation and/or regeneration of the great woodlands of our province. In the early 1900s our provincial government became first aware of the developing desert of farmed out agricultural lands in southern Ontario. As a result, the government, as it then was, established a few tree nurseries and purchased a portion of these lands which were then replanted. Subsequently, the government made arrangements with municipal and county governments, who were to purchase and manage these areas so as to obviate any direct provincial participation in land reclamation schemes. This was the policy that basically prevailed, for a number of reasons, including the depression until the last decade.

In short, reforestation or regeneration efforts by the government were confined to privately owned, or municipally owned lands, in southern Ontario.

In the early 1950s this government recognized finally that direct government intervention was desperately needed. As a result, and with federal assistance, there was an increase in emphasis on a programme of re-

generation in our usable forests. Legislation was then passed attempting to transfer basic responsibility for reforestation to those licensees actually cutting the wood. This programme, as we now know, basically proved a failure, as was evidenced by the passage of legislation in this House in 1962 which returned basic responsibility for reforestation back to the province. The fact remains, however, that generally, no real attempt was made until this decade to keep cutover areas in this province productive.

This, as I see it—recognizing of course, that I have of necessity greatly oversimplified past developments—is where the department now stands. One thing should be made clear, nevertheless. Mandatory reforestation is not in itself the answer to the general problem. Of my own knowledge, I am certain that artificial regeneration of our cutover forests in much of this province is unnecessary and wasteful. Many of these areas will naturally regenerate as quickly, or even more quickly, than they would with a compulsory reforestation programme. This is all the more true with the recent development of more efficient cutting practices, including strip cutting and scarification, as well as a number of other procedures which are in an experimental stage.

The fact remains, that in general, our paper industries are cutting and hauling in areas farther and farther from the mills—in some cases up to two or three hundred miles. This situation, if allowed to continue, would certainly mean the end of our pulp and paper mills in the north within a very few years. It has now become imperative that our government take a number of steps to alleviate and correct this situation. A few suggestions I have, are:

- (1) Fostering, encouraging and perhaps conducting a programme to remove scrub growth near paper mills and replanting the desired species of trees;

- (2) An even more energetic and enthusiastic effort to encourage private industry to carry out more extensive regeneration programmes;

- (3) A complete reappraisal of present government timber grants with emphasis on the better use of lands that will not be utilized by the licensees within the foreseeable future.

- (4) An increased effort to acquaint the public as well as industry with the problems that we have, and will result from continued exploitation of our forest resources, coupled with an expanded study of better cutting methods for all forest industries.

I should like to turn now to the actual operations of this department—or to put it another way—I propose to discuss what the government is doing rather than what it is not doing. In my very few years of public office I have noticed two basic defects in the fundamental management of The Department of Lands and Forests. To specifically ascribe these faults only to this one branch of the government would be unfair and misleading, as much of our governmental functions are beset with the same problems. I refer specifically to the increasing thinking that economy is not too serious an object in government thinking. We see more and more examples of penny-wise, pound-foolish management. We see more and more money being spent to build an image. It would seem to me that Mr. White's book on *The Making of a President* must be mandatory reading for all Cabinet Ministers. So much better could these monies be used in research projects, or even pay increases. It is shocking indeed to compare the salaries of men in public service with their equivalents in industry.

I do not hold our civil service responsible for this trend. It is only the end product of the natural evolution of a government that has been too long in power. Policy is nothing more than day-to-day decisions made as the problems arise. There is no real imagination, enthusiasm or dedication flowing down from top level.

In short, as I have said in the past, too often this department has been exploited as a political arm of government. For many years, as we all know, the pork barrel was an essential element in our political structure. Perhaps I am naive, but I felt, and still feel that the old practices are dying. Perhaps I am not too observant, but I was under the impression that when this department was administered by the former Minister there was virtually no playing dirty politics.

Whatever have been my impression then, it is somewhat different now. I know of numerous examples where the efficiency and integrity of this department were, and are, being sacrificed to gain a political end. I resent seeing the vast resources of government utilized so as to enrich a few political friends. I hate to see ordinary citizens denied privileges extended to a favoured few.

And what disturbs me, as well, Mr. Chairman, is the disservice that is being done to the civil servants working in the department. You do not enhance their prestige in the eyes of the public by using them as pawns in the game of political chess. You do not improve department morale and pride by negating the

decisions and recommendations of your own experts, trained in the field.

Those are a few general remarks. I should like to, just in closing, comment very briefly on the problem that now exists with the cutting permits that are issued under the authority of The Crown Timber Act. I spoke on this last year, as did a number of hon. members, by reason of the problem that arose at Kapuskasing. I think the hon. Minister should now know the numerous abuses that are taking place under the guise of The Crown Timber Act and these cutting permits. We know of trading of permits, of boot-legging of permits and exploitation of workers. I suggest to the hon. Minister that unless a complete review of these cutting permits, and the cutting permit policy, is made within a very short period we are going to have another problem of the magnitude that we had in Kapuskasing.

Now in closing, I should like to say one thing: I think that any good department can outlast any bad Minister.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak in the debate on The Department of Lands and Forests, I would like to preface my remarks by some excerpts from a book that I have taken from the legislative library. I think some words may be of interest to some of the hon. members here. It reads:

In many parts of Canada the forests provide the principal means of livelihood. In all of Canada the forest is an important factor in industrial, commercial and business activities. No member of Canada's population may say that his life is not affected by the benefits that flow from this natural national resource. How important it is then that Canada and Canadians be conscious of their dependence upon the forests. How important it is that this consciousness be coupled with the conviction that this source of wealth must be maintained and developed to serve continuously the people of this and other lands. But conviction alone will not suffice. Convictions may be coupled with action and must be coupled with action if the desired result is to be obtained. Action must flow from the people through representatives to constituted authority and from authority back to the people through unit organization authorized to direct forest activities under a clearly expressed policy of forest administration.

None should be more concerned about this matter from the point of view of self-interest than those whose work is in the

woods or in industry dependent for its raw material upon the forest. None have more at stake.

To speak with a loud voice without knowledge is to court ridicule. Consciousness of a need comes from observation and thought stimulated often by the thoughts of others. Conviction comes by knowledge of the facts. Action through self-interest will follow as the day the night when conviction has a factual foundation. The purpose that we should strive for is that of a wakening consciousness, marshalling facts and showing a way to action in the fundamental national problem of forest conservation and increased forest use.

I believe, in studying those words, Mr. Chairman, that they possess words of wisdom that we would all, as members of this Legislature, do well to give heed to.

I do not believe that I need say to those who have done any degree of thinking in this province over the past many years that the forest policy as adopted by previous administrations in Ontario has not by any means been sufficient to keep our forests in a decent state of production. Certainly they have done nothing whatever in a really effective way toward regenerative measures over a planned period of time.

I was rather interested, really, to hear the hon. member for Kenora mention in his opening remarks that he recognized the fact that the party of which he is a member was partly responsible for the condition our forests are in today. I believe in accepting that degree of responsibility that the hon. gentleman does himself a great deal of credit and his party a great deal of credit as well.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He is a fine fellow. He speaks well of you, too.

Mr. Freeman: I think he likes me. I like you too, Vern. This will be a mutual admiration society very shortly.

However, this is an extremely serious matter, Mr. Chairman, and I think you will realize and recognize the fact that it may be necessary for me at this time in presenting the case for northwestern Ontario and the people who are interested in the forest work in our part of the province, to repeat excerpts from some statements that I have made in the recent past.

Because of the fact, in the first place, that these are basic statements, and then again, too, because I feel that they have a very great value as soundly thought-out and planned statements in regard to our part of the country, I think I might say, perhaps

to those who are in the House at the present time, who may not have been exposed to this type of thinking recently, that the uncontrolled cutting of forests on a liquidation basis has characterized almost all logging operations in Ontario for more than 100 years. This, I think, we all recognize and realize.

This practice began in the southern part of the province and is being extended at an increasing rate into the boreal forests of northern Ontario. The consequences are manifest in the near-extinction of such valuable timbers as white pine, which is almost entirely gone now; in serious soil losses through erosion; in growing flood control and water pollution problems, and in the lowering of water tables.

This is felt by people who have given a great deal of time to the study of the forest situation as it exists—and most of our forests in this province at the present time exists west of Sudbury, Kapuskasing, North Bay and through that part of the country. Granted, there is a great deal of it which can be called virgin forest. It has never been exploited because of inaccessibility to a great extent and the fact, of course, that it is much, much too far from the mills for use on a basis that would make it possible for the mills to harvest that wood.

However, the day is coming undoubtedly when this wood is going to have to be harvested, because of the fact, principally, that regenerative activities have not been carried out, Mr. Chairman, and are not being carried out on a sound and planned basis in those areas which already have been cut over to a very great extent. The extremely bad feature of this cutting which has been done over the past many years is that it has been what is called a clean cut, that is everything within a certain area has been taken down, destroyed. In many cases this wood that was required by the ultimate purchasers was interspersed very heavily with woods which were not wanted by prospective purchasers.

The result of that was that many, at that time unwanted trees, were destroyed in the process of harvesting a 35 per cent, 40 per cent or 50 per cent harvest of the desired woods. I will leave it to your imaginations to understand just how long this type of condition can proceed, just how long it can continue.

At the present rate of consumption of our wood industries, our pulp and paper mills, our veneer mills, our log industries and so on, we are harvesting considerably more wood than is being regenerated each year. If the

figures were presented to you as they have been by foresters trained in this work to those people who are interested in our part of the province, I think they would astound you and they would appal you.

I am sure the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests will agree with me—he has been over a great deal of this country in the past short period of time—that to a very great extent this type of forestation has not been regarded with too careful or cautious an eye by the authorities. The result of it is that much more wood has been destroyed than has actually been harvested for profitable operation.

If this continues, it will be only a short period of time until northwestern Ontario is going to be in the position that eastern Ontario and southern Ontario are in today with regard to forest growth and soil erosion and water depletion. We are approaching that situation to some extent at the present time. I would warn this government, and I am sure that it realizes it, too, that it is its duty to take immediate steps, practical steps, long-range steps, planned over a long period of time, if necessary—and when I speak of that long period of time, I mean in effect from 20 to 40 years. Trees do not grow overnight and if we hope in this part of Canada to produce a desired type of wood culture, that wood culture is going to have to be realistically planned to produce the wanted type of forest growth.

I outlined very briefly in the House not too long ago, a suggested plan, and it has been given the unqualified approval of many of the senior employees of The Department of Lands and Forests as a practical step in the right direction with regard to safeguarding the forests we have at the present time and improving and regenerating the forest areas which need that type of attention.

I would like to repeat it. I have added some additional information that I have received within the last few days from these people. I would like to say to you, starting with these words, that to a very large extent the economic well-being of the lakehead area in Ontario is dependent on the forest-based industries. This includes among others, pulp and paper mills, sawmills, veneer mills, wood processing plants and numerous independent woodworking contractors and wood-producing contractors, large and small.

In connection with this, I would like to call to the hon. Minister's attention the fact that we are beginning to see again a situation which faced us some years ago in connection with subcontractors. They are ambitious

types undoubtedly, and are now approaching the permittee type of timber operator. With a contract from one of the timber companies they are going to the small wood producer who is in a position to produce, let us say, 100 cords from his farm lot. They say to him that they are offering \$17 a cord today. They have the contract, and the small permittee has little or no opportunity to sell this wood to the paper mills or to the users of the raw material.

The subcontractors have this contract to get, say, 20,000 or 25,000 or 30,000 cords. They name their own price, and the farm-lot operator takes it or leaves it. With the condition of most of those farmers in today's picture, with the very little agricultural production from their land, they are in a position where they have to take it. There is no other alternative. I suggest that this condition should be corrected—

An hon. member: Or lump it.

Mr. Freeman: Or "lump" it is an excellent word. That is precisely what they do, they lump it in most cases. Their life is not one of ease, believe me; they work hard to get that \$17 or so a cord. Then they have cutting costs to take out of that.

The group I speak for in northwestern Ontario feels that the government should immediately initiate policies directly toward these objectives: The production of maximum yields of high-quality fibre from all accessible forest soils, both freehold and publicly owned. We would say it is contrary to both provincial and national long-term interests to permit in aggregate, extensive areas in an idle, unproductive condition. We say that ownership should not confer this right and it must be recognized that a sound forest policy will necessitate some encroachment upon property rights as currently constituted. Again the restoration to productivity of all idle private, municipal and Crown lands by a large-scale reforestation programme, particularly within areas accessible to existing mills. We feel the government should review the present timber licences to free these limits held in excess of present and contemplated mill capacity; thereby making limits available for further development of secondary industries or the use by secondary and ancillary industry of species and log types not used by the present holders of limit licences.

Now by this, Mr. Chairman, we do not mean that we feel that any limitation should be placed upon the reasonable requirements of those industries which are presently established in the raw material areas. We feel

certainly that these industries create employment for the economic welfare of the area and of the province; these mills should have all the raw material that they can use over a reasonable period of time. But we feel that we have a perfect right to insist that a review be made, a very thoroughgoing review, and that in cases where timber companies hold large properties awaiting development if, and when they see fit, that this matter should receive the attention of the government, and that redress should be done if it is necessary. I believe in many cases it will be found by this department, and by the hon. Minister in charge, to be necessary.

In relation to the requirement that a holder of a timber licence must build a basic road structure, without which it is impossible to implement a modern forest management plan with sustained yield cutting, we feel the government should share the cost of building such a structure, on an agreed basis, through financial arrangements that would make it possible for the work to be paid for within a reasonable period of time through the use which the road would give to more accessible lands and to more forest products. These forest products could be brought out in larger amounts, greater quantities from these more accessible areas and would be of the type of wood that the companies need and require to produce a certain quality or type of paper.

I have mentioned in the House before that at the Lakehead at the present time we have—and The Department of Education of this province is to be congratulated—within the Lakehead College laboratory facilities which are presently not being utilized to the extent to which they could be used. There has been established at the Lakehead College a small class in forestry. We who have studied this problem to some extent believe that if these interested forest students, and students who are interested in chemistry, could be given an opportunity and access to the laboratory facilities to experiment with various undesired wood types at the present time, that it is altogether reasonable and possible that some preliminary success might attend their efforts. And if this did come about, and the facilities at the Lakehead were not sufficient to go further with the chemical experimentations, then I am sure that many of the large companies who are well equipped and well qualified to carry on this laboratory work would be very glad to do so.

I believe that it is altogether possible—many people agree with me—that within a very short period of time, a matter of a few

years, ways and means would be found for the use of many of the so-called “junk” forest species at the present time. These species are not being used. They are being cut down or destroyed.

In many instances where we have had limits which are being held over long periods of time, we know from those who have walked short distances through the various forest areas that a very great number of fine trees have become over-mature and they have rotted or fallen. We have lost the opportunity to make use of this wood. This has all been in line with this same system of unrestricted cutting, just going in and making a clean cut without thought of what is going to happen in a few years. Again, if the clean cut were made, which might be good tree farming, if the clean cut were made and then proper regenerative measures were used to rebuild that forest as it should be, it would then have some degree of merit.

But to destroy the forest without making any effort to bring a programme into existence that would bring about the regeneration of that area over a reasonable period of time, is nothing short of criminal.

We do not, however, contend that the rehabilitation of forest lands adjacent to the Lakehead will cure all the ills of the area. We know perfectly well they will not. There is much more that must be done up there to improve the forest situation, the agricultural situation and the secondary industry situation. But it is only just recently—within the last few years—that any secondary industry people had a desire to get into the Lakehead area and get raw materials from the production of forest growth. They had very little or no hope of gaining or getting a sufficient guarantee of forest resources to carry on their work over a reasonable period of time.

There has been a little bit of improvement in this situation. I believe, too, the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has had his hand in this and that he has assisted these proposed secondary industries to gain at least some opportunity for access to resources. This is a step in the right direction and I think could be carried very much further by The Department of Lands and Forests. We hope and pray that it will.

There are some areas, too, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to take a brief moment or two to discuss, through you, with the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister will agree, and I am sure most of the hon. members know, that in the not-too-distant period of time—in the last 15 years or so—we have had established in the Thunder Bay district forest

villages or forest towns, actually. They are very nice forest towns such as Terrace Bay, Marathon and Long Lac, which is a timber town. Marathon and Terrace Bay are paper towns concerned basically with paper production. The opening up of mining areas, such as Manitouwadge and others which have opened in the not-too-distant past, are bringing more wealth to the province and to the people in that area. But there is still much opportunity for the establishment of so-called forest villages or forest towns. I call the attention of the hon. members particularly to the Ogoki section north of the Nipigon watershed, most of which is virgin territory. It will undoubtedly bring much more wealth to the province in the very near future if work is done and attention is given to it.

There was another matter I am sure that the hon. Minister is interested in, Mr. Chairman. That is the feeling of the hunters who live in northwestern Ontario. In fact, I believe representations have been made to the department that certain species of game are in a sad state of depletion. I am not referring, Mr. Chairman, to moose or deer. My own observations, and information that I have received from conservation officers, and whose word I am quite willing to accept, leads me to believe that the moose and deer population is at an excellent level.

But certain bird life and that sort of thing is in a very sad state of depletion. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether the hon. Minister has had it recommended to him in the recent past that restrictions should be placed on the hunting of certain types of bird life in that part of Ontario or not. If representations have not been made to the hon. Minister, I would feel that I am instructed by the people interested at the Lakehead in suggesting this course to him, because this is undoubtedly of very serious concern to many of the people who are members of various sports clubs in the Lakehead area. I am sure that a very close look by conservation officers might result in some information to the hon. Minister that might cause him to take some action in this respect.

Now I know that the hon. member for Kenora covered some territory in his remarks, which is exactly what I would have to say about our part of the country. Therefore, it need not be repeated. I would suggest to the hon. members that as the hon. Minister stated in his opening remarks, that those of you who have not visited northwestern Ontario and seen its potential are missing something. The hon. members owe it to themselves, they owe it to the province. I

think that if they visited that part of the country they would enjoy themselves enormously. I would guarantee them six fish, say, if I had to catch them by hand. I am sure the hon. members would have no difficulty in landing fish up there; we even have fish for people like the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy).

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to bring to the attention of the House at this time. I do not know exactly how far this matter has gone; I do not have too much knowledge about it because it is only within the last few days that I have been on the telephone with various people in Fort William and Port Arthur with regard to this matter. The hon. Minister might give this House any information on this matter. It may even have something to do with the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) in some way, perhaps a very important way. It may also have something to do, and I am sure it will have something to do, with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), but under the circumstances, I think it particularly affects The Department of Lands and Forests at this time.

I am referring to some acreage along the Pigeon river in the borderline section between northwestern Ontario and the United States where a new bridge was just recently opened. I believe the old bridge is closed to traffic and the new bridge is now in operation. Along this on the Canadian side of this international bridge, there is a block of land comprising, I believe, some 2,600 acres more or less.

As I understand it, this land is presently owned by a Mr. Lloyd Johnson, who is a lawyer in Duluth, Minnesota. Mr. Johnson has owned this land for quite some time. He has attempted, to my knowledge, over the past several years, to develop it as summer home sites along the various lakeshore bays and so on. He has had only moderate success with that because of the distance that this land is from a heavily populated centre. I think it is interesting. It brings back the days of carpetbagging in the United States after the Civil War when, as we read, they went down to the southern States and took advantage of—

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Like the book.

Mr. Freeman: The book was an aftermath of the actual fact. *The Carpetbaggers* was actually based on that. If you read the book it will probably give you some idea of what the present situation is. Mr. Johnson some

years ago bought the approximately 2,600 acres of land, I believe, from the province of Ontario, naturally, for the sum of \$15,000. I think the pencil will show you that is slightly under \$6 an acre. I am told, and I am told on very good authority—I hope it is not right, I hope it is an untruth and improper information—that negotiations are presently in effect with Mr. Johnson, represented by Mr. J. C. Robinette, a lawyer of the city of Toronto. He is now quite willing to part with this very valuable land to the province of Ontario for the sum of \$5 million—just around \$2,000 an acre.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Not bad for ten years.

Mr. Freeman: That is carpetbagging at its best, I think. I am sure, however, that neither the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, nor any other hon. Minister of this government, would permit himself to be bilked in this fashion.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, just let me on that point—

Mr. Freeman: I would like to hear the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand that there are some expropriation proceedings now being undertaken by Public Works and I imagine it is for the same land my hon. friend refers to. It would be done in that way if it is done at all. Actually I have nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. Freeman: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I am somewhat reassured that the negotiations have not gone to the extent where any serious consideration is being given to an extortionate price of this kind. I would sincerely hope that if the land is purchased by the government of the province of Ontario that a fair and just price be given to the American owner of the land, if the land is valuable to the province of Ontario and to the departments within the province of Ontario. I assure the hon. Minister or the hon. Ministers concerned with this expropriation or with this proposed land purchase, that if any large price is paid for it there will be loud screams of anguish from everybody in northwestern Ontario.

I would like to say, too, to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that we appreciate the fact that The Department of Lands and Forests has taken steps in recent years—the last two or three years, in fact, I believe—to open up more park areas and rec-

reation areas in our part of the country. I believe that this will be money well invested and that more areas and more parks should be opened as soon as possible by the department in desirable locations. I believe the money expended by the government in this type of work will come back tenfold in a very short period of time.

I would ask the hon. Minister that thought be given to this problem of forest regeneration. I am sure he will agree this is a tremendously serious problem, not only to us in our part of the province, but to all of the people in this province. If an imaginative programme is not undertaken in the very near future, I would feel that this government is repeating the performance of its predecessors of the different parties in letting one of our greatest, perhaps the greatest, natural resource get away from us to the point where it will be almost impossible for us to support the mills which we presently have in our part of the province and to support the economy which we have in our part of the province.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I might direct my remarks for a few moments to some of the comments of the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken and who are speaking for their parties and who are all interested in the development of the north. I would like to say, as I said at the beginning in my own remarks, that I felt that a lot of the criticism was due to misinformation. I am much fortified in that in listening to my hon. friend here who just sat down. I want to make it clear first of all that of course the very principles which he is advocating are sound and proper, but the fact of the matter is it is exactly, in many respects at any rate, what is actually going on. I want to take this opportunity to clear this up for the benefit not only of the hon. members of this House but also for many people in this province who have not already understood the situation.

Back in 1943, this was a serious situation. The previous administration had gone through a period of difficult times earlier in its regime. There had been bankruptcies in the pulp and paper industry and some of the biggest companies today were in bankruptcy at that time, in the 1930s. There had been, over the years—with that largesse that people thought about our forests in those days and the idea that they were limitless and all that sort of thing—a lot of things done in those days that looking at it now, did not amount to good management or management at all.

But in 1943, with all of this problem in

front of the government of the day, and after a review, many of the contracts that were in existence and agreements that were in existence at that time were cancelled by order-in-council. I have a list of them here. Some seven or eight contracts covering many thousands of square miles were cancelled. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) knows that there was a very important inquiry set up under General Kennedy, a very painstaking investigation conducted and certain recommendations made. I have the report on my desk here. It is amazing how many sections of that report have actually gone into operation, although not everything was accepted by the government.

Down through those years, since about the early 1950s, there has been a tremendous change and I think everybody in this House should realize it. Just to illustrate it, and also perhaps to understand things a little better myself, I asked for some of these management contracts. There are Crown management contracts to the number of some 77 and there are some 80 or thereabouts company management contracts which have the approval of the Crown. The two together add up to something like 150 contracts. I have one in my hand here and I am going to take three or four of them one by one, to give the House an idea of just what has been done and what is going on.

I want to say, sir, that some 182,000 square miles of economically possible areas for the use of timber are covered by these 150 contracts. I think I can say, and the timber branch manager's report is right in front of me here, I think I can say without fear of contradiction that practically all of the economically useable area at this time is under this type of management. I think that is something that we ought to get into our heads in this House. The terms that are contained in here are no secret. If my hon. friend wants to come and look at some of these some time, I have got 150 of them that I brought up to the office here in the last week or so and I intend to look at every one of them myself, in detail.

But I think I can say now—and I expect I shall be able to say when I have gone through them—that perhaps there are a few things here and there we should do but I think I can say now that if we were to carry out the intention and the terms and the instructions and the technical knowledge contained in these documents, that we would meet everything that my hon. friends have said here in relation to good forest management.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a big if.

Mr. Freeman: If they are carried out!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I have here, for example, the interim management and operating plan for Northern Light Lake management unit for the period 1961-1965. This is the preliminary one, and the rewriting of it is to take place in the next year or two for a longer period of time. That is right out in the Port Arthur area. I have here initial management plans for the Black Lake management unit, which is down around Nipigon in the area of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope). I have here the management plan for the Ontario limits and freehold of Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company Limited woodlands, revised in April 1959 and again, in the course of the next short while, under revision.

We have, Mr. Chairman, over 200 foresters, qualified degree foresters, who are working on these contracts day in and day out as their whole occupation. A number of them are here at Downsview, and in every one of the 22 districts there are a certain number of them assigned to nothing else but this sort of work.

Mr. Freeman: I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, of course.

Mr. Freeman: You mentioned Northern Light Lake. I have been over that area very thoroughly, over a great deal of the lake, and as you probably know it is a very large lake. Part of it is on the American shore in the United States and part of it is in Canada. The Department of Highways put the highway in for you last year, along Northern Light Lake, they finished it last fall.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Into Northern Light Lake?

Mr. Freeman: Into Northern Light Lake—an excellent spot for boat ramps, by the way, because the shoreline lends itself to boat ramps for that type of sport fishing. But does the hon. Minister realize how many American people come up the Gun Flint Trail and go into Northern Light Lake on the American side, although the resorts in some cases are occupied by Canadian operators? Many of those Americans come in there, and when they come over towards the Canadian side, they have their motor boats and their fish boats and so on and all their equipment, and they spend days on the Canadian side, but they do not use anything that is made in Canada.

Mr. Troy: Do they bring all their gas?

Mr. Freeman: They bring all their gas, bring their Coca Cola and Pepsi Cola and Seven Up and all the rest of it. They even bring their eggs and butter and bread. I doubt if they bring any whiskey, because I think most of them are too careful to buy any. They drink any given amount.

But this situation, I think, Mr. Chairman, is something that exists not only on this lake but on several other lakes in that area. Looking at a map of that part of Ontario I think that it is actually illusory, because the maps, regardless of the care that the people in The Department of Lands and Forests pay to drawing these various maps, leave many hundreds of lakes out of the drawing. Through Northern Light Lake, for instance, you can get into a vast area in northwestern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am glad to have that interjection, but perhaps that is just one of the tourist problems. It is the exception rather than the rule, because I imagine the American tourist by and large is a pretty useful thing to our economy both in northwestern Ontario and here.

I have also in my hand another one of these contracts, The Great Lakes Paper Company Limited forest management plan and operating plan. This is one that the company itself prepared and our people go over it and approve of it and check it to make sure it is being followed. This happens to be the Black Sturgeon limit. It is a big limit, over 1,000 square miles.

Again another one here, the English River limit of the Great Lakes paper. I could go on. I did produce, as I say, 150 of these documents for the visual observation of the House. I will just produce two more. One is a management plan covering timber licences set out here of Hay and Company Limited in the district of Algoma. This happens to be a different type. This has to do with a company engaged in the veneer business and that sort of thing.

Again, we have tried to get in all of these contracts and all of these management documents, all of these elements that go for good management. I feel that by and large what I said earlier will stand the test. When I was making my original statement, I made some fairly, if you analyze them, some fairly strong statements of our resources and what we are doing. I think it can stand the test of inquiry.

Of course it has to stand the test of inquiry, that is what the hon. gentlemen opposite are

there for, to do it. I do not, in saying this, want to say that I think everything is perfection by any means. I agree with the hon. member for Fort William that the point he raised about greater uses is important. We ourselves are doing research on that. The companies are doing research and there are many possibilities.

Just one thing comes to my mind at the moment and that is that at this very time there is some very serious investigation going on into the use of pipelines, pipelines for the transmitting for miles of wood products right to the mill from the tree, with chips perhaps, actually being treated by chemicals as they come through the pipe and perhaps arriving at their destination partly, if not completely, mixed and matured for whatever purpose they want them. All these sort of things are going on.

We have an intelligent wood industry and we have, I think I can say, very intelligent Lands and Forests personnel in this field.

I might just say one other thing, about the progress which is being indicated and which I announced in part here in the House and which has been announced from time to time in the press by the companies concerned—for example, the Domtar Newsprint Limited at Red Rock, the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company at Kapuskasing, the Abitibi Power and Paper Company at Smooth Rock Falls; the plywood and veneer industry in several places; sawmill industries in such places as Whitman Lumber Company Mill near North Bay, Levesque Mill at Hearst, Boreal Timber Limited mill at Port Arthur, Chapleau Lumber Company at Chapleau, Missinabie Mill near Chapleau.

There is a trend toward building modern and more efficient mills to replace old mills in all these places and really great progress. The Great Lakes Paper Company has perhaps the largest project in the \$31 million, 200,000-ton per year pulp and paper mill addition which they are putting in.

Now, what this adds up to, I think, as shown by the survey, is that there are at present 12 large pulp and paper companies in Ontario with 17 mills scattered across Ontario and with about 50 per cent, I think, of production coming from northwestern Ontario and the other half coming from the rest of Ontario. The licences they hold are constantly under review. In this last year one or two have been completed. This coming year there are others coming up.

We are putting into these licences what we think is the best thinking at the moment; but above everything else, there is in the

statute itself, the power which was put in when that report I mentioned came down, and in the legislation that followed it there was written in the right of the Minister to come in in any instance, no matter what, if there are good grounds for it, in changing any terms in regard to actual needs and agreements.

That is an extremely important thing. What we find in practice is that, by negotiation, by discussion and where the secondary industry type of the logging industry wants certain areas to work over in the licences that are mainly used for pulp and paper, we negotiate. We ask them to negotiate with each other. We ask them to enter into third party agreements. We put pressure, where necessary, to see that those third party agreements are fair.

In a very few cases where there is no production—the hon. member for York South I think, Mr. Chairman, said something in the Economics estimates about a case where they are not actually in production. If he wants to raise it again, I will discuss it. But he chose to raise it with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). But in that type of situation we have separate agreements, and where we consider it advisable we make the agreements directly with the parties operating in the area. In other words, we do distinguish between non-operating, non-producing mill type of pulp and paper industry and the type that is hopeful, or that has gained certain production rights, made certain deposits and certain plans which they have to enter into production within a reasonable time.

With that background and with the great advance in the pulp and paper industry, and with a very considerable advance in the new type of mills in the other industry, in the logging industry in the very competitive world market, we all have to be on our toes. This department will do its best, I can assure hon. members, to help in any way to make the best use of our timber. But I do not want to sit down or leave this particular part of this discussion without saying that we are a most favoured province in many ways. We have adequate resources to take care of anything that is foreseeable at the moment in the way of expansion because of the fact that we have not got the markets at present. That may be because we are young. We have a small population area.

We have a lot of future ahead of us, whereas other parts of the world are in quite a different position. If we were in the same position, population-wise and development-

wise as some other parts of the world, we might have to be doing a lot different from what we are doing here. I do not for a moment say that certain types of management in certain other areas of the world may not be better, but they are not suited necessarily to our broad conditions as they exist at the present time.

I say to you, sir, and I say it to the hon. members of this House, that we have undertaken since this Kennedy report, a step-by-step plan to increase the reforestation and to increase the number of trees although actually, about 65 per cent of any reforestation is done naturally. It is nature that looks after 65 per cent of it. We do not have to do 100 per cent, or anything like 100 per cent.

But we are with our tree planting, with our nurseries. We are up this year, I think, to something like 43 million trees. Forty-three million trees are being planted.

We can say with confidence that within approximately 12 years from now, on the basis of the continued planning as indicated by these management contracts, that we will be providing 100 per cent replacement on the 400,000 acres or thereabouts that are being cut over each year. One hundred per cent.

In the meantime, at the present time we are probably between 85 per cent and 90 per cent as a result of what is going on. Also in the meantime, what is actually being cut is only half the allowable cut. So from a practical standpoint, we are certainly not behind the eight-ball at all. It would be rather foolish to spend money unnecessarily if you can reach the same end result by a process such as I have mentioned.

It is not too easy to get millions and millions of trees overnight, but to the extent that our nurseries are capable of production, the cones that we get and make use of, and all that sort of thing, we are moving right along. Within the next few years we will have reached the point where we can see definite replacement, along with natural growth, of 100 per cent, accounted for. I think that is good, sound policy under the present circumstance.

There were one or two other questions raised. I may answer them more in detail. I am sure, as we go along with the votes some of these points will come back again in detail in respect to particular points.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I am in order here or not. During the hon. Minister's introductory remarks he made specific reference to an advisory committee on

Indians. Does that come under main office? I cannot find it anywhere else, and there is an advisory committee referred to.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, I think it is one of these voluntary setups. It is not provided for by statute or anything of that sort.

Mr. Gibson: When can I discuss it?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member is speaking of the Indian Advisory Committee?

Mr. Gibson: No, I am speaking of the advisory committee on Indians, using the hon. Minister's own words.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes. That has just recently been set up.

Mr. Gibson: What I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is, who is on this committee?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Who is on it?

Mr. Gibson: Yes, who is on it? Where do these people come from, and what are their functions?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will be glad to inform the House of the names of the personnel on the committee. It is made up of the following: Mr. John Yesno, Central Patricia; Mr. Gus Debassige, Manitoulin Island; Mrs. Flora Tobobundung, Parry Island; Mrs. Elliot Moses, Brantford; Mr. Lawrence Chuchoo, Moosonee; Mr. Fred Green, Kenora—I imagine the hon. member for Kenora knows Mr. Green, he is one of the very respected chiefs out there; Mr. R. M. Hill, Tyendinegan Reserve; and sitting as an observer helping us, Mr. George Armstrong, captain of the Maple Leafs hockey team who is known as Chief Armstrong.

Mr. Gibson: May I ask the hon. Minister how often this committee gets together? Secondly, is there any possibility of getting a person on this committee with no political stripe from the area north of Red Lake?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would be glad if the hon. member has a suggestion, for him to let me have it. I will be glad to consider it.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, just one other question. How often do these people get together to advise you?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They were just really organized within the last six weeks or so. I think they have had three meetings. One of them, I know, was out in Kenora.

Mr. Troy: To continue that. What is an Indian under this committee?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am not trying to distinguish. The point that I am trying to make to this committee is that I am going to, I hope, have the thinking of the people who are living the lives of the Indians, and who understand the Indian population. And not what, in the past, may have been a paternal kind of an attitude for them.

Mr. Troy: Does the hon. Minister consider a half-breed who lives, say in the city of Toronto, lives the life of an Indian?

Mr. MacDonald: On the basis of conduct, we have got one in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Troy: Has the hon. Minister got a liaison man in his department?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh, yes. Yes, we have several liaison people in the department. If you want to know the actual responsibility in this field, the assistant deputy, Mr. Bayly, is in charge of the general responsibility. Under him Mr. Ormand and Mr. Cam Currie is very well known to the Indians and speaks the Indian language, or at least some of it, and we have Mr. Don Selby who is from one of the bands up at Lake Simcoe.

Mr. Troy: Does this committee also have a liaison with the committee that is already set up by The Department of Public Welfare?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh, yes. As a matter of fact I have here a 20-page document which I am sure my hon. friend does not want me to read, outlining the work done by the various departments of the government in relation to matters pertaining to the Indians.

Mr. Troy: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I mean, if Mr. Chairman would permit it, I would be glad to put it on the record for the purpose of getting it into *Hansard*, but I do not want to read it.

Mr. Chairman: May we take it as read?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, if the House is willing and I may table this, I would be glad to do it.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, on this question of an Indian advisory council, I am wondering about the terms of reference. When I was with a federal department, and on various committees I could see that if there were not clear-cut terms of reference, sometimes these could have become really a showcase. I was

wondering if the hon. Minister could give us the terms of reference.

I also notice in the remarks of my hon. colleague where he referred to the approach of the Manitoba government to Indians and Métis in connection with the report by Jean Lagasse. Again, when you move on into Saskatchewan—and this takes us back a number of years—you see approaches it has worked out in order to encourage co-ops and so on.

I think if one looks at the north with the federal government, one looks at the work that is done with Eskimos and the encouragement for local industry in the Arctic. I ask, sir, with respect to the advisory council, is it going to be an economic advisory council or just on a broad general basis about cultural life?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think I should point out this is something really to assist the Minister of Lands and Forests. It is not outside The Department of Lands and Forests but we have a lot of opportunities to develop, I think, within the department, useful qualities to provide work for the Indians. I think that they themselves should be able to tell us the most practical way of doing this, more so than we could get from other sources. That was the thinking behind it, and they operate now as a committee, and they tell us from time to time what they think.

Mr. Thompson: If I could pin this down, sir, your committee is really to advise you in your role as the Minister of Lands and Forests and the effects that your decisions as a Minister would have on the Indians?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say it is within the department at the moment in that way because I have no authority to go outside the department. But we may find that some of the suggestions may be very useful, and other branches and other departments might be interested in some of the suggestions.

Mr. Thompson: Then, sir, for example, the suggestion made by my hon. friend about the study by Mr. Lagasse—I do not know if the hon. Minister has a copy of his speech—I was wondering if any of the points are pertinent to your advisory council?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We are going to have a look at anything he has suggested.

Mr. Thompson: I beg the hon. Minister's pardon?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We will have a look at anything Mr. Lagasse has suggested. Mr.

Bayly is in the wings and I am sure he has made a note of it already.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): May I ask the hon. Minister the policy insofar as closed seasons are concerned, particularly the sudden decision to have a closed season, April 22 to May 15, in the Point au Baril and Parry Sound areas? This sudden decision has left approximately 50 fishermen at odds to know what to do with their investment, costing several thousand dollars. They have lost revenue, not to mention employment. At a meeting of the Parry Sound District Fishermen's Association, well attended by Department of Lands and Forests representatives, it was stated by Mr. Carmen Douglas of The Department of Lands and Forests that there would be no closed season this year. I would like to ask the hon. Minister his policy in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is closed at the moment and there is a special meeting to be held with the fishermen's association, which is coming in here next week to discuss this problem with us. But at the moment, until May 15 the season is closed.

Mr. Sargent: To pursue—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is done by a Minister's order actually, that closing.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the hon. Minister the power that a conservation officer has. Is it a fact that he can arrest, seize, break into any building including a home, and all he needs to have is a suspicion that an offence has been committed, a power which was given to him and far surpasses that of a police officer under the Criminal Code and surely does not give a person the protection of the Bill of Rights? I would like to ask the hon. Minister his views of these powers.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: My hon. friend can read the Act as well as I can. The Act set out what the powers are and I suggest that he read it. If he does not like it, he can bring in an amendment, but at the moment, that is the statute and that is what we are operating under.

Mr. Sargent: In this regard I would like to cite a very glaring piece of business that is going on in the department—

Mr. Chairman: I believe the member is out of order. We are still on vote 1101.

Mr. Sargent: What does this come under, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1102.

Mr. MacDonald: If he wants to complete this—

Mr. Chairman: He is on fish and wildlife.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the point I have to raise is a policy issue. I do not think it fits in with any other department, at least I am not aware if it does and therefore I would like to raise it at this stage.

Back on the estimates of the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information, I raised this issue and the new hon. Attorney General intervened because it affects his bailiwick. At that time I asked him to communicate with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests so he might be in a position to give us some comment. I am referring to the considerable public discussion that has arisen in the area north of Sault Ste. Marie with regard to the size of the tracts of land that have been given to the Algoma Central Railroad.

Mr. Chairman, I want to throw this issue into the context that I think should capture our attention—that is the government has for about a year and a half been drifting with this issue. I have here a copy of a set of minutes of a breakfast meeting that was held with the hon. Minister and others of The Department of Lands and Forests at the Royal Edward Hotel in Fort William, Wednesday, November 28, 1962. Representing the department was a number of well-known departmental officials and representing the NOTO was a group of people.

The minutes spell out the whole background of this issue in pretty militant terms. For example, their descriptions of the permits and the licensing by the Algoma Central Railroad are as follows:

The ACR owned all the land by grant early in this century except the pine thereon. They have set up a land-use permit and in 1962 levied a charge for these permits. They do not own the game and fish but the permits are being levied for permission to pass over their land.

The department has discontinued stocking any waters in this vast area but this does not hurt the ACR, it only affects the operations conducted by licensed camp owners in the area. It is felt that the department will not stand for any attempt by this railway company to issue hunting licences. The ACR has made several attempts to implement the issuing of hunting licences but it appears this will not be allowed.

A little later on they say:

This entire territory was given to the Algoma Central Railroad by grant in 1900 at the rate of 1,700 acres per mile of track built, which was originally supposed to go to Hudson Bay.

That would give them a fair tract of territory, I would suggest.

One million acres of this land was returned to the Crown in 1941 and the rest of the grant is at the rate of \$1 per year.

Then there is one rather interesting paragraph here that shows the mood of the meeting. It says:

The Minister is sure alive to this situation and will contact this company in the near future as the government is opposed to anyone having exclusive use of any large tract of land. There will be a meeting in January called by the Algoma Central Railroad and the department will attend, as well as most affected licence operators. It is assumed that the NOTO will be represented.

I am informed that this meeting was never called. Fifteen months have gone by and nothing more has been done on the issue other than—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member should not say what he was informed, because he was misinformed. If the hon. member asks a question, I will answer it, but when he starts on a preliminary of what he was informed about, he was misinformed. If the hon. member wants the answer to what has happened, I will give it to him. I presume that is what the hon. member wants.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: This particular situation has been one of some considerable difficulty. There have been several meetings and this matter has been under careful study and I will very briefly state the position as I see it at this moment.

The Algoma Central Railway was granted 1.7 million acres by the Crown in the latter part of the 19th century as part inducement to build a railway to serve Sault Ste. Marie, and it was given with exemption from taxation. In 1925, The Provincial Land Tax Act was enacted. By 1940, the Algoma Central Railway owed the government \$2.25 million for taxes, partly on the land and partly other types of taxes. There was an agreement made on March 18, 1940, ratified by the Legislature

—those were the days of the former Liberal administration. Obligations were wiped out and about one half of the lands were re-conveyed to the Crown. Further tax exemption was given to the Algoma Central Railway in 1941.

In 1962, the company began the permit system for fishing and hunting on its lands. They started to charge \$3.25 per licence. Objections were received. The company issued 5,000 permits in 1963, which would be roughly about \$16,000. We have been endeavouring to get the company to withdraw from this field, but have not been successful. It has asked \$100,000 annually for a five-year period during which it wants to review the value of the lands in the event of them being taken over by the government.

This, in my view, as far as the \$100,000 annually is concerned, is completely unreasonable. Acquisition of these lands at a fair figure for the province is under consideration, as is also the advisability of removing this exemption from taxation. Whatever the situation may have been in 1940 it is difficult for me—and I think for my hon. colleagues also—in 1964 to see any justification for the exemption from land taxation when so many others with big and small holdings must pay the land tax. These matters are receiving the active attention of the government at this time and I think I can say we are not bluffing, we intend to see that this thing is followed through.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister whether in view of a representation that was made from no less a body than the West Algoma Progressive-Conservative Association some months ago, that these lands should be reverted to the Crown—as indeed a million acres of them did at some earlier stage—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It was 800,000.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the government considering that there should be such action as is necessary to have these lands revert to the Crown?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, of course they reverted previously because there was \$2.25 million owing and it was a settlement. Today, of course, we are not in that position of having any money owing.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, the one million or 800,000 acres reversion was for the accumulation of taxes?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is right. The present position is that the acquisition of the

lands at a fair value might be a solution and it is being looked into. But also, it is a question of whether this land tax, this provincial land tax, should not now be made applicable to those acres the same as it is applicable to everybody else.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, all I can say, apart from those interesting revelations, that the original arrangement with this company which was worked by a Liberal government in 1940, is that I hope the government is going to be as tough as the hon. Minister appears to be today. If there ever was a case of unmitigated arrogance in terms of attitude: here is a company which accumulated over \$2 million in back debts—I would like to see the little fellow around Ontario, the average man who could accumulate over \$2 million in back debts or the equivalent thereof, in terms of his assets, get away with it for any length of time—and all they did was to hand back a million of the acres that they got for nothing to begin with, they had had it for a one dollar grant.

This is a hangover from the days of feudalism that is completely intolerable. That this company should now come back and in effect try to hold up the government for \$100,000 grant annually is preposterous. I hope the hon. Minister is just as tough and blustery when he is talking to them as he is with us today in the House.

I just want to draw attention to the kind of thing that is happening, apart from the licensing and imposing permits by unilateral action as though it was a great feudal tract of territory and all the serfs just have to sort of obey the dictates of the matter. This is the kind of attitude that has been manifested.

There were two resort operators in the area by the name of Cannon and Christensen. Their rent for 1964 was due in advance. Take note of this: their rent is due in advance, to a company that had over \$2 million in back taxes unpaid at one stage in its history. Notice of eviction was received by these operators on January 23 when their camps were under four feet of snow.

Mr. Culver, another operator, only owed his government land tax, his lease to the ACR was paid. Cannon paid \$395 a year for one acre and Nels Christensen paid \$750 per year for 4.7 acres. This is nearly \$165 per acre, three times what the land is worth to buy, and yet this is a year's rental.

Now I assume the hon. Minister is aware of these things. If he is not aware of them, I think this is just one more bit of evidence of the unmitigated arrogance of a company

that has been given attractive territory like this and is trying to operate on it as though it were a feudal domain. We shall look forward with interest to just how firm the government is in coming to an equitable solution in terms of the people of the area and the interests of the province.

Vote 1101 agreed to.

On vote 1102:

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, under vote 1102 I would like to bring to the attention of this House and have placed on the record a matter which is of considerable concern. It does not particularly concern anything in my riding, but it certainly concerns a great many of the fishermen, of which there are many hundreds in my riding.

That is, of course, the matter which has come before The Department of Lands and Forests on behalf of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. It is a matter with which they are indeed very concerned, and I refer to the locks which are being built to create the existing marine railway situated at Severn Falls, Swift River and on the Trent-Severn waterway. Replacement of the marine railways on the Severn River between Lake Couchiching and Georgian Bay will undoubtedly result sooner or later in sea lamprey and other species not found in Lake Simcoe gaining access to the lake.

Conditions in Lake Simcoe and some of its tributary streams, Mr. Chairman, are suitable for the reproduction, survival and growth of this type of specie. If the lamprey reaches Lake Simcoe it can be expected to result in establishment of a self-perpetuating population. The establishment of sea lamprey in Lake Simcoe would almost certainly have a detrimental effect on some of the fish there, particularly lake trout. The lamprey have already had a very detrimental effect in the Great Lakes as far as the lake trout are concerned.

Experiments are, of course, now in progress in Lake Superior which suggest that some control of these lamprey populations in the Great Lakes will be possible. The level at which it may be possible, either economically or otherwise, is not yet known and there is no evidence that the sea lamprey can be eradicated once it has been introduced. Perpetual control will be necessary and the cost of this cannot now be estimated, but will undoubtedly be very considerable.

The effect of other foreign species of fish such as alewife and other types of ferocious type fish which will gain access to Lake Simcoe via the proposed locks cannot be

forecast. However, they will create a totally new set of conditions which will definitely affect the fish life in this very popular fishing area.

The Federation of Anglers and Hunters has presented a brief to the federal Minister of Transport, which I hold in my hand. It is interesting to note that at least three officials of our own provincial Department of Lands and Forests have given strong support to this brief which has been presented. It is estimated that Lake Simcoe, Lake Couchiching and Sparrow Lake are among the most heavily fished inland waters in Ontario. Lake Simcoe is particularly productive, maintaining large families of aquatic life in spite of the heavy fishing pressures each year.

A breakdown in the brief of the Federation of Anglers and Hunters dealing with money spent by fishermen in this area under several different headings, estimates that at least \$5 million per year is spent with many, many hundreds of citizens enjoying the fishing in this particular area. Much of this revenue would disappear if the fish population in these lakes was depleted and we already have proof that this can happen because of the effect that it has had in the Great Lakes.

The question may well be asked, what additional revenue can we logically anticipate by replacing the marine railways with locks rather than have a modern, efficient marine railway? In view of the fact that marine railways are not always a limiting factor in the size of boats that can navigate the Severn River, we also must consider the depth of water, narrow cuts, and the currents which make this area very dangerous for large cruisers. It is estimated that not more than 150 larger boats per year would use this waterway. Bearing in mind that these larger boats, Mr. Chairman, are nearly self-sufficient, being able to carry almost all necessary supplies for the trip, a figure of \$200 expenditure per boat appears probable. This would give an additional revenue of \$30,000. Even if the figure were ten times this amount it would not begin to offset the possible loss of the present revenue from fishing. The cost of installing an efficient marine railway would be approximately one-eighth of the cost of building these locks. It would appear certainly that there is much to be lost in this matter and so little to be gained.

I would this afternoon like to urge The Department of Lands and Forests to give every consideration to this matter which is of such great concern to this important body, and not only this important body but the many thousands of anglers who use this lake.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: May I say to the hon. member for Oshawa, whose voice directed to me is pleasant to hear, as was the voice of the previous hon. member—in both cases not offensive—that I am glad to answer in this tone.

The Severn River locks would, of course, be more convenient to certain users if they could be enlarged, and the marine railway, that is the portage angle, were done away with. But as my hon. friend has said, and I endorse this, the danger of lamprey getting into those inland lakes if the lock system replaced entirely the present system is too great for us, at least in this department, to do other than warn and inform the federal authorities that that danger is in our view extremely great, and they should make a decision that will make certain that the lamprey will not get through.

The joint committee of experts that looked into this was composed of representatives of both this department and the federal counterpart, and the federal authority is aware of their united finding in that respect.

There is, however, one alternative that I understand is being examined—how costly it would be I have no idea, but it is interesting to know that the alternative is to make the water hot enough in the area of the locks to be lethal to the lamprey. That would mean, sir, it would be kept constantly at a temperature something in excess of 80 degrees Fahrenheit. Whether that is feasible as an alternative from the cost standpoint, I cannot say, but in any event we are on record that we are opposed to anything being done there that would let these lamprey get in.

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we are going on to another topic, whether I may come back to this for a minute. The hon. Minister knows I have been in communication with him because of representations made by a sportsmen's club in my own riding. May I ask the hon. Minister, does exclusive jurisdiction over this rest with the federal government because it is a navigable water?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, the actual construction work that goes on in navigable waters is exclusively federal and that cost is borne by the federal government. The Trent system is a federal undertaking.

Mr. MacDonald: Am I right then in concluding that all the provincial government can do is warn and complain and plead and so on, but in the final analysis if the federal

government decides to proceed we must accept its decision?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member might be asking a nice point of constitutional law, but I would think in the field that was confined to the federal authority or given to it explicitly, in the final analysis its decision would govern. My deputy thinks you could stop it by some injunction method, but I would not want to give that as an opinion off the cuff.

Mr. MacDonald: I just want to make a final comment, Mr. Chairman, that if you are looking for a field to test the constitutional issue, I think this would be a good one to move into. I will not repeat the case that the hon. member for Oshawa has presented, but it strikes me as being nonsensical that this kind of a structure should even be considered, opening up the prospect, which apparently everybody can see, of the lamprey getting into a whole group of inland waters. It is such a piece of folly that one wonders why it would be contemplated seriously when the consequences are known. Therefore, I repeat, since the hon. Minister is in good fighting trim and there is no leadership race, so that he will be looking for an outlet for his fighting capacities, that I urge him with the full support of certainly myself, and I judge the hon. member for Oshawa, to make this a constitutional issue and fight it through to the Supreme Court.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not know what difference the Opposition's support would make.

Mr. Troy: The hon. Minister said something about some people on the "offensive list" over here. I do not know if I am on the interdicted list or not. Nevertheless, I have a couple of questions.

The first one refers to a grant to Thomas Jones; what would that be for? It is not the Tom Jones we read about in the press.

An hon. member: What else?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: Seriously, Mr. Minister, I would like to know why you or your department in Nipissing set May 15 for the opening of the pike season, then May 16 for the opening of the pickerel season. Did you expect that those who caught the pickerel on Friday, May 15, and knowing that it was against the law to fish pickerel on that day, would return them to the lake? I know the people who live there would but I do not know if those who come from other areas would. We have

hundreds coming up there at that time. What was the reason behind that decision?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It was really the pickerel date that was changed, not the wall-eye, and the pickerel one was changed to suit what we thought would be the largest number of people for a good weekend.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, they would be fishing in the same water for one type of fish one day. Then the one that they come after, I think it is the second day, on the Saturday—

An hon. member: They do not work on Saturdays. If you catch a pickerel on Friday, you put your name on it and throw it back.

Mr. Troy: Then there is another question—

An hon. member: What was the answer to that one?

Mr. Troy: It is a constitutional matter. The season for pickerel in certain waters, for example, in southern Ontario or south of Nipissing. Was it May 1?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am making my hon. friend wait almost as long as he would have to wait for the fish himself. May 9 is the date on that.

Mr. Troy: I believe, then, in the district of Parry Sound you are able to fish on May 9? Is there a difference in that district?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: What is the hon. member's point? I do not—

Mr. Troy: The point is that part of Lake Nipissing is in the district of Parry Sound. People came down into certain sections of Lake Nipissing and were lifting the pickerel out in their hands in the spawning season, ruining forever the possibility of the propagation of millions of fish.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, if the hon. member has some complaint, will he make it? Then I would know what he is talking about.

Mr. Troy: It is too late, sir, to make the complaint now because the damage is done. Whether it was the fault of the department or God that gave us warmer weather than we expected, but the result was that for millions of fish the propagation was destroyed, because of the fact of geography probably.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member has any problem between now and the 9th—what is this? the 7th? 6th?

He has two days yet if he wants something. Come and see Dr. Clark. He will accommodate the hon. member in any way he can.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I concur with the hon. member for York South when he intimated there is arrogance in this department. I do not believe, in all fairness, that the hon. Minister himself, would tolerate the situation that is going on in the area of Parry Sound insofar as commercial fishing is concerned. There is nothing in his budget that is relevant or points out what I am going to tell the House about now, but I think it is a matter of importance that we know what is going on from your officials, Mr. Minister.

This is a letter from the son of a constituent of mine who fishes in the Parry Sound area. A commercial fisherman, this writer is a police constable and he says, in effect, with regards to his father:

I would ask, sir, if you could give him any help. It would certainly be appreciated as he for the past 3 years has had a very rough time in the Pointe au Baril area. He has fished all his life in these waters, knows them very well, and has made his living at this trade. He has made a study of fishing and has had some good and bad years.

During the past three months I had the pleasure of attending the Ontario Police School down at Aylmer, and I think one of the most discussed subjects was the power of the authority given to a conservation officer; the fact that he can arrest, seize, break into any building, including a home, and all he needs to have is a suspicion that an offence has been committed. A power which is given to him far surpasses that of a police officer in the Criminal Code, and surely does not give a person the protection included in the Bill of Rights.

During the last year my father was having trouble with The Department of Lands and Forests at Parry Sound. I went to see how far he was inside the stated lines for fishing, and after several checks were made it should have been obvious to the officer in question that my father had not broken the fishing law. And I also cannot help but feel that, due to all of the extra worry and concern caused by this trouble, it certainly hastened the death of my mother in November in Parry Sound. I also fail to understand how one branch of The Department of Lands and Forests can make and enforce any law which they feel should be done.

He goes on to say: "It's a sorry mess" and so on.

Now the facts of this case: For over 50 years the fishing line was set and recognized by The Department of Game and Fisheries and the commercial fishermen in this area. It was suddenly changed by The Department of Lands and Forests in Parry Sound in the year 1962. At this time, a special meeting of the Fishermen's Association was called for the Parry Sound area and this time it was the wish of the commercial fishermen in this area that the line remain as it was and had been over a period of years. But if this new line was set up, it would cut off from the commercial fisherman a vast amount of fishing grounds.

However, at this time, it was suggested by The Department of Lands and Forests that if the commercial fisherman in the Parry Sound area would consent to this change of the line, that the department there would grant them special privileges in the fall. The letter goes on to show the mechanics of this. Summing it up, he says:

In the spring of the year 1962 I began my fishing operations on the south grounds of my area. It was during this period that The Department of Lands and Forests personnel came out from Parry Sound and set trap nets in every channel used by the fish coming out to the outside waters from their feeding beds, which are in the waters along the inside islands during the winter months. While in the process of doing this, boats operated by these men, these department men, got tangled up in my nets, tearing them and cutting them in two, which cost me many dollars to repair.

As a result of this action I was forced to move my operation to the north grounds of my area, which later proved very costly as far as The Department of Lands and Forests was concerned, as only a very short time later, while in the operation of lifting my nets outside of the set line, The Department of Lands and Forests boat came alongside my boat and the officer, one Mr. McVey, stated that I was inside the line, everything I had was under seizure and that I was being charged for this offence.

I then put a buoy on my nets, leaving them exactly where they were, and went ashore; going to a telephone which was about six miles away. I phoned to The Department of Lands and Forests office in Parry Sound, talking to a Mr. Adamson, who understood the waters. He refused to do so, stating that I would have to abide by the decision of the man there.

I then phoned my lawyer and told him of the event. He advised me to get an airplane and a good camera man and have him fly the line and take pictures of the location of the nets. Later I was informed by the department in their office, in the presence of my lawyer, that the charges had been withdrawn. They, the officials themselves, were not too sure of the exact location of the line and at this time they still wanted to extend the line further out. My lawyer would not let them do this. However, this cost me many, many hundreds of dollars plus the time lost in the operation of my business. Then in the following year of 1963, in the month of June, and by the same officer I was accused again of being inside the set line. Twelve of my nets are under seizure. I was being charged and would be summoned to court.

However, I was informed that the summons which I had been served with was being withdrawn as it was on the wrong charge and another summons would be issued in this offence. So, after several trips to Parry Sound, which is over 50 miles from Pointe au Baril, the cost of taking my men, plus the many days lost in operation, on August 30 I was found not guilty of this charge. However, the cost again was many hundreds of dollars and yet in both of these offences I was within my rights.

Had I been found guilty of these minor offences I would have lost my licence and many, many thousands of dollars would have been lost as well as a lifetime of work.

Now, he says:

—as the year 1964 approaches, being in this commercial fishing business I cannot help but wonder will these things happen again? I have also been informed that the Lands and Forests at Parry Sound are again going to put trap nets in all the channels leading to outside grounds, and are once again going to take the spawns from the fish which are so badly needed to restock our own waters, and send them in to inland lakes.

I, therefore, cannot help but feel that until such time as this spawn is put back into the area from which it is taken, the rapid decline of the fishing in this Georgian Bay area will continue. It will affect both commercial and tourist fishing.

This learned man in his field, a commercial fisherman, who is highly regarded, lists a whole list of inequities here, which raise glaring questions. I will give them to the hon. Minister and not take the time of the House to ask him now—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, if I may interrupt for a moment. I understand that this commercial fishermen's group has already made an appointment to be here on May 14 to discuss a lot of these problems. We intend to talk to it then.

Mr. Sargent: The point is, Mr. Chairman, **when these things are brought up** in this House, the hon. Minister always has an answer: they are going to have a meeting.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That happens to have been set up before you brought it up. As a matter of fact it is on request of the commercial fishermen's association.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, irrespective, as my hon. friend knows, of whether a committee is to meet some time in the future or not, that does not disqualify my hon. friend from Grey North from asking him very pertinent questions relative to this vote in these departmental estimates.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The leader of the Opposition's submission is good. The hon. member for Grey North made the statement he did not want to take up the time of the House and I got up and said it would not be necessary. I said it because we have already got an appointment to see these people.

Mr. Oliver: Now, my hon. friend from Grey North said nothing of the kind.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is what I understood.

Mr. Oliver: Toward the later part of his remarks he said he had an appendix to the document which contained other inequities as his informant saw them. Prior to that he had stated a very precise case against the department which calls, I suggest, for information from the hon. Minister in reply to that charge for that information.

Mr. Sargent: That is correct.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: All these matters will be discussed. What the hon. gentleman referred to is not unknown to the department. The department people have had lots of discussions on previous occasions. But the line set in Georgian Bay—and it is one of these winding lines; there are many islands, as you know, in that area—is intended to keep commercial and sport fishing separate. It is a real problem, I can assure my hon. friend, to work out something that will meet those two situations. As far as the netting by our own depart-

ment is concerned, that is done for spawn taking, tagging and technical purposes only.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that more and more small people are being hurt by bureaucracy and such goings-on as I have related here. As I said before, I know the House is trying to get through its business on this vote, but these are very glaring questions in this department and I will forward them to the hon. Minister. The point is that this man, a small businessman, has no recourse for this loss of money. I would like to see a man like this sue the government for loss of money in a case like this. It is a great injustice and as the hon. Minister says, we will have a meeting about it. I think there should be an investigation and this man be given a square deal.

Vote 1102 agreed to.

Vote 1103 agreed to.

Vote 1104 agreed to.

On vote 1105:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two items. Without going into detail, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister will recall that I inquired of him last year with regard to the situation at Wasaga Beach and this has continued as a running battle in the intervening year. I have here a letter to a local paper in which the chairman or the president of the chamber of commerce in the area is chastising the local hon. member (Mr. Evans) rather firmly for accepting statements from the parks integration board as being the majority view of the community, when the chairman or president contends they were only minority views. I do not want to repeat all the basic elements of this to the hon. Minister because I think he is aware of them, but the latest information that the people interested in it have received over the signature of the deputy Minister is to the effect that it is still under consideration. What is the picture at Wasaga Beach?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Wasaga Beach, Mr. Chairman, is one of the great beaches of this province—

Mr. MacDonald: This I knew. What is the political picture?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There will be thousands and thousands of cars coming there, we hope pretty soon now, for this season. The situation I think at the moment is reasonably satisfactory. Arrangements are being worked

out gradually and it is a big problem, because of what was found and what grew up there before any real attempt was made to develop this as a beach under the control of an authority beyond the local community. Nature is helping this a bit because with the low water—this is certainly not desirable everywhere, but with the low water that exists this year, there is far more beach exposed than would be the average exposure. That is helping considerably.

We are in the midst of a study by an expert from the University of Toronto on the feasibility of building up the beach itself, and if that turns out to be feasible it may save a lot of money. The alternative to that would be to gradually acquire a great deal of property and solve the problems for the future that way.

In the meantime a road has been established and exits have been made to the satisfaction of the hon. member for the district, who knows that area probably better than anybody else in the House—he and the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby). I think I can say we are entering into 1964 with a fairly good situation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that if what has happened has got the approval of the local members this will certainly arouse the ire of a considerable group of people who have been in touch with me now for well over a year in regard to this. Basically the problem as they presented it to me—businessmen and others who are on the beach—is that The Department of Highways, in attempting to cope with what it deemed an unsatisfactory situation, cut off most of the streets going down to the beach. There are only one or two roads to get in, and this has resulted in a great drop in business and continuing dissatisfaction.

A letter from the former Attorney General (Mr. Cass) to one of the people who had written in said that this was under study by The Department of Lands and Forests through the parks integration board. Here I have a letter dated March 4 of this year over the signature of F. A. McDougall saying:

As indicated in your letter of February 10, the question of Wasaga Beach was discussed in the Legislature on February 25, 1963, and at that time our Minister stated that they were having a careful study made of the whole picture at Wasaga Beach. We expect within the very near future to consider plans of this area and present them to the Ontario Parks Integra-

tion Board. Until such time as these plans are approved we are not in a position to advise you of the department's position with regard to any individual property in this area.

That is the end of the letter.

Is the hon. Minister's statement, to which we have just listened, in effect a report of these studies that were outlined in the letter from the deputy Minister, or does he ignore the studies completely? Is this something else?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The letter is quite right. When these things move I can assure the hon. member they do not move overnight on a problem of that sort. But they do move and they move through the parks integration board. The latest move by the parks integration board was authority for the acquisition of some 34 acres of property in that area in relation to the general problem, which will go part way at least in helping to solve some of the urgent problems. We believe on balance that it is working out satisfactorily and I prefer to take that view. Perhaps the hon. members concerned would like to say something about it; I should say they probably know more about it than either of us.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under this vote 1105, which brings up parks of the province, I might say, that in my riding I am very fortunate to have Rondeau Provincial Park. It is one of the parks at which I think the hon. Minister said last year there were more admissions than at all other parks in the province.

I might say we do appreciate the improvements that have been made at Rondeau Park, but, of course, we have some problems there, too. One of the problems that concerns a large number of leaseholders in Rondeau Park is the renewal of leases. I have been advised by the leaseholders' association that these new leases that will be granted will contain no clause that these leases will be renewed. If, as I understand it, this is the department's policy or future plan for Rondeau Park, this is a great concern to these leaseholders. I believe the leaseholders' association has waited on the department a number of times trying to get the policy of the government in regard to leases in Rondeau Park.

These leaseholders have built beautiful cottages, ranging in price from \$30,000 down to as low as \$6,000. These cottages, with their lovely flower beds, add a great deal to the scenic beauty of Rondeau Park. However, there is a growing concern on the part of the leaseholders that the government plans to

adopt the policy of not renewing their leases as they fall due.

I think two years ago a delegation of the leaseholders' association attended here on the day the estimates of this department were being presented in the House by the then Minister, who is now the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner). This delegation requested an interview with the Minister as they had several questions they wished to put to him, but unfortunately it was impossible for him to grant this request. However, certain officials of the department did meet with the delegation, who were assured that their questions would be answered.

I have now been informed that the leaseholders' association has received no answers whatsoever up to the present time. I would like to have the hon. Minister outline, if he can, his future plans with regard to the leases in Rondeau Park.

Another matter I would like to discuss while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, is Rondeau Bay. I might say that over the past number of years this bay has grown up with weeds and has been a great concern to all the people in that area, because this bay is one of the attractions which draws tourists to the provincial park. This condition seems to be worsening. We do appreciate that this department has given a grant of \$2,000 for the cutting of these weeds, but this is no permanent solution. I believe I have asked on numerous other occasions if the department could suggest some other means, such as a chemical, which we could use in an attempt to destroy these weeds. We have been cutting them but this does not seem to solve the problem.

I understand that this bay is now the responsibility of the provincial government, although previously it was under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Over the years it has become a serious problem as nobody seemed to want to accept responsibility for the condition. However, I understand that this department now has control over Rondeau Bay and we would like to see some action in finding a permanent solution to the problem of controlling this unsightly condition.

I have another question which I would like to ask the hon. Minister. I understand that it is his intention to increase the fishing licence to \$3 or over. I hope that is not right. It may be only rumour, but it is causing concern to many people in that area.

Maybe I am giving too many questions to the hon. Minister, but another problem is in regard to the placing of gates at the entrance

to Rondeau Park. I have an article here from the *Chatham Daily News*. It says: "Rondeau Park Gates May Curb Vandalism."

Now this is something new for us in the riding of Kent East to have gates placed at the entrance. In the evening these gates will be closed and only those who have cottages, or are campers, or those on business, will be able to enter. I feel that this is unfair to other people living in the district who are very proud of the provincial park and enjoy driving any visitors they may be entertaining through the park in the evenings.

I understand the leaseholders are very much in favour of this and that the campers are very much in favour of this; but then an article appears in the *Chatham Daily News* which says "Rondeau Park Gates May Curb Vandalism!"

We have provincial police stationed at Rondeau Park. I feel that we have as fine a police force as there is in the Dominion of Canada and the province of Ontario, and I believe a lot of those young people who attend Rondeau Park are from the towns and villages in that surrounding area. I do not hear too much of vandalism in these towns and villages, the police have complete control of them. I wonder if the hon. Minister could outline to me the reason for the gates, why the police cannot cope with this situation at Rondeau Park.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The remarks of the hon. member for Kent East are appreciated. I might mention that Rondeau, second to Wasaga, is the largest attended park in the province. Last year I think something like 647,000 people were counted there. We have 500-odd campsites, which means that more than 2,000 people can camp there at a time.

The policy is, of course, gradually to clear out the leaseholds in parks of this sort because of the overall benefit to the public generally by getting more and more area in such suitable locations. But some of these leases, I understand, are to run for quite a long period of time yet and we are trying to be as diplomatic as possible in dealing with the people concerned. I hope to get down to the park before very long—even before this month is out I hope to be in that area—and I hope my hon. friend would perhaps join me and at that time we will have a look around at some of these things.

Mr. Spence: I should appreciate it.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Chairman, in regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for York South about the

Wasaga Beach area, I think when The Department of Lands and Forests took over the Wasaga Beach area they got into a very difficult situation. It is a lot different to set up a park in an area which has a lot of business places, a lot of cottages, than it is to set up a park where there is just the bush area, or lakes or streams or whatever it might be.

The Department of Lands and Forests run into a lot of difficulty at Wasaga Beach because there is private enterprise and many cottages there. In order to develop this area into a park, they found that certainly there were going to be many people who were going to be hurt in a certain way, by cutting off roads and things like that. I might say that before they took over this park there were no washroom facilities. Since the department has taken it over, it will be found that there are adequate washroom facilities in the area. The beach is a lot cleaner. Many more people go to that beach today than did several years ago.

The hon. member mentioned about the roads being cut off, I have thought about this many, many times. It has been brought to my attention. I believe that possibly a lot of people have been hurt. I know of several cases, and people have mentioned to me about their business places where the road has been cut off along the beach. This year the department has agreed to open up some roads. They found it is possible to do this. But it must be remembered in the Wasaga Beach area there is a high water mark. At the present time our beach is about 560 feet wide, but sometimes, for instance back in 1952, the beach was only wide enough for one car.

So through the efforts of the department they have now, as the hon. Minister has mentioned, employed a professor from the University of Toronto studying the feasibility of widening the beach. I think that possibly this can be done.

Out in Vancouver last year I discovered that there is a thousand-acre park that was built on sand dunes. I think it is quite feasible at the Wasaga Beach area that it can be widened so that there could be a road running the full extent of the beach. We must remember that it is the greatest beach, probably, on the North American continent. I would like to congratulate The Department of Lands and Forests on the terrific job they are doing and the very fine co-operation I have had from them.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the parks integration board. Does that come under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not know about this vote. They have their own.

Mr. Bukator: I realize that but there are the funds that go from Hydro and that the hon. Minister gets into his funds, I believe, some \$600,000 a year diverted for water rental.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is one of the things that was taken away from The Department of Lands and Forests. It goes directly to the Treasury and, therefore, we do not have the benefit of even showing it.

Mr. Bukator: I was wondering where that figure would be revealed. I stand to be corrected, and the vice-chairman of Hydro always puts me right, but is it some \$600,000 does he recall?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will check that.

Mr. Bukator: I am curious. If this is true, several years ago I had several of the Ministers who were good enough to come to Fort Erie and look at the possibility of obtaining a large section of land there at Old Erie Beach. As a matter of fact, I will take that back a step further. I mention this to the hon. members annually. The former Prime Minister, hon. Mr. Frost, when I was asking a similar question said: "You make sense and I would like to talk to you about this matter in my office." I would like now to reveal the personnel of that particular group at that meeting. The Prime Minister said then that he would like to talk with us. We met with the chairman of the parks commission at that time, Charles Daley, I believe it was. Mr. Clark, who was the executive secretary to the Prime Minister; my good friend the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) and myself.

We discussed the possibility of purchasing the land for park purposes. In my evening paper in Niagara Falls there was a bit of land for sale just up the river from that on Lake Erie, some 500-odd feet with a home on it. Mind you, it is a substantial home, but they are asking \$100,000 for these 11 acres. It is a fantastic figure and I doubt very much whether anybody will buy it except maybe some wealthy person who can afford that kind of an estate.

But down the river from that, or along Lake Erie, there is over 50 acres that could

be purchased for a much smaller figure per acre. Your people did attend a meeting and they were good enough to come to our area.

I am going to try to recall the members of the government who were there then. I stand to be corrected, because most of you will remember. But hon. Mr. Allan, the Treasurer at that time was there; I believe Mr. Morningstar was there, and the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs who was the Minister of Lands and Forests at that time. No doubt he will recall visiting Erie Beach.

We looked at this site and it got to this stage that your people were good enough, after Mr. Frost turned to Mr. Daley and said: "Buy it." Mr. Daley at that time said: "You are taking my money from me, over \$600,000, and I guess less than \$200,000 would buy that large park."

Now there would be a large park at Niagara-on-the-Lake, adjoining the Niagara Parks Commission land. There would be another outlet similar to that adjoining, not only the park land, but right close to our neighbours in Buffalo. I am talking now of Old Erie Beach.

Your people were there, and I do believe an appraiser was sent out. He looked over the proposition and they decided then that the cost was too great. They could not afford to buy it because this party who owned the land was asking too much money. But there would be a beautiful park, Mr. Minister, in that area.

He may remember the old original Erie Beach. It had many concessions, many concrete walks through it, a large pavilion. They are all there now, mind you. They are pretty well beaten by the weather, but they could be recovered. There are many beautiful trees and you could have, I think, even a park where trailers could come in and people could enjoy this.

The reason I bring this to the attention of the hon. Minister is because I have complained in this House so often—and I did it sincerely. I feel that between the Ontario Hydro and the Niagara Parks Commission, they have taken from us many dollars that I believe they should pay in taxes.

Take the parks commission, if you will, with the annual report tabled here some two weeks ago. From the concessions alone in the Niagara Parks system, they have netted \$230,000-odd. Now mind you, they are in direct opposition to private enterprise. They do a good job. Most of the hon. members no doubt have been through the park. We are proud of it. I think it is a wonderful park

and it will be there for all time to come. They will eventually expand it. I hope the government purchases Erie Beach when the hon. members get travelling about the province on their tour. I am sure it would be found this would be a good addition. The funds come from that area, in any case. But if the parks commission is going to do business in their souvenir stores and in the restaurants in direct opposition to private enterprise, I believe they should pay their taxes. When they have made \$230,000-odd net, they could very easily pay the portion that others have to pay to bear the cost.

I might say, in connection with that, that because of the dollars that originate from water rentals from the Hydro, they end up in the parks integration board. The money there I suppose is dispersed throughout the whole province.

Well, this is good. I do not think any one area should try to get all that it feels it should have, but I think this is a reasonable request. I might say to the hon. Minister that we feel that the least the Hydro, the parks commission and his people should look at is that the Hydro should pay taxes the same as the Canadian Niagara does. The second thing is that the parks commission should pay taxes when it does business in direct opposition to private enterprise in our area. And the third thing is that the hon. Minister should take a good look at that Fort Erie end because the money originates there. You have a profit, and you could purchase valuable land for our citizens to enjoy in the future. It is an excellent section of land and there is at least 50 acres that could be purchased there, I would say, very cheaply at this time.

I would like the hon. Minister to assure me, if he will—I know that he owes me no concession whatsoever—but when he is in that area, I would like very much to show him what we have there. I do believe it would be a great addition to the parks system.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am glad to hear the remarks of the hon. member and I might say that I think there will be a meeting of the parks integration board in Niagara Falls within—I think it is set up for some time within the next month anyway. I would be very pleased to invite the hon. member to attend as part of that meeting in any event, and discuss these things with the board.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, since some people want to get out of here as soon as possible I will go over this one very quickly. I pre-

sume under basic organization, vote 1110, I can ask a question about surveys and lands.

Now that we are on parks, I would like to find out the position of the parks branch in regard to Antoine Park along the Ottawa River in Mattawan township. Will the department continue to consider it in the full capacity of a provincial park—that is the Antoine, the small park along the river? It is a very valuable asset to the people of Mattawa.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is a small park, a 23-acre park. What is it the hon. member would like to know about it?

Mr. Troy: I know at one time it was thought that the parks branch would get rid of that to the municipality in which it is situated, but that little township would not possibly be able to handle it. Will the hon. Minister still keep it as a provincial park and continue to have it in the same capacity as the others regardless of its size?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is obviously a park. I do not know how we acquired it in the first place, but it is obviously a park. We got it from Highways, I think, as some surplus ground, something of that order. Actually, it is not at all of the size of a provincial park. We have a yardstick of 500 acres when possible and I do not see how we can do much about a 23-acre project there, if the hon. member is suggesting we should develop it further.

Mr. Troy: No, not any further development, but keep it within the hon. Minister's department. The people of the area want the park because it is quite an asset to the community and they do not want to get rid of it to the township.

Could the hon. Minister give me the progress made in regard to the projected park in Haddo township?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Haddo is a reserved park. Actually, these things have to take certain priorities. I do not think the hon. member is suffering in his area from lack of parks. There is a lovely park at Marten River, there is a lovely park in Champlain Park. We have Haddo reserved and it can be developed in due course, but we have to have priorities for development.

Mr. Troy: The only thing is that the Marten River camp is at a much different place than Haddo, and it would be very fine—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is a good big acreage there, as the hon. member knows—

Mr. Troy: Yes, a good big acreage. And so is the section near the Nickel Belt and Sudbury area and up Highway 69. What is the attitude of the department with regard to Algonquin Park? I know last fall there seemed to be feelers out in the press of the possibility of opening this up to some extent with access roads. I believe the hon. Minister issued a release in that regard to sound out public opinion. What is the present position of the hon. Minister in regard to Algonquin as a wilderness area? I am at the same time thinking as I read the monthly reports—or weekly, I forget which they are—from the branch in the Pembroke area, that there seems to be quite a number of access roads going in in that section of the park.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Would the hon. member just indicate if he thinks there is a lack of access or an excess of access or what? He is trying to lead me into some answer and then he will not like it no matter what it is.

Mr. Troy: No, there has been concern about keeping Algonquin as one of the few wilderness areas. Some organizations across the province, a great number of people, are concerned that there are going to be access roads opened up and projects of that nature. What is the opinion of the department? Some feel that there should be a highway going from southern Ontario through Haliburton county and that section, through the park, up to Highway 17, then on to 533 and up to northern Ontario. What is the feeling of the hon. Minister about opening up Algonquin with roads?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The answer there is that we have about 2,900 square miles in this great park and it is a tremendous park. It has been kept on the basis of the natural beauty and the right to go in there and travel by canoe and get lots of solitude if you want it, and we do not want to destroy that.

On the other hand, we also realize that in the change that has taken place over the years there are far more people travelling now to see such places as this. They want to have access as much as possible to the area into which they want to get, even in the park. We have to move with the times, but at the same time we have to preserve that original concept of the park. There is thinking constantly going on that is gradually changing, I think.

My deputy may check me here if I say too much, because he is one of these men who had a lot to do with that park. He is very

devoted to the park and to the principles that brought the park into being. We do not want to run roads in there that would in any way do away with the original concept, but at the same time we are realizing that more and more people want them. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information wants them. And, sir, we all want people to have the chance to see the great parks of our country that are available and we are trying to make them available. Now, we are not going to put a brand-new road through there or anything of that sort, but there may be gradually new points of access into the park itself and perhaps even new development so that more people will get into the interior of the park than do so at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: Will there be any change from what the *status quo* is—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The what?

Mr. MacDonald: I said, will there be any change from the *status quo* as we have known it for years?

Mr. Troy: The hon. Minister has said that there are quite a number of the recommendations being considered. I presume he is referring to that report of the 1959 committee of which Major General Kennedy, I believe, was the chairman. Did he refer to the committee in which Mr. J. F. MacFarland was chairman and Howard Kennedy was vice-chairman? Did the hon. Minister refer to that particular report?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I was referring to the report of the Ontario Royal Commission on Forestry, 1947. Howard Kennedy was the chairman.

Mr. Troy: Yes. Then he was vice-chairman of another one, the public lands investigation committee, and that committee was set up to recommend about parks and mining in parks. This committee apparently gave a strong recommendation that such be done, as it pointed out the great amount of land—that is public lands—with so few square miles, comparatively, under mining. Is there any change yet in your opinion about opening up provincial parks to mining?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think that statement has been made pretty clearly by the hon. Prime Minister and others—

Mr. Troy: I know, but clear statements have been made one week and we have found out a week after things happened—

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) is not opposed to it.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): There is no change.

Mr. Troy: No change. Thank you.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask the hon. Minister under this vote. But before I do, I am pleased to commend the hon. Minister and his department for the continued action in developing a park in Elliot Lake, and also the donation by the department to the wildlife museum there. It has become fairly evident in Elliot Lake that very shortly we are not going to have much else but parks and some wildlife.

In this connection, and for that reason, I feel like inviting the hon. members of this House to visit this park, since in this area we do not get very excited about anything smaller than a 24-pound trout.

Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention, in connection with the provincial park, that there has been some correspondence from the federal parks branch to the effect that there is some thinking of developing a national park in that area. In that respect I am going to have to ask the hon. Minister and his department for even a little further co-operation.

It has come to my attention that there is at this point, or has been, some correspondence between the federal parks branch and the hon. Minister and I would like to ask—I have not heard anything recently about it—I would like to ask if negotiations are continuing between the two governments in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think the answer would be yes. As a matter of fact, when the question of a national park was raised—and obviously in this province where we now have 85 provincial parks, we are not really searching for national parks which are operated on somewhat different methods than ours—but when this question of a national park was brought up and when it was recognized that the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Pearson), recently so appointed, comes from, or rather occupies his seat in the House of Commons, in a territory that takes in this area, it seemed to me that if there was any one particular place where a national park might be fitting it might be in a riding represented by the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada. We indicated our desire to co-operate if, at the

federal level, this is still something that they want to pursue.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests announce today that his department would proceed with the development of the Sandbanks Park in Prince Edward county. Local municipal councils and local people have long urged that this be done. We feel that this will be a great development that will benefit the people of Ontario, particularly our own local residents.

I might say that we are fortunate in that it is practically all Crown land. In a recent press release I believe that the hon. Minister described it very appropriately, and I would like to repeat his description of it:

The hon. A. Kelso Roberts, QC, has announced that development work will start this spring on Sandbanks provincial park in Prince Edward county near Wellington.

This is a unique flow sand peninsula, 1,200 acres in area and five miles long which separates Lake Ontario and Yeo Lake.

I might say that Yeo Lake is more commonly known as West Lake. Yeo was the original name, but by usage it has become known as West Lake.

The western side of the property is a magnificent five-mile white sand beach and behind this lies a chain of dunes some of which are 90 feet high.

I might say that on the West Lake side, or the Yeo Lake side, there probably would be another five miles of sand beach available which could be developed when needed. The sand comes right to the water's edge and probably extends beneath the surface of the water. A really huge development awaits us there in the future.

Less than 100 years ago the sand banks were covered with trees, a mixed forest of hardwoods and cedar. A small settlement had grown up along the south end of the peninsula which included a brick factory and a hotel. The settlers cut the trees which grew nearby and in so doing let loose an enemy that would drive them out. The thin top soil was blown away and then the wind began to move the dunes at a frightening speed up to 40 feet per year. The sand moved against the settlement and finally swallowed it. Somewhere

beneath the present dunes lie houses, a road, a hotel and a factory.

Farmers started to plant trees in the early 1900's in an effort to halt the sands. In 1921 the Sandbanks Forestry Station was established and snow fences were erected and millions of poplar, Scotch pine and other species were planted. None of these prevailed against the sand and the dunes continued to march eastward. Sporadic plantings and other methods were tried during the period up to 1957.

In that year an all-out effort was made and using snow fences, mulching with straw and brush, and planting Carolina poplar, Scotch pine, and black locust, a large enough area was covered to finally halt the sand. Further successful plantings were made in 1958 and 1959. In the period from 1960 to the present most of the moving sand areas have been successfully planted.

It is planned to construct a bridge at Wellington to join the mainland to the northern tip of the Sandbanks. From there a paved road will meander through the dunes and at suitable intervals lookouts and parking lots will be provided.

Any part of the road will be within walking distance of the long white beach. Camp grounds are planned for the southern end among the plantations which were established there. The Sandbanks will be 120 miles by road from downtown Metro and should be able to comfortably accommodate 30,000 bathers at a time.

It will be a fine companion park to nearby Outlet Beach which handled 300,000 visitors and 17,000 campers in 1963 and popular Presqu'île Park, 35 miles west, which accommodated 287,000 visitors and 30,000 campers last summer. The Sandbanks is the finest public beach on the Canadian shores of Lake Ontario and should prove to be a very popular playground for seekers of sand, sun and water.

I know that most local people will welcome this announcement.

I am aware that efforts are presently being made to make an agreement with the federal government in regard to the bridge that will be necessary as an approach to the sand dunes from the northern end at Wellington. Although direct access will presently be available from the southern end, it will add much if this bridge can be constructed and I do hope that the two governments will be able to arrive at a satisfactory agreement.

I would also hope that the federal government would give consideration at the same time to improving the harbour facilities at Wellington, perhaps constructing docks and a harbour for small boats because I feel that West Lake in itself—I have travelled around it in a boat and viewed these sand dunes—is something exceptional. As the hon. Minister has said, the dunes sometimes reach 90 feet in height and no one would imagine there was anything of that kind in Canada. I think you might almost imagine it was the Sahara Desert when you view these huge mounds of sand from the water. I think this would all be a terrific asset, not only to our local people but to the people of the province as a whole and that it will, being unique as it is, serve the people well for many years to come.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Minister a question I have asked for, I believe this is the ninth time. Not this hon. Minister, but other Ministers, each and every year I have asked, has he any report as to the possibility of a provincial park in the Bruce peninsula?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It would be a little premature but I will let the hon. member in on a secret. We are about to recommend about a 20,000-acre area in there for further development as a possible park if the more senior branches of authority will go for it.

Mr. Whicher: Who is the senior branch? Is it the hon. Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, the parks integration board—it has to go there and has to go to a few other places. Therefore it is only because I like you so well that I am telling you all this.

Mr. Whicher: If I can get a park I am quite willing to like you, too. This has been going on for so many years and there have been accusations made as many of the hon. members know. I hasten to say that I do not believe this to be true—that because I happen to be the member for that area, it has held up the possibility of a provincial park in the Bruce peninsula. I am the first one to admit—and I have on many occasions given the department credit for its parks policy in the province of Ontario—that it has done a remarkable job. I think that there are many wonderful parks scattered all over the province, but I would be certainly negligent in not pointing out once more that one of the nicest places—I do not want to get into any argument with any of the hon. members—but one of the nicest tourist localities in the

province of Ontario is in the Bruce peninsula.

When articles and editorials are written in the paper saying that because of me this park is being held up, to say the least, it hurts my feelings somewhat. I do not know if it hurts me politically or not, but I would really like most sincerely to ask the hon. Minister—and I know that the hon. Prime Minister is interested in this area because he used to summer up there as a boy and we are certainly glad to have him up there again.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister of Highways should go up.

Mr. Whicher: If the hon. Minister of Highways will bring him up we will bump over the roads together.

I am going to read this editorial—it will only take a minute, Mr. Chairman—to show you the feeling that is in the area that because I happen to be a Liberal member there is no park in this, one of the finest places in Ontario. Once more, before I read it, I hasten to say that I do not believe it, but I am going to read it to show the hon. Minister that it is one of the finest places, and the feeling not only locally, but in the area surrounding Bruce county, is that they feel I am holding this thing up. So if you can help me once again, Mr. Minister, I will certainly like you for all time to come.

The article was written in the *Owen Sound Times* on September 30, 1963, only five days after a great date in this province, and it is headed:

QUEEN'S PARK NEGLECTS BRUCE PENINSULA

For some time now it has appeared that the provincial government has neglected the Bruce peninsula, largely because its sitting member has been a member of the Opposition. Perhaps the fact that Ross Whicher at times has been an outspoken critic of the Progressive-Conservative government has made those who control such matters reluctant to give more than token aid to what is one of the province's finest summer resort areas. It has been said that at least one of those who must pass on such matters has established himself as a watchdog lest Mr. Whicher should receive credit for provincial expenditures in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I hasten to say I do not want any credit, all I would like is a park. To quote again:

Whether or not there is any truth to such claims, Queen's Park has been noticeably deaf to frequent urgings that the government should purchase land still

remaining available along the Lake Huron and Georgian Bay shorelines, that it may be safeguarded for public use in future generations. Early last spring, Lands and Forests Minister Kelso Roberts addressing the Sauble conservation authority's annual meeting very definitely promised that his department would take such action. To date that promise has not been kept.

The Bruce peninsula, with its long shoreline, its many lakes and its large acreage of forest lands, offers an ideal summer playground not only for the people of this district but for people of the thickly populated areas to the south. Within a two-hour-or-so drive from Metropolitan Toronto, Windsor and other similarly crowded areas it provides an ideal family-type holiday playground. There are already large cottage, cabin, hotel and motel establishments.

Private enterprise has done a thorough job and so far has not commercialized the area to too great an extent. But to date there has been comparatively little public land safeguarded for future years. Increasingly long shoreline areas are being purchased for strictly private purposes. While Bruce North, and now Grey North, is represented by a Liberal, the Progressive-Conservative government will do well to remember that the Bruce peninsula development will benefit those of all political persuasions or none, should it be their purpose to continue to neglect this area.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing is that they have been considering it for nine years and while I have the patience of Job with this government, I might as well have it because I am not getting up to date very fast, either in roads or in parks.

I have flown over the area with the former Minister of Lands and Forests. We went up to Tobermory and had a fine time and he said, "My, that would be a nice park down there; my that would be another one over there," but we never got the park. Seeing that we now have 85 in the province of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, I appeal directly to the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, and I hope that the hon. Prime Minister will lend a kindly ear, too, that this area be not neglected any longer insofar as parks are concerned.

An hon. member: How are you doing with the nuclear power plant?

Mr. Whicher: We are doing very well with the nuclear plant.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say to my hon. friend that I have a memorandum here, of four or five pages on that grand county he is talking about and we have got all sorts of ideas. Really we are going to do our best.

Mr. Whicher: We have not got—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that I personally would do nothing to block any effort of this type that might be recommended to me. I recall my first trip to the Bruce Peninsula as a relatively small boy. I was 14 years old. We had different regulations in those days. Perhaps I should not go into such detail, but I was equipped with a .22 rifle and a fishing rod and \$10 worth of food. I was able to stay up there in a tent with a couple of people my own size and age for about three weeks. Now, can you still do this sort of thing in the Bruce peninsula? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. Whicher: I think so. If you come it will not cost you anything.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I spent several very pleasant weeks over a period of years doing this sort of thing in the Bruce peninsula. I doubt that the fish are quite as plentiful now—

Mr. MacDonald: But what about the parks?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well now, I am only setting up the point here. I personally am not going to look with disfavour upon any proposition such as the hon. member suggests and I just want to give my hon. friend this assurance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: I am not going to spoil it. I will certainly take that as read.

Mr. Chairman, I have one other question to ask the hon. Minister. Would this be the vote where I ask about the grant that you give for municipal parks? I am thinking about the Cape Croker Indian reservation that the hon. Minister is aware of. Is this where I would ask about that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think that is under the conservation authority. That has gone with conservation authority work to the other department.

Mr. Troy: Has the Act been amended to that effect?

Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I would like to get information. Under what vote would I ask a question with regard to your department's sign painting?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Under basic organization—field trips.

Mr. Troy: I could get that under basic organization—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Vote 1110.

Mr. Troy: Thank you.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister just one question? When you said that he had gone to the conservation authority, which I know would be correct, would he be the hon. Minister to whom I should ask about the purchase of the land on Cape Croker reservation?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is one of those parks that comes under the conservation authority projects.

Vote 1105 agreed to.

Vote 1106 agreed to.

On vote 1107:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments. The hon. Minister, I know, would feel neglected if I did not make some comments on timber management.

The hon. Minister really came out fighting this afternoon. I must say that from my observation of the hon. gentleman, he fights most vigorously when his case is weakest. I was not surprised that he came out fighting this afternoon and that he devoted most of his time in defending the timber management policy and the reforestation and the number of trees that had been grown and things of that nature. I listened to him rather carefully, as usual, because I find him interesting, entertaining and provocative.

He stated, for example, that we can expect nature to do the regeneration job to the extent of 65 per cent. A lot of other people disagree with this, but I am going to accept the hon. Minister's comment this afternoon that you can expect nature to do 65 per cent of the regeneration. That means that you must consider artificial regeneration for 35 per cent. Last year's cut was 460,000 acres. Thirty-five per cent of that is 161,000. If you had to have full reforestation, it is at least 1,000 trees per acre and 161,000 acres means 161,000,000 trees.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Wait a minute. There are a lot of other methods of reforestation of a nature beyond just the natural—

Mr. MacDonald: I am aware of that.

Hon. Mr. Roberts:—scarification and all these other things. There are a lot of other elements besides the actual putting in of trees.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, but I would like this hon. Minister, sir, or some other Minister sometime, to explain what he means, "other than scarification," which is perhaps one of the means of achieving this. I just want to say without going into great length—because I have dealt with this in years gone by—that this government is not meeting its obligations, notwithstanding the hon. Minister's vigorous defence.

For example, I was interested in noting that the number of trees that are produced this year—at least last year—as recorded in the little book that you have given us, is 43 million. My colleague, the hon. member for Fort William put a question on the order paper a little earlier this year. He got a reply to the effect that the number of trees planted on Crown lands in the year 1963-64 was only 30 million. Then he asked the question—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Forty-three million.

Mr. MacDonald: Forty-three million, I agree, is the total. The number of trees that were planted by private corporations; grown on their nurseries and planted on licensed premises, Mr. Chairman, amounted to 2,204,000, just a shade over two million.

He asked the question as to how many trees six of the major companies had produced. You will find the reply in *Hansard*. On April 29, for anyone who wants to check on it. It makes very interesting reading: Spruce Falls, 1,022,000; Great Lakes, nil; Marathon, nil; Ontario and Minnesota, nil; Abitibi, nil; Kimberly-Clark, 1,182,000. So that of the six large companies, two of them are doing something. The other four are growing and planting nil on licensed land.

For the hon. Minister to get up and give the vigorous defence he can, in face of that record, I think is just a shocking attempt to cover up the facts. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I went back into the record a few months ago for another purpose and found it rather useful to recall what one of the hon. Minister's predecessors had to say. Back in the year 1956—to be found in *Hansard* at 1261-62 of that year—the then Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Mapledoram, made this comment in reference to an appropriation of \$705,000. He said:

This will allow us to prepare for a planning programme of 100 million trees annually, which will conform to the size

of the task in hand, and to carry out silviculture treatment of 28,000 to 30,000 acres.

In other words, years ago when we started these discussions—certainly I have been raising it every year with the Minister—we got an admission that 100 million trees a year were necessary for the task at hand. Here we have this year a total of 43 million trees with only 30 million going on Crown land. The figure for last year was 43 million. The figure for the year before was 49 million; the year before that it was 41 million; the year before that it was 33 million; and the year before that it was 25 million.

So, in six or seven years we have crept up into the 40's and we have stalled there. The hon. Minister suggests that we are doing a good job. I suggest that it is nonsense to argue that you are doing a good job. I suggest that it is nonsense to argue that you are doing a good job in the face of these figures.

However, let me get around to the timber management programme, in which the hon. Minister is now in the process of educating himself by reviewing them all. He brought them out for our visual inspection this afternoon.

On page 1061-62 of *Hansard* of the year 1958, the then Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Mapledoram, again had this to say. I invite the hon. Minister to listen to this rather carefully and note the year, 1958:

Now I can say to the hon. members that this year we have the plan—

he has been working to a plan for a long time. This year he had the plan:

—but I do think we now have the basic plan and we are now in the process of getting ready to sign yearly agreements on what shall, or shall not be, done in a specific area. So we have agreed on the principle of one-year contracts and the companies have agreed to go along with us.

That was 1958. Now I tell you, Mr. Chairman, how fast this government moves. This principle and this programme that they agreed on in 1958 took exactly four years to implement. In the year 1962, the hon. Minister's predecessor came into the House and announced that they had implemented a basic switch in policy. Ever since 1953, when there had been amendments to The Crown Timber Act, and when this government had absolved the companies of all responsibility for regeneration on land cut over up until that point, and assumed it as

a responsibility for the Crown; from 1953 on there was a responsibility on the company to present its annual cut programme and to present its programme for regeneration.

By 1962 the government had conceded that this was not operating. In fact, we have proof here in figures from the companies that most of them just are not doing anything by way of producing trees for actual reforestation. So, in 1962, the government confessed that in still another chapter they had basically failed. They changed their programme.

Their programme was that they were going to enter into a yearly contract with each company. There was at least this element of logic in it, that the difference in climatic conditions and soil conditions results in a different programme needed for each area. You cannot have a standard that applies all across the board. So, in theory, if the government were moving vigorously, and if you had an annual contract with each company, this might be the logical and the correct way to approach it.

But last year, which was one year after the government had put the new programme into effect, I went through a very tortuous series of questions with the present hon. Minister as to exactly what had happened in that intervening year after the new programme. I believe I have it clarified in rough terms. I want to put the question to the hon. Minister to bring it up to date. There were something like 200 licence limits of at least 50 square miles. If a licence limit is below 50 square miles, apparently this new one-year contract does not apply. Indeed I want to ask the hon. Minister, as my first question, what is the commitment to regeneration if the licensed limit is less than 50 square miles?

However, let me move forward. For the ones that were over 50 square miles, of which there were 200 of them in the province, in the first year of the new programme they had signed precisely 41 agreements. So that 159 of the 200 in that category simply had signed no contracts at all in the first year and we were still drifting. I have two questions to put to the hon. Minister to try to bring this picture up to date. What is the regeneration commitment on the small limits of less than 50 square miles? Second, on the larger limits of over 50 square miles, with how many has he now got a yearly contract?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The answer, with regard to regeneration of the 50 square mile or less, is that is done by the government itself. There is no obligation on the person who

cuts in that smaller area, directly, in that connection, to regenerate.

With regard to the larger picture, which is the important picture, we have been working since the 1962 legislation, which now permits the Minister to enter into agreements with licensees for the purpose of carrying out regeneration work. On January 29, sir, the Treasury board approved such an agreement with one of the larger pulp and paper companies which is now really the basis, or the precedent, from which we will work. This particular agreement provides for cost sharing by the federal government and the company involved, each putting up \$15 per thousand trees and the province being responsible for \$25 per thousand trees, making a total of \$55 per thousand.

Arrangements with respect to spraying in these areas is provided on the same kind of sharing; the company, the federal government and the province in this case will pay \$2 each, on a \$6 per acre basis. This is, we believe, now a precedent, or a pattern of agreement, which will develop quite rapidly.

We have some 22 of these agreements at the present time—no, I am sorry—two of these agreements at the present time, of these larger ones.

Mr. MacDonald: How many licence holders are there with over 50 square miles?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: How many?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. We guessed at a figure of 200 last year. I think it is time we got it accurate.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We have a total of some 51 agreements, applicable to some 6,000 trees. I think that is the overall figure for which my hon. friend is asking.

But the point I want to make, to again reply to what I think my hon. friend—and he may be doing this quite honestly, I am not doubting his honesty, but I think he is moving from a wrong basis.

I have tried to get before this House the fact that we have adequate resources at the present time; far more resources on the hoof, so to speak, in the bush, than there is any demand or any economic market for at the present time. We believe that the system we are using, which gradually will bring us up to 100 per cent completion for what is cut out over a period of some years yet ahead, is far more sensible from an economical standpoint than to try to be there years ahead of time, when already there are all sorts of re-

serves that are not being cut today that one could go to if one wanted to. Now surely, if it is going to cost \$55 a thousand to get this thing done for the future, you do not want to do a whole lot, thousands of those, long before they are needed.

Now that is, in actual practice, the theory to which we are working. We differ very materially in our basis of understanding between the hon. member's view and my view, and I stand by my view.

Mr. MacDonald: May I just make a brief comment, and I do not want to get into a vigorous battle with the hon. Minister—I shall complete my remarks between now and six o'clock.

The hon. Minister is ignoring the case advanced by foresters—and there is a good group of them who are interested in this whole field, who are responsible for the kind of programme that my hon. colleague has put on the record twice already. The basis of their case is that the economic area for cutting close to the mills, accessible to the lake-head area, for example, is increasingly cut off. The cutting is being driven farther back into the hinterland. Now, it is all very well for the hon. Minister to talk about accessible areas, or areas that can be cut and limits that are available and so on, but increasingly they are not the accessible areas.

I understand the different approach that the hon. Minister is putting forward, but I submit to the hon. Minister that his reply is a political reply. The foresters in the field—I am almost tempted to say apart from those in the head office here who have to live with the politicians on this issue—do not agree; and they are disagreeing more and more. However, this is an old theme and I shall leave it there, but I will be back to it next year.

I have one final question to put to the hon. Minister. If the objective was 100 million trees a year, spelled out by his predecessor in 1958 and therefore, I presume, reflecting the thinking of the department, will the hon. Minister explain to me—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Not in 1958.

Mr. MacDonald: It was 1958, yes. The objective that was spelled out by the hon. Minister in 1958 was 100 million trees.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That was before my time and I was Minister in 1958. That was 1956 and the hon. member referred to Mr. Mapledoram.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is right. I am sorry, he is right. It was 1956. All right!

The objective—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Do not blame those who were not responsible for that.

Mr. MacDonald: My question to the hon. Minister is this: If this is the objective, how does he explain to me the fact that there has not been a new forestry station established for the development of seedlings since the year 1958?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Does the hon. member mean a nursery?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: For one thing, the capacity of the nurseries has been increased, and

there is a very excellent seeding plant up here at Angus which is being opened this summer. I would like my hon. friend to come up and see how they operate up there. That is the seedling plant, not a seedling plant, a seed extraction plant.

Again I come back, and I see it is six o'clock but I am not going to recede one bit, I say that we are doing this business, we are meeting all requirements and we are looking ahead for the normal length of trees. We are going to be able to supply 100 per cent of the needs of this province for the foreseeable future; and that is a sound policy.

Mr. Chairman: It is now 6 of the clock. I will leave the chair and we will resume the debate at 8 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 6, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts, concluded 2905

Resolution re supply to defray expenses of government departments, concurred in 2925

Notice of motion No. 1, Mr. Taylor 2930

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to 2934

Notice of motion No. 2, Mr. Farquhar 2934

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Root, agreed to 2938

On notice of motion No. 9, Mr. Sargent 2938

Notice of motion No. 10, Mr. Spence 2941

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to 2945

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2945

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1964

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(continued)

On vote 1107:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), there are certain things I am concerned with in regard to the timber branch.

I know in my area—and I think it is the same thing in many other sections of northern Ontario—some of the lumber operators, particularly the people who operate sawmills, have been in operation for many years. In fact, I know in my own riding of Nipissing there is a firm that came up there in the early days; they lumbered and cut timber in the district of Parry Sound and then moved northward into Nipissing. It has been a family operation all their lives.

The great problem for them, and other small operators, is to get the timber. I know last fall a block of timber was opened in one of the townships in Nipissing—I believe it was Law township—and it was a pretty good stand of hardwood veneer timber.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister just what was the price paid, and who was the successful tenderer. I believe it was Hay and Company. I would like him to confirm that, and also what price they paid. I understand too there was quite a delay before the successful tenderer was announced. I wondered whether there were any new conditions brought up that caused the delay.

I would like to get first of all, before I continue, just what was the tender price of this company—I think it is Hay and Company in Law township. I do not know just what the number of the contract was.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): It will take a few minutes to get that.

Mr. Troy: There was some report to me that they paid about \$40, and I presume it

will cost them about \$45 more to get the timber out; and then their selling price will be probably about \$195, so they make a pretty fair profit. The thing is that these people who go in for the veneer logs are concerned with just the very best of material; then the small operator goes into such an area and much of what is left is just the rag tags, much of his material then is maybe No. 3, the type of lumber on which he does not make very much of a profit.

One thing we must consider too is that these small operators are in certain sections of the province, in the lumber areas, day in and day out. They employ a small number of men the year round and they add to their work force in the wintertime and in the summertime, too. They are an asset to our communities in northern Ontario. I understand at one time there were, I believe in this report of Major General Kennedy of 1947, certain recommendations about these lumber people in order that they might continue in operation. I am not referring to the great big operators the hon. Minister mentioned in his reply to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) when he said that only two of them were doing any reforesting themselves. I mean these small people who have been in business for many years; the only way they can stay in business is to have an assurance of getting material to cut.

There are a great number of these jobbers who get licences each year; sometimes I think they use special inducements on occasion to get the licences. They have not any mills themselves, they just get out the good stuff and that is all there is to it.

Again, the problem is in the operation of these small lumber operators. I know one firm that all they can do with the slabs is throw them into the swamp. They could, however, carry out an operation and make use of these slabs, of all this material, if they had a chipper. Of course that is a fairly expensive piece of equipment, and it is not logical that they should spend the money for equipment unless they are assured of a continuing supply of timber.

As I say again, these large operators go in for the most expensive veneer, that is all they

are interested in, and these small people have to go in and get the poor stuff.

I know it was mentioned by the hon. Minister earlier today that the Whitman people up on Highway 63 have a very expensive mill. It is a very fine operation. It is all automatic. There are only two men in the mill proper, the sawer and then the fellow who is on the edger. But it is the type of mill that requires practically a 24-hour day operation.

It is fairly expensive to erect and I believe he has to go away up to Lorrain township to get his timber. It is about 30 miles, 30 to 35, from his mill to the junction of Highway 63 and Highway 11. He goes up into Timiskaming, up into Lorrain township, maybe more than 100 miles. So he is transporting his logs to the mill for 150 miles or so.

Another thing that disturbs me is that a number of these big companies have rights to certain areas and the lumber operator, not only does he have to pay stumpage to the department, but he also pays a royalty to the people who have the licences there. I believe Consolidated is one of the outfits which have certain areas in Nipissing. They charge a royalty, I believe, of practically the same amount as paid by the lumbermen to the government. So it is sort of an absentee landlord type of thing. On the other hand, in Nipissing, where the Abitibi have large areas under their control, they do not cut themselves, there are always third party agreements. People get licences or a third party agreement with the Abitibi, but they have to pay a royalty I think of only about \$2.50 or \$3. But to this other firm, the Consolidated, I think the man who is operating there has to pay \$11 or \$12. Certainly something should be done about that by the department. There should be some assurance to these people who have been in business for years and years that they can have a yearly supply.

I notice in General Kennedy's report that consideration is taken of that. The trouble is, as I said at the very outset, that an outfit which is just interested in veneer logs goes in and gets the really good stuff and the small operator has to go and clean it up. A lot of it is poor material, at the best third grade. All the high grade is gone. It is highgrade in another way too.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Carried!

Mr. Troy: No, no, the vote is not carried. There might be a little bit of callousness here, but I am concerned with small people and small firms in my area.

If I refer to my area, the same thing has happened in all the other areas across this province where there are lumber mills. I want to see that these people who have a stake in this country and a stake in our communities have an opportunity to continue in business.

I do not know what happened to the Abitibi people or how they got so much land. I believe that was in another era and they control all kinds of rights.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Troy: Well, as I say, I do not know, I am not responsible and I am not my brother's keeper in this regard, but I still want to feel that the lumbermen as well as the big pulp men will be able to continue in business.

As the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Spooner) knows, we have an operation down in Mattawa of the Weyerhaeuser people. They need timber. I understand that it was through the good offices of the former Minister of Lands and Forests that they were able to get the timber, and they need a continuing supply.

Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, I have not said all I have to say about timber.

An hon. member: Carried!

Mr. Troy: No, there are other people that have comments. This is too important an item to just be brushed off with a simple "carried."

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I have for the hon. member for Nipissing information that the Hay and Company licence is D2329 and covers 11.8 square miles in Law township. This was the successful tender. The rates: spruce, \$10 per 1,000 board measure; yellow birch, \$40 per 1,000 board measure; white birch, \$15 per 1,000, and maple, \$20. The pulpwood part of it: spruce, \$3.50 per cord; balsam, \$2 per cord; and white birch, \$1.50 per cord.

Mr. Troy: The only thing Hay and Company was interested in, I understood, was the \$40 stuff, the really good, choice stuff. Then somebody goes out and cleans up and it just happens that much of the material is, as the hon. Minister said, \$1.50. There must be, as I say again, in the department, a policy so that these small lumber people who are operating—not just jobbers, but people who have been in business for years and years—still have their plants. They want to continue and they want to take advantage of all the

materials of the log, including the slab. In order to get some profit out of that they have to have equipment, like a chipper, and that costs money. So they cannot commit themselves to outlays, such as for a chipper, unless they are assured that there will be a continuing supply to them.

Then again they want consideration on this system of royalties to big operators who have a lot of timber and who do not cut it themselves, but allow other people to do so under a third party agreement. The latter have to pay practically as much to these lumber people as they do to the government.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would like to say this. Third party agreements are under the supervision of the department and the rates that are fixed there are rates that we have to look into. If they are excessive we cut them down. That is the practice that we go on.

This is a competitive area. Some of these older areas where there were a lot of sawmills originally—probably more than there should have been—were one of the reasons that we put this Act through this year. It was to keep a closer control over the number of mills in an area in relation to the amount of timber that is there. We cannot make the timber in those areas, but as I said earlier, there is ample timber if the people want it. They can go to the areas where it can be obtained, and I am speaking of areas within the economic perimeter.

I think in the North Bay area, close in, perhaps they are at the point of saturation, as they might be in some parts of the Port Arthur area. Over a period of time they will come back in again, but the areas farther afield should also be cut if there is a certain demand. The market is limited and we do not just want our timber going to rot because people cannot get it close in. They have to sharpen their pencils and sharpen their wits and operate in the most modern way and at the best pricing possible and help to make the more remote areas economic in this competitive field.

Mr. Troy: Another question, Mr. Chairman. There is an operator who has a mill in my riding but his home is in the riding of the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. A. Johnston). I understand he made arrangements with The Department of Lands and Forests timber branch people to get a certain block. Then when it was checked out with the district office it was found out that there is a road in there, which one of the year-by-year operators had built several years ago. The question was, would they give the

applicant the permit and let him use the road that someone else built?

It is on Crown land. Does an operator who goes in and puts a road in for an operation, control it in perpetuity? Can someone else not go in and use that road?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Can the hon. member identify the area about which he was speaking?

Mr. Troy: The person who wanted the timber was a Mr. Larochelle. The hon. member for Parry Sound was discussing it with me and usually his problems are of kindred concern to his constituents as well as mine. Mr. Larochelle of Callander, has a mill at Mud Lake. If the road into that block of timber that is left was put in by a jobber two or three years ago, does he still have a right to hold the timber just because he put a road in?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: As a matter of fact, if the cut is finished and the party's licence is out and he has left the area, he has no claim to the road. On the other hand, if he is continuing his cut and has put the road in at his own expense, he would have—

Mr. Troy: That is reasonable and that is what I hope. So that the man will—

Some hon. members: Carried.

Mr. Troy: No, no. There is more.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Mines.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, I rise in this debate to congratulate the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. I have noticed what a much different man he is since he took over Lands and Forests, he really has a great sense of humour.

I was up in the district of Mr. Chairman a little while ago—the Fort Frances district—and he was telling a meeting there that any time you caught a fish in Rainy Lake that was less than 24 inches between the eyes, you threw it back in. The Minnesota governor from Minneapolis was there and he said, "You know, I hear you have a Department of Economics and Development." He said, "They go a long way in what they attract to Canada and how they label the Canadian goods." He said, "I was fishing in Lake Superior not so long ago and caught a six-pound trout and I noticed a little metal tag on its fin. I looked at it very closely and it said, 'Made in Ontario.'"

Those are stories that they tell up in that area, and I want to compliment the hon. Minister on his sense of humour.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister said that in speaking about fish and wildlife a couple of hours ago.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I know, but I am speaking on vote 1107. I will come to that and tell the hon. member something about timber.

I want to congratulate the hon. Minister on the fine job he is doing and I also want to say a word about the staff of The Department of Lands and Forests. My association in running sawmills and taking out ties goes back over many years, as these gentlemen know. I know the deputy Minister, who has been a very faithful servant of this department for more years than I can remember, is a man that any government would be proud to have as a servant. I can look around me here at a group of men that I worked with for many years. When I hear criticism levelled at them, and the way they have run the timber industry in this province, I know it certainly stems from insufficient knowledge on the part of those who make the charges.

I think that I am entitled to speak on timber because in my area there are some ten pulp and paper mills. If any hon. member can match that I would like to see where he is. Six of those mills are right in my own constituency. They are big mills, employing hundreds and hundreds of men—thousands, I would say, when you consider that both in the bush and the mill they turn out about \$225 million of wooden gold every year for this province.

I will go on to say, certainly they make mistakes. We all do. But these are mistakes that are corrected. They are made because they are striving at all times to better the pulp and paper and the sawmilling industries in this province. I heard the hon. member for Nipissing speak about chippers. Right in my own city the Northern Wood Preservers have enormous chippers. There is not one thing wasted in that log, not even the bark. It is used for making liquor for the pulp mills for certain glues they use.

My friend, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman), mentioned reforestation, and I agree with him on many matters. The hon. Minister agrees as well. We know that reforestation is necessary, and great strides have been made in that field. When the hon. member for York South got up and talked about 43 million trees being planted by the government he forgot to take in the

many trees that the companies plant themselves—and the Boy Scout camps and other organizations that plant trees. He does not know anything about that. How could he know when he sits in Toronto 95 per cent of his time. He reads criticism in the papers, in books and so on, and takes it for granted. If he would go out and get some practical knowledge we would probably listen to him a lot more.

Mr. Bryden: He got an answer from the department on that point.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Just for a minute, Mr. Chairman, speaking of timber, I would like to take the minds of some of the Opposition back to when I first started in the sawmilling business in Port Arthur. That was in the 1930s. I was an alderman in the city of Port Arthur.

We had at that time to give tax concessions to the Abitibi mill in our city and the Provincial Paper Mill in order to get a very few manhours per day for our men. These were tax concessions from the city to keep those mills running part time. The Liberals, my hon. friends, were in power in Ontario until 1943, when Premier Drew came in. He established the policy of no more export of raw pulpwood. Do you remember that? That is something that my party can be proud of.

It is the reason why there are ten pulp and paper mills working in my district when there was only one, which was not running, at the time the 1943 election was held. That policy has proved one of the greatest things that this government ever did in this province for the development of this great pulpwood industry which is pouring, as I say, \$225 million into our area.

We talk about the sawmilling business, about Northern Wood Preservers, Seaman's big mill at Hudson and in Port Arthur; the hon. member for Kenora's (Mr. Gibson's) riding where there are fine sawmills; and down in Fort Frances there is a pulp mill and so on. Why? Because timber is supplied to all these mills so they can turn out wood products. It is the reason why The Department of Lands and Forests of Ontario should be given full credit and its men given full credit for doing a marvellous job in every facet of that industry.

When I hear criticism about petty things, petty little things that do not mean anything, it is simply clouding the issue, which is really a very fine picture of development. They make mistakes. We all do. But certainly the benefits they bring to this province far outweigh any mistakes that they may make.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Just do not say anything about my park.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No. Well, there is one thing the hon. member must remember. When you get a promise from a Minister on this side of the House, you can bank on it being fulfilled.

There is, Mr. Chairman, at the present time, the greatest upsurge in the pulp and paper business and in sawmilling in this province that this province has ever seen. I know that is so. A tremendous upsurge. And I think The Department of Lands and Forests, and its staff, are largely responsible. I want to thank them for the help they have always extended to me in my work in this province. All I wish to say to them is keep up the good work because this government is always behind the ladies and gentlemen in that department.

There are two or three things I would like to mention to the hon. members, two or three things that the hon. member for York South chastised me for saying in this House. There is the \$31 million addition to the new mill being built in Fort William plus a \$31 million addition to the Great Lakes Paper Company. The hon. member for Fort William knows all about it. It is a marvellous addition to this industry, a large addition costing millions is being built to the Provincial Paper mill in my own city.

Also Marathon Paper has a large addition there and a new sawmill; and Seaman's sawmill at the Lakehead, on the lakeshore in Port Arthur, a \$14.5 million expansion of the plant of Domtar Ltd. Newprint at Red Rock, just a little east of my city; a \$550,000 sawmill and chipping plant for Jim Mathieu Lumber Company at Sapawe, just a little west of me; a \$1.25 million process conversion programme at the Ontario Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company Limited at Kenora.

Many of these things the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) mentioned previously. We are now making vehicles up there for harvesting and hauling of trees, pressure-treated timber, jute and plastic bags, new grades of fine paper, and new types of paper bags. All these things have become reality due to the policy of The Department of Lands and Forests of this government.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for letting me make these few remarks. These are factual things which have already been accomplished. So, gentlemen, when you criticize over on that side of the House that the pulp and paper and timber business is going to pieces, just read your figures properly. Get some

knowledge and you will not get up on your feet and say the things you do.

Mr. Troy: Well, as somebody has said the hon. Minister of Mines is the anchor man on this team.

An hon. member: Do not be too hard on him.

Mr. Troy: Sir, I would like to ask the hon. Minister: In the report of General Kennedy, he had recommended that there must be at least six million acres in southern Ontario that should be reforested because it is not suitable for other purposes. I can remember, as I mentioned before in this House years and years ago, hearing the dean of forestry at the University of Toronto say that there are vast acres, many square miles of land, particularly in the Muskoka, Parry Sound and Nipissing area that should be taken out of agricultural production and reforested.

As I have also mentioned, I have seen the forests in Europe. They are regular parks and they have been harvesting timber there for centuries, even away back to the Roman days. Still their yield per acre is much ahead of ours. I just wonder what was done in regard to reforestation of areas in many sections of southern Ontario and sections of northern Ontario that should not be agricultural lands at all but should be reforested.

The problem now is that the department of conservation, which had a happy place in The Department of Lands and Forests, is taken over by some department altogether. It got off the rails in a certain department and then it was put into Lands and Forests, which I think is its natural habitat, but now it is in Energy and Resources Management. Conservation has many relations with your department, but I presume the charge was not your responsibility. It comes under the department or the conservation authority.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): This is the timber vote!

Mr. Troy: I do not know what you are talking about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Is the hon. Minister going to comment on what the hon. member has said?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would merely make this comment, and this is repetitious to some extent, as I said it in another context earlier. If the timber resources of Ontario were in the centre of Europe, we should have every stick of the whole 2.7 million cubic feet of it

used up; we should have no problem at all. But we are over here on another hemisphere with much freer breathing space and I would rather be here looking for markets than over there in the centre of Europe with all this timber.

So far as the plant of trees on private lands is concerned, if the hon. member will take a look at page 148 of this 1964 pamphlet, which was distributed yesterday, he will see the disposition of nursery stock. He will see that a very large amount of it is going into forests managed by the department in southern Ontario for the most part. He will see that a lot of trees are planted on private lands—9.5 million or so in the last year, recorded there. This is going on all over the province.

Mr. Chairman, we are not neglecting one single section of the whole 22 districts in which we are operating.

Mr. Troy: I just asked a simple question. Do not get riled.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I hasten to rise, in case the last remark from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests might precipitate the hon. Minister of Mines into rising again. I understand on reliable authority that after the next election he is planning to run for president of the civil service association.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to refer once again, and when I use the term "once again" I am referring to a series of sessions, to the thorny question of licences or permits granted to settlers. This matter has been before the House on several occasions in the past year. Unfortunately it is necessary to raise it again because the explanation and answers given by the Ministers in past years were far from satisfactory.

The matter has a special urgency at this time, Mr. Chairman, because it is a part of a much larger problem which I referred to at some length under the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General. It is an integral part of the present condition of labour unrest that exists in the Kapuskasing area of northern Ontario, and has existed there for a year or two.

It is unfortunate that this present situation exists. The union that operates in this industry—the Lumber and Sawmills Workers Union—is a union with a long record of achievements to its credit. In fact, I believe that until the unfortunate occurrences of a year or so ago, it had not had a single strike since 1946, even though we all know it operates in

an industry in which problems of labour relations are of more than average difficulty. Because of negligence and mismanagement by this government and several of its departments, the situation was created in which a strike occurred a year and a half ago. We all know that in the course of that strike some most unfortunate occurrences took place, culminating in the death by shooting of three men.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have detailed what I consider to be the responsibility of The Attorney General's Department in this area. I will not deal with that phase, but there is another important phase and that is the matter of settlers' permits or licences. Fundamentally, the mishandling by The Department of Lands and Forests of this question over the years has been a major cause of discontent and tension in that area and we cannot—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: We will not restore the sort of harmony and good spirit that is essential to good labour relations until this issue is satisfactorily resolved. Last year the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests made a fairly lengthy statement of the policy of his department in this field. I would say that this statement—and I have read it again today—describes the situation as it exists in the mind of God sitting in head office in Toronto. It does not describe the situation that exists in the field, according to information that I have received.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I will in a few moments, Mr. Chairman, place before this House detailed information to indicate how the policy of the department, as declared by the hon. Minister, is not in fact carried out in the field. I would say to this House that what is happening and what has been happening for some time in relation to the issue of settlers' licences in the Kapuskasing area, has been to create a situation whereby the major pulp companies, acting through jobbers, can exploit settlers to undermine the bargaining position of their own employees. They apparently do it without any interference from The Department of Lands and Forests—if not with the blessing of that department.

The pulp companies are using the settlers to undermine the employees, and even worse, they have pitted settler against wage-earner to the point where—

Mr. Chairman Order! In my opinion, settlers' licences in relation to the cutting of pulp wood, and the timber operations of the pulp and paper mill in that area should be dealt with on that basis and not on any other basis. There are two separate identities.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you, though, that you cannot isolate the consequences of a policy from the policy itself.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): It is The Department of Labour.

Mr. Bryden: This has nothing to do with The Department of Labour. There are aspects of this problem that are clearly of great interest to The Department of Labour, but the policy relating to the issue of timber licences is strictly a policy of The Department of Lands and Forests, and The Department of Lands and Forests has to take the consequences of what I would describe as the maladministration of its policy.

Mr. Whicher: They are all against you.

Mr. Bryden: That is nothing new. Whenever they are against me, I know that I am on the right track.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate, as briefly as I can, the policy of the department as outlined by the hon. Minister, and then show what I think are its deficiencies. To avoid the possibility of misrepresenting him, I am going to quote some extracts from what he said to this House last year, on February 20. I will start by quoting a sentence from page 874 of the *Hansard* for that day:

In a limited number of sections of northern Ontario where the land has been settled relatively recently, as an aid to the annual income to be gained by a settler, The Department of Lands and Forests instituted into government policy a system for the cutting of wood on Crown lands by settlers.

He also indicated on page 876 that:

In the regulations as to eligibility it is pointed out that the widows are considered as a permanently incapable settler class and that particular class is entitled to come under this scheme to a certain extent.

So far, I do not think anybody could object to the policy. The department has attempted to aid settlers. The original purpose of the policy—let us put it this way—was to aid

settlers by licensing them to cut a limited amount of pulp wood in the off season so that they could supplement their income in the period when there was nothing else coming into their households. I think that the normal policy is to limit the amount that any one settler is licensed to cut to 100 cords.

Now, the hon. Minister also outlined another aspect of policy and—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Is that right or wrong? Is that good or bad that those widows get the contracts?

Mr. Bryden: I said that the purposes of the policy are unexceptionable. I have no objection to the purposes. It is the application that I object to, for reasons that I will indicate in a moment.

A second phase or further development of this policy is, I think, fairly outlined in the following extracts from the hon. Minister's statement of last year, which I will quote:

The department in its cutting licence rights to the pulp company would require that the latter buy from the settlers certain quantities of the timber.

In other words, it not only gave cutting rights to the settler but it also tried to arrange that there would be a market for his product. And in elaboration of this policy the hon. Minister explained somewhat more fully further down on page 875:

It will be seen therefore at once that the operation I have outlined is to see that these settlers have an opportunity of disposing of some pulp wood to the mills. Then someone familiar with the logging business, the hon. leader, referred to this—

the hon. gentleman referred to was Mr. Wintermeyer, the then leader of the Opposition:

—the hon. leader referred to this, but I think he had a wrong slant on it, and I would ask him to please pay attention to this because I believe this is the actual situation—someone familiar with the logging business—such as, for example, some small licensee operating in a township himself, or some settler or contractor—knowing the capacity of other settlers in the township area concerned, would ascertain in any given year the number of settlers in his area who had qualified for cutting 100 cords of wood from the Crown land in the Kapuskasing management area. He would then discuss the matter with the pulp company concerned—in this particular case the Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Company—and obtain from that company

the required number of cords—they used the card system—which would represent the willingness of the company to buy 100 cords as per each card from one of the settlers through the head of the group, on the understanding that The Department of Lands and Forests would indicate its approval on the cards.

This card would be presented to the department along with the attendance by the bona-fide licensees in person—the ones to be covered by the group of cards—and these licences would then be made out to the individual bona-fide licensee. Cards would be stamped with the approval of the government and the cards would be handed to the company. The licences would go to the bona-fide settlers. The group leader for his work and services would make an arrangement with the licensee for some charge.

We now see the element of company control. A settler cannot get a licence unless he has a card from the company. The company hands the cards out to certain agents who act as brokers. So the original policy now becomes a policy whereby a settler, we are told, may get a licence if he can get a card from a broker who, in turn, has got it from the company.

This has led to the exploitation of the settlers. These brokers have a control over the situation.

The net result is that the company pays much less to settlers than it would have to pay when it harvests its own timber through its own employees. I believe the figures are something like this: The cost to the company of harvesting its own timber with its own employees is about \$28 to \$30, whereas the settlers get somewhere around \$16, \$18, or \$20. These poor fellows are exploited. Their need is taken advantage of to undercut, as I said, the employees of the company and weaken their bargaining position.

However, the matter becomes more—shall I say the trap—becomes even tighter in view of the way in which the policy of issuing licences is administered. Now, sir, the hon. Minister in his statement last year outlined it in a way that one could not object to—and I would like to refer to what he said. But before I do that, I would like to quote a relevant section from The Crown Timber Act; section 16, subsection one provides:

A licence shall not be assigned, pledged or charged without the consent in writing of the Minister, and permission to cut timber on a licensed area shall not be granted by a licensee without the consent

in writing of the Minister, and he is not under any circumstances bound to give such consent and he may impose such terms and conditions as he deems proper.

Subsection two—an assignment, pledge or charge of the licence for permission to cut on a licensed area does not have any force or validity unless the Minister has consented thereto in writing.

That is the statutory provision, Mr. Chairman, and if it were observed it would guarantee that the original policy was actually carried out in accordance with its original intent. That was to give a certain supplement to bona-fide settlers.

The hon. Minister in his statement last year amplified what is contained in the statute. He explained it as follows:

In normal cases it would be expected that the settler licensee would do his own cutting and he might even do his own skidding. He might also do his own hauling, although it would not follow necessarily. In some cases he would not even do his skidding, and in some few cases for reasons that would have to be satisfactory in the long run to the government he might not cut all the allowable cut himself. Or he might arrange under exceptional circumstances, for someone else to do the cutting.

In the latter case he would probably make the type of deal that would enable him to make a small profit in the transaction. This, of course, would be the exception to the practice.

The licence issued by the department would not be assignable. If a settler for some good reason could not complete his cut—for example, if he had an accident—he could possibly get the department at the local level to issue a new licence to some bona-fide settler.

So the hon. Minister's own explanation of the statute and the policy of the department is that permits are issued to settlers and it is expected that the cutting will be done by the settlers themselves. Only in quite exceptional circumstances would there be any variation from that practice.

If this practice had been followed, as I say, I think the original intent would have been carried out. However, it is interesting to see what has happened. To some degree this is indicated in the hon. Minister's own statement. Continuing from where I left off reading, he said:

In the season 1962-63, that is from April 1, 1962, to date, licences—

and there is a parenthesis here:

—now I have got three different types of licences so I am giving these figures in groups—under the group system I have just mentioned were issued for a total of 27 groups, 440 licences. In addition to that, certain store co-operative groups received a total, in six groups, of 101 licences. I might say that these general store co-operative groups are made up of general stores along Highway 11 which helped to finance the settlers concerned and they themselves sometimes do some of the work such as hauling. It is a co-operative effort—

Mr. Chairman, I would like to interject here that the so-called co-operatives have nothing to do with co-operatives in the sense in which the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) would understand them. They are not co-operatives, they are the old company store deal. A man in a store gets a bunch of permits, which are supposed to be issued to settlers, but he in effect gets control over them. Then he has a bunch of men to cut the permits. The hon. Minister said a little later that in total, 706 licences for pulpwood and saw logs were issued in the period, and 652 of the licences were pulpwood licences. He also said:

I would also stress, in explaining this system, the fact that the department, through its inspectors, knows pretty well from time to time who is doing the cutting. If they have reason to believe that there is in any particular case a series of transactions not in keeping with the regulations and the purpose of these cutting permits, they restrict or cancel or refuse to renew the permits.

This is the idyllic situation painted by the hon. Minister in his statement last year. It was a prepared statement and I have no doubt he gave careful consideration to it and he intended it to represent the policy of the department.

So what are the facts, Mr. Chairman? I have here a list of 35 specific instances in the cutting year 1962-63, to which the hon. Minister was referring, where cutting was not done by the people to whom the permits were issued. Furthermore, some of these instances refer to more than one permit, so the number of permits involved is substantially more than 35; I have not counted them, but it is probably about 70. I also have in my hand a list of 180 instances in the 1962-63 season where licences were issued apparently in contravention of The Crown Timber Act, the regulations and the

hon. Minister's stated policy. Yet the hon. Minister says the department is right on top of this situation and would know if anything were wrong.

In reference to these two lists, Mr. Chairman, which I will deal with in greater detail in a moment, I would like to make it clear that the people who gathered the information incorporated into these lists had no special powers of inquiry. They were simply people living in the area who found out what they could from their knowledge of people in the area. Obviously they would not have discovered all cases of the type that I am referring to. Nevertheless they would discover some.

But they had no facilities for conducting an exhaustive inquiry and therefore the lists could not possibly be exhaustive. Therefore, I think we should consider these lists not only as important in themselves, but perhaps even more important, as indicative of a widespread situation which is quite out of accord with the idyllic picture painted by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Take, first of all, the first list that I referred to, the list of instances my informants were able to discover where cutting was not done by the licensee, notwithstanding the announced policy of the department.

Arthur Beauvais, permit No. 17299, was sold to Frank Gallant. Philippe Briere of Val Rita cut the permit as Mr. Beauvais was working as a blacksmith in Frank Gallant's camp. Mr. Beauvais sold his permit for \$150. Mr. Briere was paid \$7 a cord for cutting.

Rosaire and Michel Boily, permit Nos. 17758 and 17757, both were working at Camp 78, Spruce Falls, and Gilles Boily cut the permits.

Fernand Boisvert was employed at Spruce Falls mill. He got a permit as a settler and hired Roland Castonguay to cut it.

Yvon Brisson obtained a settler's permit and sold it to J. E. Tremblay. Mr. Brisson was working in the camps. A Mr. Gaston Brixhe cut the permit.

Mrs. Yvonne Morin sold her permit to Gagnon of Mattice—Permit No. 17512. Gagnon hired Gaston Brunet at \$8 per cord to cut same.

Jean Louis Cantin's Permit No. 17025, was sold to Ulysses Tremblay. Mr. Cantin was employed by Spruce Falls Woods. Lionel Gagnon at a rate of \$7 per cord cut the permit.

Gerard St. Pierre's and Marie-Rose Laflamme's permits were sold to Gagnon of Mattice.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, how the same names keep recurring as the purchasers of these permits. They sold the permits to Gagnon at Mattice; Alfred Carrier and Antonio Carrier were hired to cut the permits at \$8 per cord.

Mrs. Marguerita Bois' Permit No. 17225, was sold to Gagnon of Mattice and cut by Camille Carrier.

Bernard Gagnon's Permit No. 17051, was cut by Florian Carrier and Romeo Carrier at \$8 per cord.

Gerard Charlebois was employed by Val Cote Co-op, and his brother Cyrille and Andre Leduc cut his permit.

Emile Duclos was cutting settlers' permits for Charles d'Amours at \$7 per cord. He did not know whose permits he was cutting.

Edgar Landry was employed by Spruce Falls and obtained a permit. Edgar Duguay cut it at \$7 per cord.

Real Fortier and his father Gaston of Hallebourg cut at least four settlers' permits at \$7.25 per cord. They were hired by the Hallebourg Co-op.

These co-ops, as you will recall, Mr. Chairman, are not genuine co-ops at all; they consist of storekeepers who in effect traffic in these permits.

Mrs. Louis Philippe Latulippe's permit, No. 17479, was cut by Gaetan Garneau at \$7.50 per cord. Mr. Latulippe was contracting from other settlers.

Emile Leduc's permit, No. 17480, a crippled man on welfare—

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I wonder just on a point of information, are there quite a few names? If there is, could I suggest that it be tabled instead of reading if it is 120 names?

Mr. Bryden: No, this one is a short one, I am not going to read the other one.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, it seems that conditions here tonight are like the *matinée* on Saturday afternoon while the movie is on. I would like to hear what the hon. member for Woodbine has to say. I am close to him but I still have difficulty in hearing him because there is so much disturbance. Regardless of what we feel about the proceedings here, nevertheless we must remember it is the Legislature and we do not want to have it, as I say, like a *matinée* at the Capitol Theatre on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: Please continue!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, some hon. gentlemen a few minutes ago were suggesting that I was making charges without anything to back them up. Now that I am giving them the evidence, they do not want to hear it. This figures. It is nothing new.

Ernest Trepanier, who is a trapper, had a permit and hired Harmel Desbiens and Florian Gervais at \$8 per day to help cut the wood allotted by permit.

Paul Legault hired Hector Guindon to cut his permit No. 17033 at \$7 per cord. I have no doubt that is a very common French name, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member sit down? How many more names have you got to read off?

Mr. Bryden: I have given about half of them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Would you not consider submitting these names and placing them on the order table?

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am prepared to put them on the table, Mr. Chairman. I would like these particular names to be on the record. I have another list of 180 names and I will assure you that I am not going to read that list. But I will place a copy of it on the table, or give it to the hon. Minister as you may direct, sir.

Mr. Troy: If this concerns trafficking in licences, I think it should be heard.

Mr. Bryden: I cannot remember which one I left off at. If hon. members would stop interrupting me, it would not take so long.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Fidele Hebert, with permit No. 17145, receives \$180 per month pension. Frank Gallant bought the permit and it was cut by Alfred Hebert at \$7 per cord.

H. Mailloux sold his permit to Frank Gallant and it was cut by Maurice Hebert.

Alex Landry, holding permit No. 17117, was working for Spruce Falls Woods and his brother Alexie did the cutting.

Etienne Lelievre, with permit No. 17154, is an old-age pensioner. This permit was sold to Ulysses Tremblay and cut by Roger Lanteigne at \$7 per cord.

Herve Leduc, permit No. 17459, was helped to cut by Andre Leduc. Andre Leduc also cut on the permits of Gerard Charlebois, Cyrille Charlebois, Herve Leduc and Armand

Charlebois at \$7.50 per cord. All the permits were bought by the Val Cote Co-op.

Jean Paul Leclerc's permit No. 17672 was cut by Renald Leduc at \$7.50 per cord. Val Cote Co-op bought the permit. Mr. Leclerc could not cut his permit as he was employed by The Department of Highways.

Jean Denis Vallee's permit No. 17202 was sold to Gagnon of Mattice and cut by Eddy Letourneau at \$7 per cord. Mr. Vallee was a contractor on hauling.

Gishlain Levesque cut unknown settlers' permits for Val Rita Co-op.

Rejean Nolet's permit No. 17667 and Simon Nolet's permit No. 17666 were cut by Germain Nolet, and Mattice Co-op was the buyer.

Arthur Garreau's permit No. 17444 was cut by Edward Pelletier and Frank Gallant was the buyer.

Lionel Couture's permit No. 17677 was cut by Jean Paul Provencal and Val Cote Co-op was the buyer.

Anatole Beauvais was employed at the Spruce Falls mill and the permit was cut by Albert Rousseau.

Donat Hebert's permit was cut by Romeo Saindon of Mattice.

Adelard Vallee was employed by the Newaygo Timber Company and his permit was cut by his brother, Ernest, for \$8 per cord.

Sante DiPrimio's permit was cut by Rene Lamontagne and Odillon Lamontagne of Hallebourg. Mr. DiPrimio was employed by Newaygo Timber Company Limited and had no time to cut his permit.

Luc Nolet, holder of permit No. 17461, sold his permit to Mattice Co-op. He was paid \$8 per cord by the Co-op for cutting same.

Lucien Michaud of Val Rita sold his permit to the Val Rita Co-op and was paid \$6.50 per cord to cut same.

The co-ops and the brokers are the worst violators in the buying of permits.

Mr. Fillion of Departure Lake is one of the worst violators. We have unsigned reports that a family of four sons, along with the father, each received a 100-cord permit. Mr. Fillion employs moonlighters and school children to cut these permits that he buys.

The above are only a few cases of the selling and buying of settler permits. Although it is pronounced in the Kapuskasing area, all other areas such as Cochrane, Devonshire, Val Gagne, Matheson, Timmins, and so on, are just as bad.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to the other list that I referred to. It is a list of 180 permits which, as far as I can see, without being a skilled practitioner in the law or anything approaching that, were issued in contravention of the Act and the regulations and the announced policy of the department in that they did not go to settlers who needed this supplementary income to maintain them. I will not read all of them, but I would like to take one or two examples, or rather several examples, from the list. And I will either give the copy of the whole statement to the hon. Minister or put it on the table.

The first one on the list is Mrs. Georges Alig of Moonbeam, Ontario, licence No. 24321, who draws mother's allowance and therefore is not eligible for a permit. Then, her son Florion Alig of Moonbeam, Ontario, holder of 24462, works for the Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Company.

Through the list there are many who work for the Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Company, or in some cases for Abitibi and various other employers in the area. They are not settlers in need of money to supplement their income over the year. They are employees. In fact, one of them, a man called Donat Bernard, has a year-round job with The Department of Highways. Why would a settler's permit be issued to a man in that category?

Some of them do not even live in the area.

Although the policy is supposed to apply to settlers in the area, one of them is the owner of the Fauquier Hotel. On what conceivable basis would a settler's permit be issued to a hotel owner? Another was issued to a woman. We heard the hon. Minister's explanation, which was reasonable as far as it went, that there was a policy of issuing permits to widows of settlers. I would certainly not object to that. But here we have one issued to a woman, Rolande Dumais, whose husband works at a mill. She is not a widow; she has a husband who has a job. This is permit No. 24317.

And so we go, Mr. Chairman, through much the same sort of cases, where people with regular jobs got settlers' permits ostensibly for the purpose of supplementing their income so that they could carry on as settlers. It is this laxity on the part of the department by which permits, apparently, are issued, almost broadcast. That — plus its policy that is ostensibly for the purpose of ensuring there is a market for the cut, but actually enables the companies to get control of the permits through brokers representing

the companies — is the way the vise is tightened on the workers in the area, and on the settlers themselves.

What happens is that a man gets a job cutting for \$7 a cord. He does not get the permit at all. He is hired by somebody else to cut a permit. Frequently the person who hires him is a co-op. I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that it is high time this situation were cleaned up. I would repeat that it is urgent for it to be cleaned up now, because the situation in the Kapuskasing area is still explosive. There is much resentment as a result of the grotesque handling by The Attorney General's Department of certain prosecutions following the deaths of three men. I appealed to the government previously, and many people have appealed to it, to set up a Royal commission to inquire into—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman—to inquire into the whole matter, including the policy of The Department of Lands and Forests with regard to settlers permits. It is quite clear that the government is not going to set up a Royal commission. It will give no reason for its refusal, but it is not going to do it. I do not think it has a good reason. Many valid reasons have been presented to it and it simply sloughs them off, it pays no attention to them. So we will not get a Royal commission but I would make this one appeal, Mr. Chairman:

Would the government please do something while there is still time, about this disgraceful policy, which I have just outlined, so that at least this source of discontent can be removed in the future and in the negotiations which are now coming up the workers will not feel that they have this hanging over their heads?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a completely integral part — this permit system—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to sit down. We are dealing with the policy of timber management and no other item.

Mr. Bryden: And I am saying that the policy of timber management of this government gives a weapon to the pulp and paper companies, which they have used to the detriment of their workers. If the policy is not changed, the workers will next go into negotiations with a threat hanging over their heads, which will certainly not create the

sort of spirit that will produce harmonious settlement of their negotiations. I think this is a most desperately urgent matter, Mr. Chairman, and I would appeal to the hon. Minister to do something to rectify it.

I will now place on the table the documents from which I was quoting.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to spend very much time on this type of barrage of bulk statements thrown together with practically no weight behind them whatsoever. We were listening, perhaps, to the battle of Cochrane South last September. It is possible that these very comments were gleaned from the representative of the party for which my hon. friend stood in the election last September; but at any rate the winner in the election is over here. He speaks for the people of Cochrane North, and the candidate for the NDP was a very poor third, beating the Social Credit candidate only. Now that was pretty well settled on the local level and the local front at that time.

However, as far as this story and this situation is concerned, the forebears of the people who were there and did that voting went in there and opened up that country and went through a period when this was all part of the life of the community. You would go in there and knock it all out overnight! Well, we are not going to do any such thing, and you might as well understand that now.

We have talked with the representatives of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers and we get along very well with them. They do not need spokesmen like the hon. member in this House, who is doing them a disservice if he only knew it. We have taken the lists of names that have been submitted and they have been checked. Here is something more like the facts, instead of what the hon. member for Woodbine has been saying here: From the investigation of these 180 names, we found that in the department—and the deputy was responsible as well as the rest on this; and he is not the type of man who has very much wool pulled over his eyes—we found that 11 persons who had received district cutting licences were not eligible. They are classified as “steadily employed and not living on their patented lot six” “old age or invalid and not living on their patented lot five,” for a total of 11. And that is the fact, not all these figures and these names that the hon. member has been carrying all over the record here for the last half-hour.

Of the permits that were issued and involved, 1.5 per cent were cancelled. That

represents the percentage and nothing like what the hon. member has been saying. It is nice to hear from over there what the hon. member thinks of the people of that area making a few extra dollars out of this type of work. We think they are entitled to do it and we are going to see that they get a fair shake as they have had in the past.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We are dealing in this matter on a reasonable basis and in the atmosphere in which we are dealing today, \$22 is the price, not the figures the hon. member quoted for cutting. Eight hundred and twenty-seven permits were issued this winter and there has not been a single complaint with respect to the cutting that went on this year and we think that is a big improvement. That is the way to handle the situation, not screaming from the roof tops as the hon. member is doing, and particularly not knowing enough to stop, even when the decisions have been made at almost every level except his own.

Mr. Bryden: I think the violence of the hon. Minister's reply is an index of the validity of my point. Obviously he has very little of an answer. His whole fine statement of last year has been exploded higher than a kite by facts placed on the record. Of course, he goes off on his typical diversion, he wants to relate it to the election campaign, he wants to assert the proposition that might is right and that facts can be battered down if somebody happens to win an election. This is an ancient device by this government, but it does not alter the fact that facts are facts and they cannot be obscured in that manner. The hon. Minister has done everything possible to throw up a smokescreen, but the facts are still here.

He has said that I got these names from certain people of the same political viewpoint as mine in the constituency concerned. I will tell him that I did not get them from that source. He has told me that the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union is a reliable union, which it is, and that it has been in contact with the government, which it has on many occasions, and that I should get information from them.

Well, I would like to inform the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the information I presented to the House came from the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union and I think they know what they are talking about. I think they have sources through which they can get reliable information, and it was on

the strength of that conviction that I undertook to read these cases into the record. The hon. Minister cannot get out from under by this sort of diversion. These are facts, they are solid facts, and—

An hon. member: Because the hon. member stated them?

Mr. Bryden: I have stated they have come from a thoroughly reliable source, a source which the hon. Minister himself admitted was reliable. The hon. Minister said that representatives of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union have been to see him many times. Perhaps he will tell me how many times they have been down to see his department over the years, asking it to clean up this situation regarding the issue of permits. The hon. Minister has done absolutely nothing about it at all.

There is practically nothing that this union—this responsible reputable union—has requested of this government that it has received, yet its requests have been fair and reasonable and most essential in the situation that exists there.

As a result, what would one expect them to do? They have come to the Opposition parties. I have no doubt they went to see my hon. friends in the Liberal party; they have certainly been to see us from time to time. They have always been courteous enough, as most organizations have been, to give us copies of the briefs that they have given to the government and to the various departments of the government, and to explain those briefs to us.

I have in my file briefs from this organization over a number of years. Year after year there has been this same request to enforce the law with regard to the issue of permits. It would appear that it is hopeless; the hon. Minister's mind is closed. He is not even prepared to consider facts. He is going to continue. I take it from what he said—I hope it is not true, but it seems to be the only possible conclusion—he is going to continue to allow these permits to be used as a device to be used by the big companies against their workers in the event that they get into a dispute. That is unfortunate.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): On vote 1107, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, I would like to bring the matter that there has been more and more talk about in northwestern Ontario over the last, to my knowledge, three or four years, but particularly in the last few months. This has to do with timber scaling. I am sure that the hon.

Minister of Lands and Forests is in possession of this information as well, but I think for the sake of the record that I should present it at this time.

The fact is that there was evidence of a tendency in many cases for company scalers to scale wood in the bush below or above the allowable average of five per cent. This could lead to a substantial loss of honestly earned income to cutters, and also a serious loss of revenue to the government in stumpage fees. Due to this fact, the present method of scaling wood in the bush is a constant source of friction. This I know to be so very true. I get complaints almost daily from woodlot farmers and from haulers and so on, who find that there is a \$30, \$40, \$50 or \$60 differential in the price that they should be getting and the price that they do get on delivery of the wood. This is important money to people who are in receipt of small sums of money as an income.

The present method of scaling wood in the bush is a constant source of friction among the paper companies, the scalers and the cutters. It is felt by the people in our part of the country in particular—and I presume it is true in the Kapuskasing and other areas of northwestern Ontario and northern Ontario, where pulpwood cutting is carried on at a large scale—that the Ontario government should review the present method of issuing scaling licences and consider the advisability of placing all wood scaling in the hands of government scalers, thus ensuring that all parties concerned receive an accurate scale and a fair and just distribution of the proceeds therefrom.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, and I have a feeling somehow that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests will agree with me, that he must have received over the last many months, many complaints in regard to this type of thing. These are not isolated cases, these are not cases that one comes into contact with once or twice during a cutting season. They are situations which come to one's attention many times during the cutting season. It is particularly true in cases of woodlot farmers and it happens particularly, as my hon. colleague mentioned a while ago, with regard to these so-called co-operatives.

I think I mentioned briefly a little earlier when I spoke with regard to this type of merchandising wood and purchasing wood, that these people are not, strictly speaking, co-operatives. They are merchants in their own localities in a variety of types of merchandising, such as general stores and the

like. The practice in so many cases is that the woodlot farmers go to these general stores and set up a credit account upon which they draw merchandise against the amount of money that they will be paid after their wood is delivered. Therefore, the merchant is in the position of a co-operative operator, as he calls himself. He is in a position to make a double profit. We have no quarrel personally if he is giving these people service and if he is dealing fairly with the people from whom he is purchasing this wood, in the scale of the wood—giving them an accurate scale, seeing that they get an accurate scale and also that they are paid a proper amount for the wood that they entrust to him for handling.

I would strongly recommend to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests that if this matter has not been brought forcibly to his attention in the recent past, it is a matter which is well worth the scrutiny of the department. I believe he will find that he will have the gratitude of many people, men, women and children, in northwestern Ontario if he can come to a just and equitable solution to this particular matter.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am very much alive, Mr. Chairman, to the problems of scaling. Actually, we have a standard system for Crown lands and sometimes settlers and others make agreements on their own on other methods of scaling. The Quebec system is sometimes used by agreement, by private arrangement. But the whole process of scaling in the light of all the new developments that are going on in the industry, the mechanical end of it and all that sort of thing, has been under review. I have here a preliminary report on scaling which was received just a few months ago from some of our experts in the field and we are very much alive to that question.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1107 agreed to.

On vote 1108:

Mr. Troy: I am not finished with 1107 yet.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I have 1107 passed.

Mr. Troy: By whom? You just said "carried." It is the same thing as we have had in the years past.

Mr. Chairman: Order! If the hon. member wants to make a statement on this vote, we are prepared to allow him to do it.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member

has a question to ask on this vote, I would ask you please to go back to 1107.

Mr. Chairman: I will rule that we revert back to 1107, if the hon. member has a question to ask.

Mr. Troy: Yes. We had the same information given to us as was presented to the NDP. We had a delegation from Kapuskasing area and it made very serious charges.

What we are concerned with is this: Is the hon. Minister satisfied that the provisions in The Crown Timber Act in regard to that particular part of our problems were adhered to? He had 180 more permits issued and the hon. Minister says there were only 11 infractions. Does the hon. Minister deny then that every one of the others was on the up and up and all the provisions of The Crown Timber Act in those instances were adhered to?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: As I outlined, having discussed it with the other parties, having seen all the lists that they wanted looked into, and having looked into them, the people of our department came to the conclusion that 11 only came within the infractions and 1.5 per cent of the permits were cancelled on that basis. We always have a few because after all this is quite possible in that number. This year, as I say, we have had 800-odd permits granted. The cutting has gone along, so far as the department is concerned at any rate, without any undue problems or difficulties apparently, and without complaints being lodged. Therefore, we can assume that this year, perhaps as the result of some of this that has gone before, it is running smoothly. We are concerned with correcting errors in trying to keep this on a proper level. But we believe the people of that area want this method for the settler to have an extra source of income and to be kept within the proper range of the Act and the requirements of the Act. That is what we permit to be done.

Mr. Troy: Does the hon. Minister mean to tell me that those people who applied for those permits were settlers? What is his understanding and what is a "settler" under the department? A settler to me is one who is settled on a certain area and gets his settler's permit, but the people in this, reading these permits, are people from Kapuskasing, from towns and—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Our analysis of the 180 has all but the 11 classified as in the eligible column. The 11 are not in the eligible column. The details are set out in the memorandum.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask my hon. friend, under The Crown Timber Act is there any leeway or latitude allowed in determining the qualifications in respect to a settler? Is there anything in the Act to allow the department to give these cutting rights to other than settlers, or have you got to determine in the department that this man is a settler before you can properly give him a licence to cut?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, the answer would be that there is discretion if one wanted to use it in relation to what might be called the fringe, fuel wood for example. Permits for fuel wood and that sort of thing can be granted to any settler or to anybody who needs fuel—

Mr. Oliver: Yes, but this is cutting pulpwood.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, one can get a permit for fuel wood, for example.

Mr. Troy: It is clear the answer does not reveal very much. Mr. Minister, has the E. B. Eddy Company a large area of timber under licence in the district of Timiskaming? How many square miles and how many acres has it and how much has it itself cut?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The Eddy Company?

Mr. Troy: The E. B. Eddy Company from Ottawa and Hull.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The Eddy Company Limited in the Elk Lake area had some 1,640 square miles under license. There is quite a story, of course, behind the Eddy Company. The original agreement, covering the Montreal River concession, was made back in 1907 with the J. R. Booth Company—Mr. Booth himself, I think at that time—for a period of 21 years. It was to expire in 1928. This agreement was subsequently assigned to J. R. Booth Limited.

By an agreement, sir, dated April 27, 1933, the latter was granted a new license for 21 years, dating from January 12, 1928 and expiring in 1949. This license was assigned to the E. B. Eddy Company Limited in 1946. After prolonged negotiations, the Eddy Company was granted licence A-106 for a term of 10 years—from February 15, 1953, expiring in 1963. A further licence has recently been issued for a ten-year period expiring in 1973.

I should say that the Booth operation in the area, was for sawlogs when it was held by that company. For a number of years, pulpwood from the area was used at the J. R.

Booth pulp mill at Ottawa. Since the closing of the large drives on the Ottawa River, it has proved uneconomic to operate the concession area for pulp wood.

The licence issued in 1963 for a ten-year period, contains the following provisos:

Provided that if the licensee does not honour, before the expiry date of this licence, build and have in operation a pulp mill capable of utilizing a minimum of 100,000 cords of wood per annum, at a location to be approved by the Minister, the Minister may refuse any extension of this licence; and the bonds referred to in clause three hereunder shall be forfeited to Her Majesty, and retained by her as liquidated damages and not as a penalty.

Provided further that if at any time during the term of this licence, a firm proposal is made to the Minister by a person other than the licensee to establish a mill for the purpose of utilizing the timber on the licensed area, and the licensee has not commenced construction of a pulp mill as herein provided, the licensee agrees that it will, within 60 days from the date of the Minister's notice to the licensee, either give a firm commitment to commence construction of a pulp mill as herein provided within 12 months from the date of the said notice, or it will, within the said 60 days, deliver up the licence to the Minister, whereupon the licence shall cease to have any force or effect. The Minister will forthwith return the bonds referred to in clause three of this licence to the licensee. In the event the licensee gives a firm commitment to commence construction of the said pulp mill within the 12-month period, it shall be required, at the time of the commitment, to deposit with the Treasurer of Ontario an additional \$200,000 in cash, or bonds of the government of Canada, or of the province of Ontario, as security for the due performance of the obligation of the licensee in respect to the construction of the said mill.

And provided further that until such time as the licensee commences construction of the said pulp mill the Minister may, for the purpose of supplying the requirements of local industry, grant licences to cut any or all species of timber on any part or parts of the licensed area in which mature and over-mature stands of sawmill timber predominate. In issuing such licences the Minister will in as far as practicable preserve the pulp wood values for the mill to be constructed by the licensee.

It will be noted that the two objectives of the department are adequately provided for in this licence. One, the establishment of a pulp mill in the vicinity of the licensed area at the earliest possible date; and secondly, until such time as the pulp mill can be established, the licence provides for the utilization of all species and products, other than pulp wood, through licences issued by the department. This latter matter is under department consideration at the present time.

Now I would like to say, not because it has been asked directly, but because there was a statement made by the hon. member for York South when the hon. Minister of Economics and Development was before the House. A broad allegation was made that this company --middle man, as it was called--was in there making great profits at the expense of settlers. Nothing, really, could be further from the truth than that. The facts of the matter were as follows, and we have had a review of the ten-year period.

We have had the figures from their company's records of the sales; third party agreements receipts by them from the people who were cutting in the area over that period of time; and we have the charges, which amounted roughly to some \$19,000-odd a year for fire charges and ground rent and that sort of thing. It amounted to something like \$19,400. Then there were some additional charges which brought the whole up to \$22,000 or \$23,000. The end result of that ten-year period was that the company was able to recoup something like all but \$60,000 of its own outlay. As a result of the charges which it made on a cordage basis from these people who were cutting. But the company did the actual management.

If the company had not been doing that, the department would have had to put people at work doing the management. On the analysis, it was felt that we got more for our money really, that way, than we would have had we done it ourselves. We have, as I read out a moment ago, the provision for doing it directly if we so desire. But in that case, of course, the charges would have to be made to cover those costs against the persons doing the cutting.

Actually, all of these contracts come under the review of the department. The thought that any one of these licensees could walk out and make great profits is not correct. At least if they did it, they would do it with the knowledge of the department because all of the prices are under the review of the department. And in this particular case, as I say, over the ten-year period as a result of

these third party cuttings, it enabled the company to recoup some of its outlay. But in consideration for that, they had to do the management work.

There might be a question of whether we should deal directly, make our own charges and let the company pay the full amount. That might be a legitimate criticism. That is probably the better way of doing it. The door is very clearly open to do it that way if we figure that it is the better thing for us to do.

Those are the facts. My hon. friend blew this thing up as though great profits were being made by middlemen. In this particular case there was nothing in it whatever.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, in his reply to my question in regard to that licence the Eddy people have, the hon. Minister says they are licensed for the cutting of timber in that area. Are these third party agreements, or did the department itself give the licence, or did it make the agreements with the Eddy Company?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There are five licences but in that area for the cutting of sawlogs and that type of thing. One of them is being processed at the present time. There are five agreements at the present time for a total of some seventeen million board feet of sawlogs outstanding.

Mr. Troy: And is the hon. Minister satisfied that the ten-year clause is okay?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that we have a rider in it that we can cancel it at any time on 60 days' notice if they do not go ahead with the mill and if we have an opportunity to have somebody else come in and put up a mill. We think that is good enough protection.

Mr. Troy: Now, just one last question: Is there anything to advise the House about the pulp mill that is a possibility in the Elliot Lake area? The hon. Minister will recall that some years ago when the Elliot Lake crisis was discussed here, the then Minister of Lands and Forests said that negotiations were under way for a possible mill at Blind River.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, there are certain negotiations at the present time in relation to that, but I can make no announcement at this moment, because it has not reached the point where I can say anything.

Mr. Troy: We are getting warm.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I hope so, I hope so.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, in the light of the explanation the hon. Minister tried to make in regard to the issuing of pulp cutting permits, would he tell the House whether or not there are provisions in the Act that allow for the so-called broker or company agent to purchase these permits from the original holders, and contract to other work groups, and what relation the Act has to the original price paid to the broker?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: My hon. friend is not using the language that I would use in connection with this, because there is not any such thing as a broker in this at all. It is the E. B. Eddy Company itself holding the main licence, which is a big operating company, as my hon. friend probably knows, down in the Ottawa-Hull area.

An hon. member: He is talking about the Kapuskasing permits.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am sorry, I thought the hon. member was pursuing the previous question. I will have to ask the hon. member to give me the question again.

Mr. Gisborn: My question to the hon. Minister is: are there provisions in the Act that govern the issuing of the permits to the so-called settler—are there provisions for what is known as a broker or company agent to pick up the permits from the original recipients and then set up work crews, take out the pulpwood, receive the going price—as has been mentioned \$22 a cord from the company—and pay off to the work crews a certain rate under that rate? This is the question I want to know: Are there provisions in the Act for this kind of operation, because this is what is actually going on?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): The rake-off!

Mr. Gisborn: That is right.

An hon. member: Do not be crude.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would refer to section 26 of The Crown Timber Act, and it is a pretty broad section:

Notwithstanding anything in any general or special Act or in any regulation or in any licence or in any master plan, the Lieutenant-Governor in council having regard to reasonable business requirements of the licensee may cancel or vary any licence in respect of one or more parts of the licensed area or in respect of any type, size or species of timber designated by him.

And then it goes on to have certain provisions under sub-paragraph 2. But section 26 is the section if my hon. friend wants to look at it in detail; that is the all-inclusive section.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. G. E. Gomme (Lanark): The hon. member has asked his last question.

Mr. Troy: No, I happened to pick up the issue of—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Do not start reading all last week's newspapers.

Mr. Troy: This may be of interest; it is on timber, and the resident of Sturgeon Falls, who contested the election last September for the NDP is classified here as an horticulturalist and an authority on reforestation. He proposed a number of things, particularly for reforestation and he is reported in this newspaper as saying the reforestation should take place in the fall when dormant seedlings are not injured by transplanting.

He explained that the average loss in spring reforestation was as high as 80 per cent because of the warm spring sun and the quick run-off of the water. Autumn planting would allow frost to fill in air pockets around the roots of tender seedlings. Thus, before the growing season begins, the young plants may gradually adapt to the new environment. In this way ample time is given for adaptation until the dormant plant becomes reactivated during the growing season in late spring and early summer.

What is the matter?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! We are dealing with vote 1107.

Mr. Troy: This is timber, sir, is it not?

Mr. Chairman: This is reforestation that you are speaking on right now.

Mr. Troy: Well, I presume that is reforestation of—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: On the advice of my experts, I will tell the hon. member it is all right to plant in the fall but it is better to plant in the spring.

Mr. Troy: What is the hon. Minister's answer to this, then? He said that only 50 million of the hundred billion seedlings planted each year in Ontario have survived and on the other hand—

Mr. Gomme: Did he count them?

Mr. Troy: I do not know, I just—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Our count would be 80 to 90.

Mr. Troy: Eighty to 90?

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, without wanting to put a lot of words on the record tonight, I would like to suggest that the hon. Minister can possibly accept the fact that there are some small inequities in the granting of timber permits.

I refer to a situation in our area where a big timber operator—and I am quite familiar with this, and this request from a small operator is certainly evident in the hon. Minister's files—the large operator has taken a lot of timber, a lot of choice timber out of that country as compared to a small operator whose local mill is not operating at all. Being a small operator, he would not employ more than 20 or 30 men, but I would like to think that the hon. Minister could accept that everything, in spite of what the hon. Minister of Mines had to say in his speech, is not exactly as it should be any more than everything in The Department of Public Welfare is as it should be, because he made a speech on soup kitchens.

Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there is a possibility of the department paying a little more attention, as much attention as possible, to the small operators and looking very closely at the local economy of some of these smaller people as compared to some of the big industries?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: This undoubtedly is what we would want to do and if there are any specific cases that my hon. friend wants to bring forward, we will certainly give them a special look.

Vote 1107 agreed to.

Vote 1108 agreed to.

Vote 1109 agreed to.

On vote 1110:

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, on this vote 1110, basic field services, in reading the report of the public lands investigation committee I find reference to re-surveys and re-establishment of surveys. Recently a resident in my riding sought to do some expansion of property that he owned and later found out that the survey was not correct, and I know that in another section of the riding a dam was built years ago by the Ontario Hydro,

and the proper survey shows that it was not their property at all and that the survey was wrong.

In the recommendation of this expert committee it is pointed out that a minimum of at least \$100,000 be provided annually in the estimates of the hon. Minister's department for re-survey, re-establishment and monumenting the original surveys. What is being done now in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We are asking for some \$50,000 extra in the estimates for re-surveys this year.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I wonder if the hon. Minister would undertake to advise—not here, but some time—if any monies were paid to George Green of Green Airways of Red Lake, by his department during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963.

Secondly, just as an item of personal curiosity, on checking through the estimates under what would appear to be this vote, I find that something like \$20,500 was paid to the Westbury Hotel and something like \$4,900 was paid to the Royal York Hotel. I do not think there are any other hotels listed. Is there any rational basis on which the hotels in which the hon. Minister's people stay are chosen?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say to the hon. member that this department, as everybody knows, I think, is a business department. It has many business connections and has requirements that cover a broad area in relation to committees, to delegations and to many different associations which come here in groups from time to time and which are entertained by the department. I could give a list of the different types of things. We have something in the neighbourhood of between 40 and 50 occasions where this sort of arrangement is made. Such lists as appear on page 191 here of the pamphlet give a fairly representative list of the types of organizations that come in here. That item accounts for lunches and that sort of thing, which are held for large numbers of people, several thousands during the year.

Mr. Gibson: I am not questioning the amount that was spent, Mr. Chairman. What I want to know is, why the rather unusual distribution between these particular hotels? I have nothing against the Westbury Hotel and nothing against the Royal York Hotel or any other hotel, but it is about a 5-to-1 split in favour of the Westbury. I am just wonder-

ing why the Westbury was chosen rather than say, the Park Plaza.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is a good point. Perhaps I should think more about my own riding and bring more in to St. Patrick riding. Actually, the Westbury is not in my riding. It is in the riding of the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) I think.

But the fact is that service at the Westbury Hotel, and habit—one gets into the habit of going to a place—are the reasons the Westbury seems to be favoured. I can assure the hon. member that there is no significance in it other than that, to my knowledge, in any shape or form. They have a reputation for serving a very good roast beef dinner and that type of thing.

Mr. Gibson: Will the hon. Minister undertake to provide—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Also, the deputy points out to me that a reservation cannot be had just for the asking in the hotels of this city. Meeting rooms are required and so forth and reservations have to be made for them. To some extent also, the convenience of the location of the Westbury to the area of Queen's Park has set it apart.

Probably we should get a better distribution. We will have to look into that.

Mr. Gibson: Just to finalize this, will the hon. Minister provide me with the information about Mr. Green? I asked, sir, for information about Mr. Green and Green Airways and what the department had paid it, if anything, up to March 31, 1963. Will the hon. Minister have the department send me that information?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: None of us caught what the hon. member is asking for there, will he please—

Mr. Gibson: All I want is information. I want the department to forward to me, by mail if necessary, any amounts paid by The Department of Lands and Forests to George Green or Green Airways of Red Lake in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963. I do not want it now.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, there is a piece of property in Sturgeon Falls that was originally intended—I notice the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs looking me over on this one—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I answered that four or five years ago.

Mr. Troy: I know the hon. Minister did, but I want to know if anything is going to be done about it. It was all serviced and ready for a building. One of the projects that was to be carried on in that building was the preparation of signs for the parks and all the areas which the department owns. It is being done in the Pembroke area but has the hon. Minister any plans for the particular property in Sturgeon Falls that was purchased and for which services were installed? This property is not being used at all? This has not been answered, has it, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not think we feel that there is any immediate need to change from Pembroke. Is the hon. member suggesting that we should change our paint shop? We feel that with the methods of transportation available today, it is working out well. I am sure that hon. members from that area would be the last to want to see us shifting that around.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. Minister if he had any plans for the property which he had serviced with water and, I believe, sewage. This was, of course, early in 1959, but it never materialized.

In the monthly letter we get from the Pembroke district, there is an article about the terrific waste of trees at Christmas time. Trees are cut down and are not sold. They are just tossed away. They do not get to the market. After the Christmas season they are taken out to some dump and burned.

I know we must be careful here. We are up against Santa Claus. I am not talking about the Christmas trees of those who are in the business, but of needless cutting on Crown land. It seems a terrific waste of timber that might be merchantable later on.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We try to keep track of this sort of thing on Crown lands. A lot of trees are cut on private lands and the owners would have to look after problems of that sort.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions for the hon. Minister. Is it a fact that all of the land bordering on Georgian Bay has been frozen and cannot be sold?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is correct. This is a temporary situation while a survey is being made in the whole Killarney-Georgian Bay area.

Mr. Sargent: How long will this condition remain?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We would anticipate about a year.

Mr. Sargent: One year. I would like to ask the hon. Minister why they continue it if it is the policy of this department to replace beaver. I understand you have increased your beaver population greatly in the north—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not us.

Mr. Sargent: I did not put that very well. This is a serious matter. The fact is that my people tell me this increase in population of beaver is flooding many thousands of acres of land and they are building dams as high as 40 feet and holding back water. At these meetings, we may laugh at these people, but they are important to me. They are in the commercial fishing business but they have gone so far at meetings of their association as to call for a crash programme of bombing these dams to release this water into Georgian Bay.

We have seen documentaries on CBC where thousands of deer are lying down dead on the high hills because they cannot feed in the valleys. They are freezing to death on the high plateaus because there is no place to feed—this is all flooded by beaver. Is the hon. Minister doing anything about blocking this increase of beaver?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: In connection with the beaver, normally in the zones of the trappers, they pretty well manage their own beaver crop. When you get outside of that area you do get into trouble. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. W. E. Johnston), he is not here at the moment, had a problem but they got a solution. I think the hon. member for Lanark also had a problem. They got a solution. Perhaps if you have got a problem up in Grey North and you get a little more experience, we can get a solution up there, too.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, this is being facetious. I do not like this. This is important. We feel that the beaver population should be stemmed. I think I would like to have some intelligent thought from you on this matter. It is very important to the people in my area.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If you have a special problem up there—some think fishing is better above the beaver dam—but if you have a special problem, come on over to my office. You have not been over there yet, anyway. Come over and talk to me.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, may we have a report from the hon. Minister on the operation of the new regulations regarding the fishing huts on inland lakes, like on Lake Simcoe and Temagami and Nipissing?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The branch head tells me that it is working very satisfactorily, from our experience so far.

Mr. Troy: I might point out that the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) is rather bashful, but I notice a dispatch from New Lis-keard about a plastic ice fishing hut plant. I wonder if the department has had any information about this. I will tell him, Mr. Minister, to send it to your department for inclusion, maybe, in that bulletin that you send out. It is listed as a portable plastic ice fishing hut weighing 40 pounds. It folds down into a sled and can be put up in a few minutes. It is a little industry that may develop with a little publicity. With your signature on the bulletin it may go a long way in certain areas.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It sounds like an interesting bit of equipment. Have you got the price there?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What are you reading? The want ads?

Mr. Troy: I will be quite generous and I will not make the proper retort to that. No, it does not say here. I will ask the hon. member for Timiskaming to get in touch with the hon. Minister.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question with

reference to a question which the hon. member for Grey North put, sir, as to sales of Crown lands on the shoreline of Georgian Bay? I understand that there was a one-year freeze on Crown land sales on the shoreline of the entire Great Lakes area. The hon. member referred to Georgian Bay only, but I wonder if the hon. Minister would say that this applies to the entire Great Lakes shoreline?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes. It is a freeze, so to speak, temporarily on the whole shoreline.

Mr. Troy: And are they sold by auction or tender? I know they are frozen now, but when they will be sold.

Vote 1110 agreed to.

Vote 1111 agreed to.

Vote 1112 agreed to.

Vote 1113 agreed to.

Vote 1114 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Mr. W. G. Noden, from the committee of supply, reports the following resolutions:

Resolved,

That supply in the following supplementary amounts and to defray the expenses of the government departments named, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1964:

Department of Education:

Grants to provincial and other universities, etc.	\$ 473,000
Special grant	1,000,000

Department of Health:

Special grants	4,162,000
----------------------	-----------

Department of Lands and Forests:

Special grant	58,000
---------------------	--------

Treasury Department:

Main office	\$ 1,000,000
-------------------	--------------

— and —

Resolved,

That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the government departments named, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965:

Department of Agriculture:

Main office	605,000
Agricultural and horticultural societies branch	976,000
Agricultural rehabilitation and development branch	956,000
Co-operatives branch	42,000
Dairy branch	871,000
Extension branch	2,860,000
Farm economics and statistics branch	343,000
Farm products inspection branch	530,000
Farm products marketing board	78,000
Information branch	353,000
Livestock branch	1,566,000
Marketing development branch	142,000
Ontario food council	45,000
Ontario junior farmer loans branch	148,000
Ontario telephone service commission	107,000
Soils and crops branch	475,000
Demonstration farm, New Liskeard	82,000
Horticultural experiment station, Vineland	527,000
Kemptville Agricultural School	633,000
Western Ontario Agricultural School, Ridgetown	545,000
Federated Colleges, Guelph	9,009,000
Main office	750,000

Department of Attorney General:

Main office	107,000
Ontario Police Commission	433,000
Legislative counsel	56,000
Administration and finance division	351,000
Legislation and civil law division	215,000
Criminal law division	1,017,000
Administration of justice division	7,786,000
Public safety division	1,752,000
Ontario securities branch	307,000
Ontario Provincial Police	20,300,000

Department of Civil Service:

Main office	88,500
Position administration	204,500
Recruiting and examination services	241,000
Training and development services	101,500
Administrative services	276,500
Pay research	58,500
Ontario Joint Council, civil service arbitration board and grievance boards	40,500
Employee relations	47,000

Department of Economics and Development:

Main office	\$ 1,126,500
Economic council	210,000
Economics branch	177,000
Financial research branch	98,000
Housing branch	1,304,000
Ontario Development Agency	266,000
Ontario House	371,000
Ontario Research Foundation	1,182,500
Regional development services	211,000
Special research and surveys branch	200,000
Trade and industry branch	910,000
Housing branch	6,099,000

Department of Education:

Main office and general departmental expenses	1,209,000
Elementary education branch	4,071,000
Secondary education branch	1,642,000
Technological and trades training branch	4,258,000
Teacher education branch	4,947,000
Professional development branch	595,000
Special educational services branch	3,660,000
Registrar's branch	1,810,000
Curriculum and text-books branch	198,000
Community programmes branch	399,000
Ontario's fitness programme	100,000
Provincial Library Service	140,000
Youth service division	50,000
Federal-provincial agreements	27,694,000
Scholarships, bursaries, etc.	2,250,000
Legislative grants, etc.	294,210,000
Miscellaneous grants	749,000
Grants to provincial and other universities, etc.	47,189,000
Grants to other institutions of higher learning	2,165,000
Teachers' superannuation, etc.	4,000
Main office	3,000,000

Department of Energy and Resources Management:

Main office	138,000
Energy branch	521,000
Ontario Energy Board	95,000
Conservation authorities branch	1,356,000
Ontario Water Resources Commission	3,100,000
Water management programme	400,000
Conservation authorities branch	5,350,000
Ontario Water Resources Commission	20,000,000
Water management programme	1,600,000

Department of Health:

Main office	5,511,000
Public health administration branch	2,320,000
Public health nursing branch	82,000
Maternal and child health branch	133,000
Dental service branch	82,000
Nursing branch	389,000
Epidemiology branch	905,000
Medical rehabilitation branch	589,000

Department of Health, continued:

Tuberculosis prevention branch	\$ 5,577,000
Industrial hygiene branch	1,001,000
Environmental sanitation branch	277,000
Laboratory branch	3,032,000
Mental health branch	70,586,000
Hospital Services Commission of Ontario	65,559,000

Department of Highways:

Main office	4,431,000
Maintenance—King's highways and other roads	81,884,000
Construction and other capital projects	213,067,000

Department of Insurance:

Main office	493,000
-------------------	---------

Department of Labour:

Main office	791,900
Apprenticeship branch	1,274,500
Conciliation services	417,000
Labour standards branch	522,000
Labour Relations Board	519,300
Safety and technical services	1,538,300
Human Rights Commission	88,000
Industry and Labour Board	9,500,000

Department of Lands and Forests:

Main office	1,890,000
Fish and wildlife branch	536,000
Forest protection branch	190,000
Lands and surveys branch	951,000
Parks branch	1,271,000
Research branch	733,000
Timber branch	1,013,000
Forest ranger school	221,000
Junior ranger programme	820,000
Basic organization	19,471,000
Extra fire fighting	750,000
Lands and surveys branch	100,000
Timber branch	900,000
Basic organization	5,000,000

Office of Lieutenant-Governor:

Office of Lieutenant-Governor	27,000
-------------------------------------	--------

Department of Mines:

Main office	484,000
Geological branch	1,098,000
Mines inspection branch	328,000
Laboratories branch	183,000
Sulphur fumes arbitrator	24,000
Mining lands branch	354,000
Main office	1,000,000

Department of Municipal Affairs:

Main office and branches	48,824,000
Ontario Municipal Board	402,000
Main office	1,366,000

Department of Prime Minister:

Main office	\$ 108,000
Cabinet office	87,000

Office of Provincial Auditor:

Office of Provincial Auditor	539,000
------------------------------------	---------

Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship:

Main office	1,122,000
Office of the Speaker	57,000
Legislative Library	68,000
Clerk of The Legislative Assembly and chief election officer	117,000
Queen's Printer	218,000
Registrar-general's branch	775,000
Sessional requirements	1,180,000
Post office	700,000

Department of Public Welfare:

Main office	6,476,000
Child welfare branch	6,223,000
Day nurseries branch	325,000
Field services branch	1,441,000
Finance and administration branch	324,000
General welfare assistance branch	19,319,000
Homes for the aged branch	2,816,000
Rehabilitation services branch	407,000
Welfare allowances branch	32,873,000
Welfare allowances branch	19,799,000

Department of Public Works:

Main office	1,071,000
Ontario government buildings	8,817,000
Leased premises	2,500,000
Maintenance of locks, bridges, dams and docks, etc.	125,000
Miscellaneous	175,000
Public buildings	35,000,000
Dams, docks and locks	975,000

Department of Reform Institutions:

Main office	2,415,000
Parole and rehabilitation service	519,000
Institutions (Ontario reformatories, industrial farms, training schools and district jails)	17,697,000

Department of Tourism and Information:

Main office	97,000
Administrative services branch	245,500
Publicity branch	225,500
Advertising branch	944,000
Tourist promotion and information branch	314,000
Tourist industry and development branch	493,500
Division of archives	265,000
Theatres branch	117,000
Travel research branch	80,500
The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission	1,791,000

Department of Transport:

Main office	\$ 872,000
Ontario Highway Transport Board	166,000
Highway safety branch	481,000
Motor vehicles administration	5,410,000
Motor vehicle accident claims fund	630,000

Treasury Department:

General administration and public debt	991,000
Accounts division	571,000
Revenue division	5,125,000
Data processing branch	570,000
Ontario Racing Commission	213,000
Pension Commission of Ontario	145,000

Resolutions concurred in.

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 1 by Mr. R. A. H. Taylor,

Resolved

That the Ontario government take positive steps to salvage certain gold and base metal mining areas where through depletion production is rapidly being reduced and in some areas ceased completely; and to salvage the accumulated investment of individuals in these areas by:

1. Determining alternative industry suitable to these areas that will replace depleted mines.
2. By positive encouragement of these new industries to be developed in these selected areas.

Mr. R. A. H. Taylor (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, since tabling this resolution, I have had the opportunity to speak on this subject in the Throne debate and during the mining estimates. I will not repeat those remarks at this time. Also, there has very recently been presented to the committee on taxation a very complete and excellent brief on this subject by the Association of Mining Municipalities. I concur entirely with the points raised in this brief.

I would also like to refer the House to an editorial that appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on April 27, the concluding paragraph of which says:

Far too much has been done in the north on the short term—get in, get rich (or otherwise) and get out. Not nearly enough has been done in the north on a basis that looks to, and cares about, its future. It is on a long-term basis that the Ontario government should consider, and act upon, the reasoned request of the mining municipalities.

I present this resolution.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very opportune time, before the closing session, to talk about the northland, because I think there are many things we can explain to the hon. members of this House, which are perhaps not realized—what is actually going on in the north. I have a report here that I am sure will answer the hon. member's questions and perhaps any doubts he may have as to this government's activities in the northland.

In the interests of the economic council, the northern development committee of the economic council has listed a substantial number of research projects bearing on economic conditions in northern Ontario of which nine have been selected and submitted to the Ontario Research Foundation for thorough investigation. Work on the following six projects is well advanced:

Possibilities for the development and expansion of the peat moss industry; expansion of existing markets and determination of possible new applications for refuse grain screenings. This has been completed.

Feasibility of establishing an abattoir at the Lakehead. This has been completed.

Assessment of the economic feasibility of a further development of the coarse fish industry in northern Ontario. This has been completed.

Possible application of jet smelting techniques in northern Ontario are still going on through the Ontario Research Foundation.

Commercial probable uses of gold mine tailings is also going on. I might say, concerning those reports that were completed, we forwarded them to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) just last week because he has some reports of his own that we are working on jointly, and we think that out of

these finished reports, plus what The Department of Agriculture is working on, we can get some action on these matters that have been referred to.

Research is about to commence on the following projects:

The possible development of the needle trade. I discussed this a few days ago during the estimates. We believe that there are many people in northern Ontario who could fill this skilled need in the needle trade and we are working on that at the present time.

The advantages of forest fertilization for the forest-based industries is another research programme that is under way, and prospects for co-operative market garden operations. We believe there are possibilities up there for this kind of a business to take place in northern Ontario.

On completion of this research work, the northern development committee proposes to assign further studies to the Ontario Research Foundation; where this research demonstrates development potential the committee intends to encourage the establishment and/or growth of the relevant economic activities. This may be expected to be of particular significance to the areas of northern Ontario that are experiencing the effects of mine closure and the depletion of mineral resources. In some areas, recent activity in Timmins has generated renewed interest in all parts of the northland.

The northern development committee has requested a grant of \$5,000 from the Ontario economic council to support the northeastern Ontario development committee in preparation of an economic survey of the district of Timiskaming, which, in addition to an analysis of economic problems peculiar to the area, will also present recommendations for the overall improvement of the district's economy.

Since some mines in the area have been closed and others are nearing the end of their economic life, a survey of this nature may be expected to be of particular importance at this time. A similar survey on the district of Cochrane was completed last year with the financial support of the Ontario economic council to the northeastern Ontario development association. The northern development committee recognizes the importance of good transportation facilities for the growth of Ontario's northland. It has, therefore, under consideration, ways and means of accelerating highway construction and improvements and also has requested and obtained several studies on northern air transportation which are expected to prompt the committee to make specific recommendations.

Again, as I pointed out in my estimates, we are working with the federal authorities on the re-use and rehabilitation of these air fields, and I think there is something like 20 up there that could be used. But first of all, we have to find out whether passengers are going to come along and how much freight can be transported in these small planes through these various centres. So there is a survey going on to open up the area.

Now the interests of the special research and surveys branch of our department has also made a contribution to the north. In 1958 the branch published an economic survey of the northeastern Ontario economic region and this was followed in 1959 by a similar economic survey of the northwestern Ontario economic region. These surveys present a wealth of economic and statistical information relating to population, employment, natural resources, industrial production, transportation, tourism and other economic activities that make up the economic life of these regions.

The data thus assembled, Mr. Speaker, are analyzed and interpreted, major trends are indicated and on occasion reference is made to undeveloped potential. At present a re-survey of the northeastern Ontario economic region is underway. Teams of economists have visited all areas of the region and carried out extensive on-the-spot investigations. The results of this work are expected to be published before the end of this year. On completion, a similar re-survey will be made of the northwestern economic region. In addition, the branch has, during the past three years, completed a number of feasibility studies complete with recommendations dealing with economic problems in specific areas. For example, an extensive study on the development of alternative employment opportunities in the Bancroft-Bycroft area, which is experiencing the effects of a sharp decline in the uranium industry.

I might say that we have had two or three delegations down from Bancroft. We have been working with Father Henry and the industrial commissioners up there. I have been corresponding with the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada and the hon. Mr. Drury, the Minister of Industry, and while they have made their announcement this week—and perhaps the announcement had to come along these lines—nonetheless I am quite sure that, as Rt. hon. Mr. Pearson stated, within a few weeks he hopes to make a very important announcement about the uranium areas and we, I assume, will know what that announcement is within a few days.

A study on northeastern Ontario with particular reference to the role of the Ontario Northland Railway and the region's economic development.

A study on air transportation in northern Ontario and a study of economic prospects bearing on housing requirements in the Timmins area. Furthermore, economists of this branch participated in discussions with local representatives and government officials at Elliot Lake and Timmins, convened to determine ways and means of cushioning the effects of mine closure or depletion of mineral deposits, and to propose measures that could be taken to stimulate the local economy and develop demonstrated potentials. In our research branches we are seriously studying all these economic activities.

Then there is the interest of the trade and industry branch which I believe answers part of the question the hon. member proposed. The trade and industry branch does not direct industry to one area over another and I might add that the federal government follows the same pattern. When dealing with companies looking for a plant location, the branch provides them with complete information covering the availability and sources of raw materials and encourages them to consider locating where such materials are available. During 1963 we recorded the largest number of new plants to establish in northern Ontario in any one year. This is a list of the new plants and where they are located:

The Galfa Manufacturing Company Limited; manufactures chairs and chesterfields in Timmins. Boreal Equipment Contractors Limited; a chip plant in Port Arthur. Bristol Machine Works Company; machined products in Sudbury. Caland Ore Company Limited; iron ore pellets in Steep Rock. Canadian Lundia Limited; prefabricated wood and steel shelving in New Liskeard. Ken-O-Kee Fibreglass Products Limited; maker of fibreglass boats in Kewatin. H. Kutzler Lath and Lumber Mill; laths for snow fencing, Kakabeka Falls. Lowphos Ore Limited; iron ore pellets, Capreol. Mathieu (Rainy Lake) Forest Products Limited; a chip plant in Fort Frances. Stonefields Industrial Minerals Limited; coloured stone, exposed aggregate, in River Valley, and the West Coast Wire Works Limited; foundriner screens, Fort William—not in production yet, but will be, I understand, very shortly.

I think hon. members will see that we are getting a share of new plants and new industries in northern Ontario. Perhaps they are sliding in and we do not notice them.

It must be recognized that a large part of

our secondary manufacturing industry prefers to locate reasonably close to the highly populated market areas in the southern part of the province. The trade and industry branch, therefore, has taken direct steps to encourage and assist in the expansion of local industry in northern Ontario.

In order to alert businessmen and industrialists in northern Ontario to the possibility of manufacturing new products and entering into export, seminars were conducted at North Bay and Fort William during the year. All manufacturers of the northeastern and northwestern regions of the province were invited to attend these seminars. Guidance and first-hand knowledge was provided covering sources of financing for the acquisition of new equipment or plant expansion, the manufacture of new products under a licensing or contract arrangement, and the export of products to the U.S. and European market areas.

Forty companies in northern Ontario receive on a regular basis details of new products, for which the trade and industry branch is attempting to find companies that will produce these items under a licence or contract arrangement. Again, I say this is the same pattern followed by the trade and industry people at Ottawa, so that everybody gets a crack at any prospects we have for the manufacturing of new products.

As part of the Ontario Trade Crusade, the following seven companies from northern Ontario went on sales missions sponsored by the Ontario government: The Rock Iron Company Limited, Sudbury, went on the Chicago mission. R. J. Minoug & Company, North Bay, went on the United Kingdom and European mission. The Industrial Garment Company Limited, River Valley, went to the United Kingdom. Great West Timber Limited, Port Arthur, went to Milan, Italy. Hinspergers' Harness & Tent Co. Limited, from Port Arthur, went on a Chicago mission. Northern Plywoods Limited of Nipigon, went on a Chicago mission, and the Soo Foundry and Machine Company, went on the Los Angeles mission.

Many of the manufacturers in northern Ontario are included in our invitations to go on these foreign missions and open export markets for themselves. I just want to assure the hon. member that we are making sure that our manufacturers in northern Ontario are not overlooked on the possibilities of getting in on the export trade.

As part of the Ontario government regional development programme, the Northeastern Ontario Development Association and the Northwestern Ontario Development Associa-

tion are playing important roles in the overall development of these regions of the province. The northeastern group has just recently published a detailed study of the Cochrane district covering statistical data, analyses of some of the economic problems of the area and possible courses of action which might be taken. A similar study is being undertaken for the Timiskaming district and there will be a 35,000-mile aerial survey of the James Bay basin on the Quebec border this coming year. I think you will see that the north is being closely scoured not only by the provincial people, but also by the federal authorities.

In northwestern Ontario, the association has carried out transportation and labour studies and like those of the northeastern region, and is continually advertising the agriculture, industrial and tourist development opportunities which exist. These associations are operated by the municipalities of the region and therefore are able to select a programme of development which they feel is best suited to their own area. The Ontario government supports these associations with an annual grant of up to \$15,000 and by providing advisory and the agent staffs when required.

I say to hon. members that northern Ontario is a land of untapped riches that exist in forest, field and stream. We will perhaps, in our time, see a greater use of northern waters. We have heard a lot about the shortage of water and I am quite sure that if we are going to get any more water it is going to come from the north. We are witnessing a growing interest in cattle raising. They are raising more cattle in the north country today than ever before. We have forest products in ever-increasing abundance and the world needs an ever-increasing amount of what we can produce.

We are pushing electric power into every corner of our northland and this opens up vast new opportunities for those who populate much of this untapped virgin land. I think I can speak with authority, because I was up there in the 1930s when we did not have the highways, the hotels and the roads and people lived a more pioneer life than they do today. There have been great strides made, I know, from the 1930s and the early 1940s and I think we have only begun to realize what the northland has to offer.

Roads, airfields and railways will spread the opportunity of investment and access to the economic possibilities of the northland, which we know are waiting for those men and women who will accept the tremendous

challenge of the future as they have done in the past, a past that has brought forward much wealth for this province and its people. The recent discoveries in Timmins, under swamp land, of what would appear to be another prodigal gift from Mother Nature, present a challenge to many of our adventurous young men and women to go north and carve out a career of success as so many have done before. We cannot be complacent at any time in the problems of our northland and its people. We must be mindful of the contribution made in the past and the possibilities of the future, which will add to the prosperity and well-being of this province and certainly of Canada as a whole.

In my view, the northland can set a pace of economic prosperity in the years ahead that could very well pale into insignificance the successes that we have enjoyed in the past. I am confident that the hon. members of this House share this optimism in the future of northern Ontario and its community leaders and I can assure you that this government will do everything in its power to make sure that the resources of the northland are not left hidden. Certainly we will utilize the efforts of the people in the northland to make full use of those resources, as we have done in the past. I am sure that you do not need to have any fear about what will happen to the northland. It will get its share of support from this government and certainly from my department in particular, and I am sure I speak for my hon. colleagues as well. We are well aware of what exists for this province in the northland.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Are we still speaking on this resolution? I wonder if—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sorry, I did not hear the question.

Mr. Troy: Has the hon. Minister's economic committee made any recommendations to the department in regard to the mining laws—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I would remind the member that we are debating the resolution.

Mr. Troy: What about the statement the hon. Minister of Economics and Development made? That was debating the resolution, all right!

The hon. Minister said: "By positive encouragement of these industries to be developed in these selected areas—".

The point I want to make—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Is the member prepared to debate the resolution before the House?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: I know, but— Let me ask you a question, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: May I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: I am asking the member a question. Does he wish to debate the resolution?

Mr. Troy: Unless I can get an answer to this question, I cannot debate it, sir.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 2, by Mr. S. Farquhar,

Resolved,

That, consideration be given to the establishment of an agricultural school located in northern Ontario and dealing specifically with the problems of agriculture in northern Ontario, to provide facilities for young farmers in the north at a cost comparable to income.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of this resolution, I hope I will not find it necessary to reiterate the arguments for the resolution that I mentioned in an earlier speech in the House. In any case, I hope that my remarks will constitute emphasis on the importance to the northern agricultural industry of a northern agricultural school.

Many solutions have been offered for the bolstering and strengthening of our agricultural industry and my ideas, which certainly are coloured by the needs of the north, may be at cross-purposes with solutions that I have heard thus far in the House.

I have previously mentioned the importance of the erection of grain elevators which would allow northern farmers to take advantage of cheaper boat freight rates for their grain.

Eviscerating plants and abattoirs for northern Ontario are also important, but the primary need is the development of facilities

for educating and encouraging our farmers to produce facilities that they can make use of with a minimum of expense. As everyone of us knows, who is aware of the changing times in agriculture, this is now a specialized industry calling for techniques and equipment the present-day budgeting and accounting knowledge. This knowledge is just not available in Algoma-Manitoulin.

During the past few years even our government illustration stations have been allowed to run down for lack of effort and guidance on the part of the department, until these have all but disappeared from the area. Technical and intensive education in all vocational lines is available in most cases locally. Why not in agriculture? The lack of this education is the reason our young people are leaving the farms. There certainly is a class of young people who would like to farm, but they must be made aware that there exists a need and an opportunity for a living in this field.

I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that in northern Ontario, opportunities for the expansion of the dairy industry are practically nil. This is partly due to the shortage of urban consumers and partly to existing legislation which eliminates northern dairying from competition with southern and eastern Ontario dairying. This is the basis for another speech and I am not unmindful of the difficulties involved, but these are conditions we must live with.

The livestock and poultry-raising industry is something else. Ontario needs and will continue to need beef. Government control, therefore, must begin to be exercised in the kind of production that Ontario can use.

Mr. Speaker, we need a northern agricultural school in which northern students can enrol and be guided and taught along the lines to which northern conditions lend themselves and at a cost that northern families can afford. What better place for such an institution than the heart of Manitoulin Island in an area where the economy, and particularly the agricultural industry, is sick? Not because the people are unwilling to work but because they have been given very little encouragement or help along technical lines of production or advised as to what they can and should produce.

Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been encouraged to find that, as a result of my discussions with various people in the department, the hon. Minister and Mr. Crown, the director of ARDA, are taking a long look at the need for a community pasture programme in the area of which I speak. This effort has met

with a degree of enthusiasm on the part of northern farmers that is almost overwhelming.

Let me express my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the department will further recognize the needs of northern Ontario by implementing even some modified facilities as a start toward educating and encouraging our potential farmers.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, just before the hon. Minister replies: as a summer resident on Manitoulin Island over the past many years, I would like to support everything the hon. member has said and to say that anything that we can do—anything that our government might decide to do to assist the farmers in that area particularly—I would certainly pledge any support that I can give. The hon. member, I know, is a long-time resident of that area and he speaks with sincerity and knowledge, and I just wanted to rise and support him in this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin with a great deal of interest and he has brought many points out tonight that I think are quite pertinent to the area which he represents.

I noted this resolution on the order paper some time ago and made it my business to inquire into the grants that have been paid toward high school boards where agriculture is taught. I note that throughout the province of Ontario there are some 105 schools which offer agriculture, vocational agriculture at secondary level. These schools are paid on the average about \$4,000 annually in grants. I recall very well a personal experience I had—if I may, Mr. Speaker, crave your indulgence to mention this—in the operation of a high school board with which I was associated, where vocational agriculture was taught. We did this because we felt it was a good thing for all of the boys in Grade 9 to participate in vocational agriculture, whether they came from the urban or from the rural areas, and then for the boys to make a choice after Grade 9 as to whether they should continue or not. They found there was a substantial number of our rural students who continued on in Grades 10, 11 and 12. But we noted with interest, in examining the number of schools and the location of these schools throughout the province that not one high school in northern Ontario has seen fit to avail itself of this grant towards vocational agriculture in high schools.

Now, I am in sympathy, and I am sure

that all the hon. members of the House will be in sympathy with what my hon. friend has suggested would be an excellent idea in the establishment of such an agricultural school in northern Ontario, and his area in particular, but I wonder why, if there is such a need for an agricultural school in northern Ontario, the high school boards in his particular area, and indeed throughout all northern Ontario, have not seen fit to establish this vocational agricultural course in the high school itself.

I also would like to call to the attention of the House, through you, Mr. Speaker, that from the period of 1952 to 1963 there was a total of 45 students at the Kemptville Agricultural School from the area north of the French River in the province of Ontario. In the history of the Ontario Agricultural College there have been 116 graduates from the college degree course with their origin in the districts listed in that particular area, and 52 graduates from the diploma course from these same districts. This is in the entire history of the agricultural college.

I think it would be wise, Mr. Speaker, for us to point out that at the Western Ontario Agricultural School at Ridgetown the cost for tuition amounts to an estimated \$343 in the first year and \$328 in the second year, and at the Kemptville Agricultural School, again operated by The Ontario Department of Agriculture, the total approximate cost for students is about \$375. For all students attending approved educational institutions for degrees, diplomas or certificates, The Ontario Department of Education pays anything over \$10 for one round trip each school year for each student residing in the territorial districts. This applies to all northern Ontario students attending educational institutions in southern Ontario. I think this is a very good approach to the problem of providing education there for the students who may come from those respective areas.

We would like to advise, Mr. Speaker, that The Ontario Department of Agriculture has an agricultural educational departmental committee, the chairman of which is our assistant deputy Minister, Mr. Ken Lantz. It is composed of a membership of Dean Richards of the Ontario Agricultural College, Mr. E. L. Woodley, the principal of the Ridgetown agricultural school, and Mr. A. M. Barr, the principal of the Kemptville Agricultural School. I can assure my hon. friend that we have discussed with this educational committee the matter of providing agricultural education for northern students.

We noted that my hon. friend suggested that the interested young farm people of the

area which he represents should be maintained in agriculture by the provision of such a school. I am sure he would be the first to agree that it might be somewhat difficult to warrant the capital investment that might be necessary unless we were sure that there could be a very great demand from the areas involved for student attendance in such a school. We have found that in the establishment of the other two schools in southern Ontario there has been a time taken to build up the classroom population to the place where it is now making it quite worthwhile to carry on these schools. I would suggest that we continue our present programme and it might well be that we could give consideration to the establishment of types of short courses in northern Ontario. I think this is a very excellent way of bringing, in a very practical way, an agricultural educational programme not only to the young people who are on the farm, but also to those who are actively engaged in it as farm owners as well.

These are matters that are under active consideration and I would hope that we would be able to deal with them suitably as time goes on.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on this resolution on behalf of our group. I think the general objective of this resolution is a desirable one. I wonder if we could not become a bit more precise in terms of meeting that objective. I think the information that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has given us is extremely significant when we discover that in northern Ontario there has been absolutely no move at all by young people to avail themselves of what agricultural vocational training is now in the curricula and for which there are grants. I think this points up perhaps the need for a bit of leadership. But I wonder whether or not there is some possibility of meeting, at least in the initial stage, the objective that was in mind when the hon. member made this motion, by co-ordinating with it more experimental work in terms of meeting the particular needs of northern Ontario in those pockets where there is a potential of agricultural development.

The hon. member, for very understandable reasons, has concentrated a good many of his remarks on the needs of Manitoulin. The problem of northern Ontario in agriculture, as I see it, is that there is a particular need in Manitoulin, there is a particular need in Timiskaming, there is a particular need in Cochrane, there are certainly particular needs in Fort Frances, Emo and the town of Rainy

River, and there are other little pockets around Kenora and in the area between Kenora and Dryden.

I think it is a pity that many farmers are living a marginal existence there. Yet if one goes into the towns it will be discovered that most of the stores are selling chain imported vegetables and goods that might be produced in that area. I am wondering whether it would not be possible, wherever the opportunity presented itself, to establish on an experimental basis the possibility for developing the potential, providing the know-how to the farmers in that area, so that they could be encouraged to meet the local market instead of having the extra cost involved in bringing in produce.

I think another point that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has made is very valid. It is, that for a limited population like that of northern Ontario to contemplate the capital expenditure of a completely new school, quite apart from the difficulty of getting the brains and the experience which cannot be bought, is a pretty formidable obstacle. But I repeat, if one has experimental plots or experimental farms—in effect satellites of OAC down here—trying to cope with the particular problems of northern Ontario, and you combine with that some more leadership and direction at the extension level or the vocational level in the schools, then you would be both exploring the particular needs of the north, encouraging people to get into agriculture, and exploiting the potential, without getting into an unnecessary capital expenditure which at this stage would seem to be a white elephant.

In other words, I think the ultimate objective is a desirable one. It is one that has to be done in stages and some of the information that has come out here tonight, particularly from the hon. Minister of Agriculture, points up rather sharply what some of the initial stages are. Obviously what he has told us indicates that the people of the north themselves, either because they are not aware of what can be done by way of encouraging participation in agricultural activity or because enough leadership has not been given from here—and I would not pretend to say which—have not taken the initiative. Perhaps we should make a start right there.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I thought, was very fair and very analytic in his reply in discussing this resolution. As I think all of us know, resolutions are not placed on the order paper letter-perfect. We are not bound to have it stand up in a court

of law or anything like that. What we want to do, of course, is to get the idea across and to initiate discussions that will have a beneficial effect.

I agree largely with what the hon. member for York South has said. I want to comment on something the hon. Minister said when he intimated to the House that certain students from northern Ontario were going to Kemptville and certain other students were going to the agricultural college at Guelph. That, I think, is not the answer. I think when the hon. Minister said that the high schools were not taking up that particular branch of agriculture in the north, the story is told in a further comment of his when he said something about Kemptville.

He said that Kemptville, after it was established or when they were talking of establishing it, went through a time lag—there was a period of probation, as it were—before the people in the area responded to the full worth of that institution. What is found in respect to Kemptville will be found in respect to northern Ontario. You are not going to have an instantaneous response to any forward move of agricultural education in the north, but just as it came to Kemptville after a period of time, so it would come to northern Ontario and unquestionably would have a great and beneficial effect.

I can see this agricultural education in northern Ontario not as a reproduction of Guelph or of Kemptville or of Ridgetown, but I can see it as an extension emanating from these institutions up into the north.

I think the vital point of difference between what the hon. Minister has said and what we believe is this, that you cannot bring the people down from the north and educate them in our institutions down here, take them back up to the north and hope that they are going to reform the agricultural industry of northern Ontario. I think what has to be done for the people of northern Ontario has to be done in northern Ontario. And I think that is the vital difference in what we have been discussing tonight.

And surely, as one who knows the north as well as the hon. Minister and as well as perhaps most of us in the House are aware of conditions in northern Ontario, he must realize that certainly one institution in the north would not serve wholly or adequately the interests of the north. The conditions of the north are varied and there are pockets around New Liskeard, the head of the lakes and out into the northwestern part of the province, but as we look forward to the future of northern Ontario and agriculture as

one of its main contributors, I think we have to assess ourselves in this respect: that the people of northern Ontario in the agricultural field have to be given the opportunity comparable to what the people of southern Ontario were given with Ridgetown and Kemptville and Guelph.

Now, I am not saying that it should be a great, big institution, but I am saying that the knowledge and the extension services that we have flowing from these three institutions in the south must, in some way, in miniature as it were, be transplanted in the northern part of this province and be built up to serve the needs of the farm people in northern Ontario.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the department pay close attention to the Lindsay Vocational Institute because it has done a pilot project of this nature. The agricultural representative, Mr. Brown, in Lindsay, has been most helpful and has worked thoroughly and fully with the school officials to work out a programme. I think this could be of very great use to the people of Ontario, especially in northern Ontario where they have vocational schools, and I think they would find this would be very adaptable and provide a practical programme.

Mr. Troy: I would like to ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, in his research did he go into the operation of the agricultural school that we had at one time in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Where was that?

Mr. Troy: At Monteith.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That was not an agricultural school as such, it was a residential high school.

Mr. Troy: Well, it was called an agricultural school.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It was called an academy.

Mr. Troy: An academy, whatever it was, it was also characterized as agricultural.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I doubt that.

Mr. Troy: Well, I do not care if the hon. Minister doubts it or not, I know because I have had experience with students from that school.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: If the hon. member does not mind—as I understand it, the

Monteith Academy was a residential school in the early days in northeastern Ontario for students where there were no high school facilities. And it has been closed for many years.

Mr. Troy: I know it has been closed. At that time, of course, all I was interested in was knowing something about these young people who attended there, so I was not interested in agriculture in those days. The hon. Minister has heard of this from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, in whose riding Monteith is situated, and it was my understanding that it was an agricultural institution. But the hon. Minister has said, and my hon. leader has also said, that in the early operation of Ridgeway and Kemptonville, there were very small enrolments. Before the government decided to put up the institute of technology in Kirkland Lake a survey was made all across northern Ontario to find out how many young people would be interested in attending such an institution if it were situated somewhere in northern Ontario. At that time, the place was not designated but it was to be somewhere in northern Ontario. So I suggest possibly the same thing might be done to find out if there is an interest, and find out through the schools. If a survey were made in the schools in the north for the technical institute, possibly a survey could be done in the next year in our schools. I am sure there are certain sections in the Nipissing area, in the western section, down in the Chisholm section, in a fine agricultural area in Parry Sound, in Manitoulin, up in the New Liskeard area. I suggest, therefore, that a survey be made just to see if there would be enough interest to have a small agricultural school up north.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order to reply briefly to what has been said by the hon. leaders of both Opposition parties, I think they have been quite constructive in their suggestions. I would like to suggest that we are carrying on a co-operative farm basis, with The Department of Agriculture and certain individual farmers throughout the north, **demonstration projects** of one type or another. We feel that these are most important, they are having a marked effect. For instance, in the operation of cow-calf herds, in some of those areas where there is an abundance of pasture and hay. This is working out exceedingly well. In relation to the demonstration farm project at New Liskeard and Timiskaming area, John Butler, the farm manager there, is doing an outstanding job in bringing farmers into the

farm and demonstrating to them or showing them effective means of operating under northern Ontario conditions. This last winter we ran a short course there for a duration of a few days and we were pleased to find a very good response throughout the whole Timiskaming district from farmers who came there for a couple of days to take a concentrated course in practical agriculture. I think this is something that can be expanded throughout the north. I like the idea of these co-operative farms, to see how much interest really will develop. We would like to follow this through a little further in accordance with what has been said.

Mr. Troy: We are trying to encourage the young people to stay on the farm. The hon. Minister is talking about the farmers already established.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 9 by Mr. E. Sargent.

Resolved,

That the Ontario government be requested to pay grants in lieu of taxes on the same basis as the federal government on all property owned by the Ontario government or its agencies, except on property used for highway purposes.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, this is another case, along with the inequities between the province and the municipalities, where the government does not carry its tax load. Now, in Toronto today, these people in Toronto got their tax notices and the howling around Toronto is rampant tonight.

That is because — the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs might agree with me—the government is not paying its fair share of the tax load.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to correct the hon. member and say that as a Toronto member I have not heard any howls about the tax bills that he said went out tonight. As a matter of fact they came out quite some time ago.

Mr. Oliver: That is no point of order.

Mr. Cowling: Well, it is a pretty good try, though.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. member does not even know what is going on in Toronto, that is the trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: The set-up now basically is this, that the province of Ontario, on the buildings it has in municipalities, is paying on its own assessment, not the city's nor the municipality's. The province sets up its own assessment and pays taxes only on the land and buildings. It pays no education tax. The federal government pays taxes in municipalities on the assessment made by the municipality. It pays its full share of the education tax.

Now, I would suggest that business has to pay its full share of the education tax and briefly, watching the clock, I would suggest that the province measure up to its responsibility and pay taxes in municipalities on its property—such as The Department of Highways here—on the full assessment made by the municipality, and pay education tax. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I suggest the province stop scrounging.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Who is talking? Wow!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I think that with all due respect, as the lawyers would say, that my friend the hon. member for Grey North, His Worship the Mayor of Owen Sound, has not thoroughly examined this whole picture.

Mr. MacDonald: That is damning with faint praise if I ever heard it.

Mr. Oliver: I think it is leading up to something.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: This resolution proposes that Ontario should adjust its basis of payment in lieu of taxes to conform with the basis of the federal payments in lieu of taxes. Yet at the same time it proposes that the base on which these payments are made be more generously defined by the province than by the government of Canada to include, and I quote from the resolution: "all property owned by Ontario," and so on, "except property used for highway purposes."

I presume, from the statement of the hon. member, that he is of the opinion that the federal payments are more generous in nature than the provincial payments. To reach this conclusion on the ground of comparing the basis of payment only, giving no regard to the base on which the payments were made, would be just as misleading, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, as comparing the mill rates of two municipalities and paying no attention to the equalization factor with respect to the assessment.

Mr. Sargent: That is your fault, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is not my fault at all. The hon. member should just wait a minute. He does not understand anything about it at all. The basis upon which payments in lieu of taxes are made are roughly equivalent at the two levels of government. Both The Municipal Tax Assistance Act of Ontario and The Municipal Grants Act of Canada exclude properties which, in the main, might be described as public amenities, such as arts, reforestation projects, museums, hospitals and properties of that type. The exemptions are so closely parallel that there can be no criticism of the provincial Act on the basis of any comparison in respect of the federal Act.

Mr. Bryden: Did the hon. Minister type this up while he was reading it?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I have the two Acts here. I have looked at them and I have written this myself. I have had it here in my desk for many weeks. If anyone wishes to read the Acts I shall be very happy to present them with copies.

Mr. MacDonald: Take them as read.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member has already read them. What my hon. friend proposes in extending the properties, in respect of which payments are made, is that the provincial government would outdo the federal government in the extent of its coverage. The suggestion that the province extend its payments to the type of property now excluded by both levels of government boils down to a question of whether government should be expected to pay taxes on amenities which it provides for the residents of one area of the province.

Since both the province and the government of Canada have specifically excluded this type of property from the normal payment provision, I assume that the question was considered by the hon. members in both the House of Commons and the provincial Legislature; and that each group reached the same conclusion. That is, that these properties should be excluded from the normal payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. Sargent: Why?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Now, then, Mr. Speaker, in respect of the base on which payments in lieu of taxes are made, it is worthy of note that from the point of view of the municipality, the provincial Act improves on

the federal Act in at least one respect. The Ontario Act provides an appeal from the assessment established as that on which the government will calculate its payments. Valuations of federal property are made originally by the municipal assessor, but are subject to revision by The Department of Finance. I might say that such revisions, Mr. Speaker, are very, very frequent. Furthermore, there is no appeal to the municipality from the value set by The Finance Department of Canada.

Now, in the province, on the other hand—and I would beg the hon. member to pay particular attention to this because the statement that he made is incorrect—in the province of Ontario the original assessment is made by The Department of Municipal Affairs. The municipality may, if it chooses, appeal the valuation to the Ontario Municipal Board. Could we be fairer than that?

An hon. member: No, no!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: In respect of the payment of taxes for education purposes—

Mr. Sargent: Does the hon. Minister want an answer to this question?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, just wait a minute. I will answer questions when I am through with this.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister is answering his own questions.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am answering my own questions. I am giving the facts in relation to this resolution.

Insofar as the payment of taxes on account of educational expenditures in the province are concerned, I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members, that the government of Canada pays no portion of the cost of education in this province, except possibly small amounts in recent years for the construction of vocational schools. But it does not contribute to the cost of education below the university level.

Now then, education grants in the province of Ontario are based on several factors. But the most important ones are the assessment per classroom, or per pupil, as the basis on which the grant percentage is arrived at. So, the lower the assessment per classroom, or per pupil, the higher is the grant from the provincial coffers. So in order to get a better distribution of the financial support from the province to the boards of education, it is much more desirable—and much more just—with the system that we have in Ontario of distributing education

grants on this basis, is much more desirable and much more acceptable than if we were to accept the federal method of paying such grants.

There is one further aspect, Mr. Speaker, that I think we should bear in mind. That is that the provincial Act specifically directs that the commercial mill rate shall be used in calculating payments in lieu of taxes. The federal Act does not specify which rate, commercial or residential, shall be used. Further, although the Minister of Municipal Affairs may provide that no payment shall be made on properties for which municipal services are not available, the Minister of Finance of the government of Canada may deduct an amount from what might otherwise be payable for a service, if it chooses to provide that for itself, and to deduct—I quote this from the Act—"such other amounts as the Minister considers appropriate."

I understand—I have mentioned this before and I repeat it, sir—that as a result of the latitude allowed to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa there are many of these. I would suggest that most of the payments that are made by the federal government in lieu of taxes are negotiated rather than calculated.

Mr. Sargent: Forty-seven per cent taxes to municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, yes, I am sure that the hon. member is aware of that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, this is another case of where the hon. Minister says that if we are not satisfied we can appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. Is that not a joke?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I just said so.

Mr. Sargent: The Ontario Municipal Board is a creation of this government.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: But the hon. member cannot accuse the Ontario Municipal Board of being partial to anyone, whether it is appointed by this government or not. He knows that.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to remind the members that as mover of a substantive motion, the member has the right to speak a second time. But in speaking the second time, that concludes the debate.

Mr. Sargent: I am not talking about educational grants, Mr. Speaker. I am suggesting that what all the municipalities of Ontario want is for the province to pay its full share of municipal taxes. That is all

we are asking for. The government expects business and everyone else to pay their full way, and the province dodges out and says that they have special privileges. This motion is to have them pay their way, and I suggest that every hon. member of this House is responsible to his taxpayers and for the taxes they pay. Most of the hon. members have been in municipal government and know the sorry mess that things are in taxwise, and I think it behooves every one of them to help their treasuries and their local ridings and to vote for this motion, because it is important to municipal government.

Mr. Cowling moves the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The motion is out of order, as you yourself indicated the debate was closed when the hon. member spoke.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say "aye."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please stay quiet until I finish?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye".

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, what motion were we voting on?

Mr. Speaker: The resolution that you put before the House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I for one misunderstood the motion that was put by the Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member made the motion. All those that were opposed to the motion—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, yes, the members on this side of the House said "nay", and in my opinion the "nays" were in the majority.

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 10, by Mr. J. P. Spence:

Resolved,

That a committee be set up to study the feasibility of a select labour force to help harvest the crops in southwestern Ontario;

that direct contact be made to the selective service commission by The Department of Agriculture requesting their help in forming a select labour corps; that a similar operation to that used during the last war be set up with The Department of Education to ask for Grades 12 and 13 students to participate and also with the universities asking for first-year students.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to bring to the attention of the government, and especially to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the problem of the shortage of labour to harvest the cash crops, fruits and vegetables, in southwestern Ontario.

I might say that since this resolution was placed on the order paper a great deal has been said, Mr. Speaker, about it, under the estimates of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and also by the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson), and I do not want to take up too much of the time of this Legislature as the hour is growing later, Mr. Speaker, but I will touch on some of the points.

This shortage of labour has been a severe loss, a concern to the farmers in southwestern Ontario in 1963, and some of those who are in the agricultural industry say that if there is not something done to solve this problem of the shortage of farm labour for harvesting our fruit and vegetables, they are not going to plant their crops this year.

Now, the hon. Minister, when presenting his estimates, made a statement that steps had already been taken to help solve this problem. I think there was a meeting called in Chatham, Leamington and Tillsonburg co-ordinating the committee that was set up, and steps are being taken to see if something can be done to solve this problem.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time there is a real shortage of farm labour. Perhaps the co-ordinating committee has not got into operation yet but we are starting out of the beginning of the year with a shortage of farm labour, which does not look too promising for harvest time. There was not only a shortage of harvest labour but there is a shortage of workers for the processor too. He also has experienced a shortage of workers to process these crops.

I believe the hon. Minister of Agriculture also said during his estimates that unemployment insurance comes under the federal government, which is a true statement, and that he had nothing to do with it. I do know people who last year would have accepted employment in agriculture but they lacked

stamps in their unemployment insurance books to enable them to draw unemployment insurance in the winter time if they needed it. Naturally they did everything they possibly could to get employment in industry and construction, and I think it should be brought to the attention of the federal government that this is one of the problems it is causing: the shortage of farm labour in southwestern Ontario.

I know it is a federal problem, but the shortage of farm labour is a provincial problem, and I think if the hon. Minister of Agriculture drew this to the attention of the federal government it would help to solve the problem of these cash crop farms.

Since the hon. Minister made his statement in the House, about March 3, perhaps developments have taken place. I would appreciate hearing what has taken place since that time, Mr. Speaker, and maybe we have something bright to look forward to.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution that has been on the order paper for some time and which was, as my hon. friend suggested, debated during the estimates of our department some time ago, I would again like to reiterate the fact that the farm labour service function with The Ontario Department of Agriculture is conducted through the Ontario federal-provincial farm labour committee. The present composition of the committee is made up of representatives of our department, headed by the assistant deputy Minister, Mr. Gordon Bennett, with our deputy Minister for the province on the committee as well, and the executive officer of the extension branch, Mr. Montealm, who is also a member of the committee. The other members of the committee are members of the National Employment Service, located in the province of Ontario with the federal government.

The origin of this committee goes back to the period during the second world war, as my hon. friend has suggested in his resolution. There was a programme established at that time where the students were allowed to leave school prior to the end of the normal school term and were, in some instances, allowed to stay out of school in September, in order that the crops could be harvested. This was a wartime measure and it worked exceedingly well. A good many high school students availed themselves of the opportunity to get their year's work on the basis of providing farm labour service and I think it made a great contribution.

As a matter of fact, it was interesting to note that in 1944 there were 48 farm labour

camp established and they provided the services of 4,600 workers at that time. This is significant. This arrangement was continued throughout the war years and then following the war it was abandoned, as far as student labour was concerned. They could work in the summer holidays, but the business of letting them out early and keeping them out later in the year was abandoned.

Then, in 1952 there did not seem to be the same patriotic interest in farm labour that had been exhibited by other members of our society than those who were students at high school and university—I am referring to members of various types of work forces, the police, the firemen—many types of workers came out to the farms and rendered a very wonderful service, but this interest gradually disappeared and finally was entirely lacking in evidence. Today I must confess that there are some farmers who still depend on this source of help through private arrangements they make with various service industries in our urban areas.

Another thing that took place during the 1950s was the immigration policy of our government. The number of immigrants who came into the country, in many instances provided farm labour until they got themselves established through learning the language and becoming absorbed into industry in one way or another, until finally that source of labour supply seemed to dry up as well.

There has been a continuing programme established through the Ontario federal-provincial farm labour committee, working with the flue-cured tobacco growers' association in providing skilled workers from the southern United States to assist with the tobacco harvest. During the past five years an average of 3,000 workers per year has been admitted from the United States. Each year during the tobacco harvest a problem seemed to arise in accommodating itinerant workers, not only from the United States but from other areas of the province as well.

In 1962 an interesting experiment was set up. A tobacco harvest workers' co-ordinating committee was established in the tobacco-growing area. It arranged for the organization of a temporary camp to accommodate itinerant workers. A major portion of the financing has been assumed by The Department of Public Welfare and the municipalities involved. Under this programme the federal-provincial governments and the municipalities shared in the cost, with the major share of it being borne by the senior government. This project was again operated in 1963 and has worked very successfully in these two

years. I feel sure it will be continued in the future.

I think it should be pointed out though, in all fairness, that the matter which my friend, the hon. member for Kent East raises, is something of a seasonal nature really. Being of a seasonal nature, it becomes something of a problem for those farmers needing this help to have accommodation for the farm help. In many instances, arrangements have been made for the farm help to be transported from the urban community to the farm and back again and this has worked reasonably well. A typical illustration is the Toronto area here and the Bradford marsh, north of Toronto, where a great many farm help are transported daily back and forth from Toronto. Approximately 2,000 workers are supplied to several growers in these areas from Metropolitan Toronto during the season.

The federal government and our provincial government Department of Agriculture and Department of Labour have been working together to see how best we can cope with this situation which does exist as far as farm help is concerned. I think it will be an increasing problem to provide farm help in the future. Not any longer, really, do farmers want the type of help, generally speaking, who have nothing more to offer than their hands. More and more, farmers are interested in obtaining help who have a knowledge of operating machinery—very expensive and complicated machinery as well.

What I believe is that of necessity we are going to have to continue and to expand the training of young people from across Ontario in the operation of farm machinery—perhaps set up specialized courses in our schools at Kemptville, Ridgetown and Guelph, and I would like to suggest, in some of the vocational schools that are now being established in the province, to train these young people to be agricultural machinery mechanics.

We are training motor mechanics, as far as this is concerned, in our vocational schools and there is a great demand for these people. Young boys are interested in getting into these courses. I do not know of any who cannot find work. But really a motor mechanic is quite different from the type of mechanic who is required in a farm implement repair shop, shall we say, or as the operator of a farm machine. He has to know something more than just the mechanization of a gas or a diesel engine. He has to know something about the operation and adjustments of a combine, for example. These are things that are of a specialized nature.

We have now worked out an arrangement

through the recommendations of the farm machinery committee that was set up a year ago, to provide for the establishment of just such courses as I have mentioned, across the province of Ontario. I think they will meet a very real need in the future. With the hon. Minister of Labour I think we can work out something that will be of real benefit.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Labour for the government of Canada is proposing that there be an arrangement between the ten provinces and the federal government toward a farm labour agreement based on mutual co-operation and mutual participation, with the establishment within each province of a senior representative to carry on the work of the farm placement of labour in each respective province in co-operation with the federal National Employment Service.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to debate this matter here, but it does seem to me that we should look at this with a degree of anticipation because I think it has many possibilities. At the same time I think we should recognize the fact as a provincial government that the federal government provides the National Employment Service. They have offices and the machinery allocated, if I may use the term. They have the procedural, functional operation now going across the various provinces. It would seem to me to be a duplication of service if we were to set up a similar type of service here.

I would like to suggest, with all due respect to the idea that came out of the meeting that was called in 1962, attended by the various provinces and the federal government for this type of agreement, that we should now in the light of present-day circumstances, examine this proposal with the idea of leaving all of this matter of the placement of labour entirely in the hands of the National Employment Service in the respective provinces. We would co-operate with it in every way possible, from the standpoint of setting up our committee, working with it in an advisory capacity just as we have in the past, but leaving the actual operation of it in the hands of the organization that is now in operation.

I leave this to the consideration of the House, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we also should recognize the fact, and I do not suggest for a moment that this was what has generated my hon. friend's resolution, that last year was perhaps one of the most unusual years for the harvesting of our cash crops that we have ever experienced. We had that

type of season. It was cold and dry, and our crops did not mature—that is the cash crops did not mature. Then we got into a beautiful period of weather in September and October, and the crops finally matured. But a lot of these students had gone back to school and to university and so we found ourselves harvesting these crops at a time of the year in which they normally would not be harvested, and without the normal type of school help that is usually available.

Perhaps with the early growing season that appears to be in evidence already in Ontario this year, this will not be a problem. We certainly hope it will not be a problem to the same extent it was before, but I can assure my hon. friend that our Ontario federal-provincial and farm labour committee are aware of this matter. A survey is being conducted in the respective communities that my hon. friend referred to earlier, and in which meetings have already been held. We hope that a suitable and satisfactory solution will be worked out.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): In rising to support the resolution of the hon. member for Kent East, there are two brief points that I would like to make concerning the desperate urgency of the situation at present.

In regard to the farm students, I would hope that, possibly this year, a special dispensation can be given through The Department of Education to allow students to participate in the early planting. Yesterday I was in my riding, touring various areas. The manager of our largest packing house is down in Quebec on his own, recruiting labour to bring back to my riding this next week. They are very desperate.

But if it is possible for the students with A-1 qualifications to get off school this spring during the planting season without losing the grants to the towns or townships school boards, I am sure this would be greatly appreciated by the ridings in Kent and Essex counties.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I think there are two reasons for supporting the resolution now before us. The first is the one that the hon. member for Kent East explained quite well. That is the need, as far as is humanly possible, to assure an adequate supply of farm labour when it is required. I will not try to improve on what he said because I do not think it is possible for me to do that. He knows far more about the situation than I do.

I would, however, like to mention what I can see to be the second reason for supporting this resolution. That is through systematic

effort such as the resolution proposes. As I understand from the hon. Minister, an attempt is being made right now so that it may be possible to improve working conditions for farm labour.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that some of the worst exploitation of labour takes place in the farm labour field. Wages are low, hours are long and conditions are frequently deplorable. We have heard much about the unfortunate migrant workers in the U.S., in such states as California and also in the southern U.S. Those who have studied the problem of poverty usually list the migrant worker as one of the people most in need of attention and assistance. We have migrant labourers in this province, too, not on the same scale as California, but we certainly have it. Many of the same problems exist.

Indeed, according to what the hon. Minister has told us, and I think most of us knew it already, a good deal of this migrant labour is being brought in from the southern United States. The very people who are subject to exploitation in their own country are being brought in here. I suspect the wages they are being paid are far from adequate.

Also, these migrant workers in particular, are frequently the subject of victimization. I think some of this victimization could be remedied by regularization of the labour supply. That, at least, would eliminate the possibility of the fee-charging employment agent, who grabs off a piece of the already inadequate wages that these people get. It may also prevent some other forms of cheating that have been perpetrated upon them, and which are only inadequately covered by the provisions of The Masters and Servants Act.

I appreciate that this is a very difficult problem when looked at from both points of view. There is no question that it needs most earnest consideration. I would say that one of the methods, and the basic method we are going to have to consider if we want to improve the supply of farm labour, is to devise ways and means of providing proper working conditions and proper wages for these people.

I suspect that the situation is going to be tougher this year than it was, even, last year when there were exceptional circumstances involved. Unemployment is at a low level this year and, when people are not desperate, they are not going to get into the sort of situations that are all too often frequent in the farm labour market. So that the interests of both the farmer and the worker are protected, proper regularization of the whole market is required. Every effort should be

made to balance demand and supply as far as it is possible to do. Serious steps should be made to ensure that proper wages are paid and proper working conditions are available to these people.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, may I just have a word with respect to this matter, because it is one of some concern not only to the government, but to my department?

There are some points that should be kept in mind when considering this subject. I will endeavour to record them. Other than that, I would not suggest that we will be able to settle the matter this evening.

This matter resolves itself into a question of supply and demand. Those who operate farms, and are employers of labour, must enter the employment market. They will have to engage in the area of supply and demand and the available labour. The market price for the labour is a factor which will have to be taken into account.

There has been considerable discussion, particularly in the past few weeks and with reference to my own department, having to do with minimum wages and wages paid; and the general area of wages with respect to agricultural labour. Of this I am cognizant. I am concerned about the general subject matter. I cannot, of course, ignore it. The information that comes to me from a reputable and reasonably reliable source is that farm labour in this province is receiving no less than \$1.12 an hour, including board, or 92 cents an hour without board. I put this, I am sorry, in reverse—\$1.12 without board and 92 cents an hour with board. I simply record these figures in *Hansard* and before the House. I neither support them nor do I say they are wrong.

The question of the labour market, of course, has a direct bearing on the state of prosperity which our province is presently enjoying. The unemployment rate at the moment is 2.5 per cent in Ontario, which is probably the lowest known figure in history. Two-and-one-half per cent, of course, must be analyzed. We know that there are many areas requiring labour; unskilled in some cases, skilled in others, where the required bodies are just not available. At the same time we know that there are people seeking

employment, probably in other areas of this province, but we are unable to make the adjustment from where the supply is available to where the demand exists. And when we are talking about a 2.5 per cent unemployment figure, we are down to such a consideration as I am pointing out to the House.

With a view to attacking this matter, and to getting some information which is intelligible, information which our Department of Economics can deal with and which our Department of Agriculture can consider and which our Department of Labour can work with, we have endeavoured to go to the federal government to secure this information. It is recognized, and I state it and we are grateful for it, that we do have a high degree of co-operation with the various offices and officials of the National Employment Service.

If I might digress for a moment, I will state the policy of my department in these matters. We will endeavour to provide services but it is not our intention to go into areas where service is already being provided so that we avoid a duplication of effort. But in trying to get at this information of where this labour supply is available, why people are unemployed, we have met with a completely closed door and I put this before the House because I would not want any hon. member to come to any conclusion that would suggest by way of inference or otherwise, that the province of Ontario and this government is not interested in this tender subject matter. We are trying to analyze it, we are trying to get at the root of the thing, but we are being blocked at the moment because of certain positions taken by the federal government at Ottawa in not letting us secure the information.

Mr. Cowling moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that this House do now adjourn until 10:30 of the clock tomorrow morning, to rise for lunch and recess at 12:30 and resume at two of the clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.45 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 7, 1964
Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Report, standing committee on public accounts, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	2949
Third report, standing committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts, Mr. Beckett	2949
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	2950
Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964, bill intituled, reported	2950
Bailiffs Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported	2950
Resolution re Bill No. 44, concurred in	2950
Registry Act, bill to amend, reported	2950
Investigation of Titles Act, bill to repeal, reported	2950
Custody of Documents Act, bill to repeal, reported	2950
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, reported	2950
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, reported	2954
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	2954
Assessment Act, bill to amend, reported	2954
Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, reported	2954
Certain tax sale of land in the township of Herschel for the relief of Wallace Bullied and Norah Bullied, reported	2954
Division Courts Act, bill to amend, reported	2955
Notaries Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	2955
Vaccination Act, bill to repeal, reported	2955
Public Health Act, bill to amend, reported	2955
Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, reported	2955
Fire Departments Act, bill to amend, reported	2955
Credit Unions Act, bill to amend, reported	2955
Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, bill to amend, reported	2955
Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act, bill to amend, reported	2955
Ontario Law Reform Commission, bill to establish, reported	2956
Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, reported	2956
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, reported	2956
Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grants Act, 1960-1961, bill to repeal, reported	2956
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	2956
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, reported	2956
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, reported	2956
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	2956
Ontario Food Terminal Act, bill to amend, reported	2956

(continued on page 2964)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1964

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery, students from Highland Heights Public School, Peterborough.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George) begs leave to table the report of the standing committee on public accounts.

Mr. H. E. Beckett (York East) from the committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts, begs to submit its third report.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): **Mr. Speaker,** before the orders of the day, I would like to bring to the attention of the House through you, sir, a series of very important farm credit meetings.

Farm credit needs in Ontario are emerging as one of the most important problems in agriculture, and The Ontario Department of Agriculture is anxious to make all farmers aware of the various sources of credit, and uses and costs of credit. Therefore, a series of special meetings will be held in key centres in the province beginning on June 8 this year and lasting through to June 12.

The object of these meetings, which will be entitled "Farm Credit—Where to Get It and How to Use It," is to bring farmers together in these various centres to discuss the importance of credit in successful farming operations, and the types and sources of credit which are available. A special team of department personnel, in co-operation with the federated colleges in Guelph, will be made available for these meetings. All of them are trained and have extensive knowledge of farm credit problems.

Participating will be the economics department of the federated colleges; the farm

economics and statistics branch of The Ontario Department of Agriculture; personnel from the Kemptville and Ridgetown schools; the extension branch of the department, and also the information branch which will work with press, radio and television in the promotion of attendance at these meetings and in providing graphic, visual aids which will be helpful in understanding many of the complicated features of farm credit programmes.

Discussions at these meetings will cover the whole field of farm credit, from conventional loans on real estate which are presently available, and the various farm assistance loans which are available from the provincial and federal governments, to intermediate and short-term credit for which the modern farmer has a growing and urgent need if he is to manage his farm successfully.

At one time, conventional mortgages were able to provide the capital needed to acquire and finance a farm. However, the situation is radically changed today. Now, more than half the capital value of our farms is in the form of livestock, equipment, feed and supplies. More financing is required for short and intermediate use through loans issued by banks, credit unions, finance companies and merchandise accounts. Another source of credit is also emerging on a very large scale in the form of merchandise or sales credit. It is estimated in Canada at the present moment that there is some \$500 million of trade credit exposure to farmers from head offices of firms dealing in farm equipment and supplies. It is also estimated that there is probably this much again available to farmers by the dealers of these companies acting on their own responsibility.

Much of the credit advanced by dealers is in turn transferred to finance companies, and the whole process of this form of credit not only becomes costly, but can also result in unpleasant experiences. It may not be generally appreciated, but the fact is that the capital requirements per man in farming are about the highest of any industry in Canada, running about \$30,000 per man.

Under our family farm system we have the tradition of owner-operator farms. As farms change ownership, it becomes necessary to

finance a farm at least once every generation. There are over \$3.25 billion tied up in Ontario farms in farm real estate, equipment and livestock. Much more capital is also required for feed supplies, operating expenses, and living expenses until returns come in. Altogether this is a staggering amount to refinance every generation.

As well as dealing with the government loan programmes, and the conventional loans through banks and trust companies, this series of farm credit meetings across the province will also go into all of the other methods of financing and credit so that the farmers of Ontario will be able to arrange a sound management programme and also be alerted to some of the dangers and pitfalls in ill-advised credit programmes.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the thirty-second annual report of the Minister of Public Welfare, 1962-63 and the Ontario Hospital Services Commission annual report, 1962.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Fourth order, committee of the whole House; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

THE APPRENTICESHIP AND TRADESMEN'S QUALIFICATION ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 4, The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 22, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 4 reported.

THE BAILIFFS ACT, 1960-61

House in committee on Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Bailiffs Act, 1960-61.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 39 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

That, any amount payable by the Crown under subsection eight of section 94a of The Registry Act towards the cost of a judge's plan shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,

as provided by Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE REGISTRY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Sections 1 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 17:

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Concerning section 17, you will find the portion of the section on page 9 of the bill, subsection 6. I move that clause (b) of the proposed subsection 6 be amended by striking out the words "a deed, conveyance, mortgage, assignment of mortgage, lease, assignment of lease, plan of subdivision, release or quit claim made by", in the first, second and third lines, and by striking out the words "or by" in the fourth line.

Sections 17, as amended, to 37, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 38:

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, with respect to section 38, I move that the figure "8" be inserted before the figure "33" in the first line of subsection (1) and in the first line of subsection (2) of the said section 38.

Sections 38, as amended, and 39 agreed to.

Bill No. 44 reported.

THE INVESTIGATION OF TITLES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 45, An Act to repeal The Investigation of Titles Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 45 reported.

THE CUSTODY OF DOCUMENTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 46, An Act to repeal The Custody of Documents Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 46 reported.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

On section 1:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I can see that my logical argument on second reading of this bill had no apparent effect on the Minister (Mr. Davis). We still have the scale of maximum remuneration permitted for school trustees, unchanged from the time the bill was first introduced in the House. At the time, I got certain information about average daily attendance in the Metropolitan Toronto area. I regret to say I have since lost that information, so what I say now is purely from memory. My recollection is that there are only two school boards in this area with average daily attendance of 60,000 or more. I think they are the Toronto board of education and the North York township board. I do not think even Scarborough has that much. It may or may not. It is very close.

There are probably not, I would think, more than half a dozen school boards in the whole province that have a system with average daily attendance of 60,000 or more, with the result that your maximum of \$150, the highest maximum permitted, applies only to a very few school boards. The school boards to which it applies are school boards which in some cases involve very close to full-time work by some of the trustees, particularly by the chairman of the board. It seems to me quite ridiculous that in the city of Toronto the remuneration of school trustees should be limited to \$150 per month, or \$1,800 per year, whereas aldermen, I think after the next election, will be getting something over \$4,000, and by aldermen I mean merely city aldermen. Those who are on Metro council get a further supplement.

My observation is that there is just as much business to attend to and just as much time being consumed by trustees as there is by aldermen. I see no reason at all why school trustees should not get the same remuneration as aldermen if they take the responsibility of voting it for themselves and appearing before the electorate on that basis.

I think that in this bill, as in so much legislation that has appeared before this House over the years, the government thinks in rural terms. I have no doubt that in a school board where the average daily attendance is fewer than 60, a monthly honorarium of \$5 is in order, or if the average school attendance is less than 1,000 it may very well be sufficient to provide a monthly honorarium of \$40. But I think it is time in this province with its heavy urbanization that we started to look at problems from the urban point of view, and not have everything determined by what is satisfactory

in rural areas. I think that full consideration should be given to the rural areas and their needs should be considered. So, also, should the needs of the urban areas and particularly of the great and growing metropolitan areas.

The problem that has arisen in the past from the failure to permit any remuneration for school trustees, and a problem that will be only partly mitigated by the quite inadequate remuneration which is now to be permitted, is that it is difficult to get many people to serve on school boards. A school board has a tendency to become a select club of people who can afford to spend a great deal of their time without remuneration. I am not objecting to the service provided by those people—I think it is a fine thing that they offer their services—but in a democratic society I think elective office should be open in fact as well as in theory to all citizens and it should be financially possible for any citizen to serve in any elective office. The remuneration provided to elected officials should be sufficient to compensate them for the time they lose in attending to their duties as elected officers.

There was a comment from behind me referring to this House. I am not suggesting that there is any serious problem in this House at all. I think—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Who is supplementing your salary?

Mr. Bryden: Nobody is supplementing my salary. I really think, Mr. Chairman, that it is time we had an end to this type of cheap comment to the effect that some people in this House are somehow having their salaries supplemented in some improper way. If anybody wants to know, I am largely dependent on the income I receive as a member of this House. I have a small supplementary income which is purely from my own resources and has nothing to do with any other person. I hope that is settled once and for all and we will not hear further *sotto voce* comments on this matter.

However, I do not think, with regard to the members of this House there is any problem at all on remuneration. If there is a problem, it is nothing like the problem that exists with regard to school boards. The bill that the hon. Minister has before us now is a half-hearted, half-way attempt to solve a problem. I had thought that the hon. Minister was a more decisive man than that. In fact, I think in many of his activities he has demonstrated that he has greater courage and power of decision than is demonstrated here.

What he has put before us here is a feeble compromise that does not really solve the problem at all for at least the larger school boards in the province. It may be satisfactory for some of the smaller school boards, but I think it is time the hon. Minister looked at the problems of the trustees on the larger boards. I hope that, having done so, he may next year concede that what he has put before us now is quite unsatisfactory and come in with an amendment that will permit school boards to put their remuneration on approximately the same level as municipal councils are now able to do. I realize that it is difficult to create an exact parallel between school boards and municipal councils, but as far as it is possible to do so, I think they should be on exactly the same basis.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on that particular point, I think it should be pointed out that for many years the school trustees association of the province appeared before the standing committee on education and time after time recommended that there be no remuneration paid to the school trustees in the province. I have been a member of that committee for a great number of years and I was impressed by the fact that they were not asking for any remuneration. Many school trustees, and I say Toronto school trustees — I am familiar with them maybe more than other areas of the province—have for years been proud of the fact that they serve in their capacity of school trustees without remuneration and that is the way many of them still want it.

The very idea of paying a school trustee for the time that he or she may spend on work of his local school board would be impossible, because we cannot pay these people the amount of money that would compensate them for the hours they spend on their work. There is not any figure you could put on the great work they do. I say that this bill is a move in the right direction and will assist some people who need financial assistance, but I still think that the great majority of our school trustees in this province are public spirited citizens who wish to serve in the area of education without remuneration, and they are proud of this fact.

This attracts many types of citizens, for the most part very well educated themselves, who are prepared to take on and do their share of looking after the problems of education in our province without pay. I think it is a secondary matter and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any of our trustees or any people contemplating running for the board of education

will say, "We are going to be paid so we will contest the election on the first Monday in December." I do not think that applies here at all.

I think the whole purpose of the bill is perhaps to offset some expenses by way of gasoline and incidental expenses that a school trustee might incur in the process of his work. But I do not think at any time that we would expect, or that the school trustees and their associations would expect that we would be able to pay, or that they would be paid for the great services that they render to the citizens of our province.

I think the bill is a step in the right direction but as far as paying school trustees for their time and efforts, it would entail a great deal of money and I do not think that they expect it.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I think what the hon. member for High Park has said is true in the sense that the people who are our school trustees do a very fine public service job. I know that for a long time many of the trustees felt that remuneration was unnecessary, but I would submit this, that most of the people who at that time were on school boards had another source of income, and that source of income was not interfered with by their work on the school board. When we come to the very large metropolitan complexes we have today, some of the large municipalities in and surrounding areas of Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor and so on, we come to the place where, if a trustee is to do an adequate job, evening work is not enough. Very often it has to be supplemented by quite a significant amount of daytime work.

The way this is achieved today is by more ladies, who have the time, getting on the school boards. That is good. I think this is very good. But I know of many instances where a man who works, perhaps, on various shifts, both in a supervisory and a worker's capacity, has been cut off from the possibility of running for the school board because, if he did, it would mean that he would have to take a very significant loss in income.

I think that for this group alone it is important that they should not suffer financially if they want to do public service of this kind in the larger areas. Certainly, in my municipality and in others like it, the amount signified here is not adequate to look after the loss of income, which good people might suffer by taking on this kind of public responsibility.

I would submit, sir, that even if we

doubled the \$150 per month it would mean in the large municipalities, not more than ten cents per head per year. This would be a figure which, to me, is not a high price for us to pay for this kind of service. It would not add significantly to our tax rate; just a very small addition. It would make it possible for many people to do the job they would like to do in this field.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I want to make one thing very clear. We discussed this when the bill had second reading. We spoke of it in the committee and I pointed out to hon. members at that time that these figures had been discussed quite fully with the trustees' council, who conducted a poll of the trustees of the province on their own initiative. This is quite a new departure in the administration of schools, and the trustees' council felt—we seek their advice and guidance in these matters—that these amounts for the commencement of this departure from what has been the principle in the past, is perhaps quite adequate for this type of service.

As is pointed out in the bill, we are not referring to it as a salary. It is an honorarium. You should realize that 25 per cent of the trustees still voted against receiving any honorarium. I anticipate, as time goes on and the idea receives almost universal acceptance, that these rates will be altered over a period of time. But I want to make it very clear as I did to, I think, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) and the education committee, that these figures had all been discussed with the trustees' council, which organization is the spokesman for the trustees here in the province.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be mentioned, however, that the people who are discriminated against in this schedule are grossly under-represented in the trustees' council. If you take a simple poll of trustees in number, they would be swamped. The Toronto school board has a total of 18 members. If you take a poll of trustees, they would have 18 votes and 18 local boards, which have fewer than 60 days average daily attendance, would equal their votes. I believe that the trustees of the city of Toronto are unanimous, or almost unanimous, in wanting a higher scale. I think that their need should be considered. They are only 18. I do not know how many trustees there may be in the province of Ontario, but their responsibilities and the amount of money they are responsible for would be equal to that of several thousand others, if you take in the rural trustees. This sort of counting of

heads, by which the hon. Minister justifies his present policy, is simply not appropriate for the situation. We consider the needs of each board on its own merit—

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not say that the salary was determined. There was no question of a salary mentioned in the questionnaire. It was the number of people who wished to be paid. On the trustees' council the urban boards have as much say, if not more, than the rural boards.

The council is a group, and I cannot give the hon. member the exact figure now, who are representatives of the various trustee organizations. The poll was not conducted on what the people should be paid, so that the urban people on the trustees' council had as much voice or interest in the discussions on this provision as the great bulk of the people from outside the urban areas. It was not done in the manner that the hon. member suggests.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would still submit to the hon. Minister that the thing is weighted in favour of the smaller boards. It has to be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The trustees' council is not weighted that way.

Mr. Bryden: What weight would the Toronto board have, for example, in the whole council? Certainly nothing in proportion to the expenditures that the Toronto board is responsible for. Even so, the point, I would suggest, is still invalid if the bigger boards are in a minority. They should not be discriminated against. Their position should be determined by other people who are facing other problems. It is still part of this rural approach to the solution of problems and, I submit, the needs of trustees in the Toronto area should be considered on their own merits, and not in relation to how somebody votes in some small rural area.

Mr. Cowling: Have you talked to any of them?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, I have. One of the former chairmen, a prominent member of your party, Mr. Stainsby—

Mr. Cowling: What did he have to say about it? I have talked to them, too.

Mr. Bryden: What did they say? They are all against this.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, I think I could speak with a little

authority on this, having been the chairman of one of the largest boards in Ontario, the Scarborough board of education, for two years, 1961 and 1962.

Mr. Chairman, in the poll that was conducted by the Ontario School Trustees' Council, the boards were broken down by size. While the total vote was about 2.5 to 1 in favour of payment, the vote from urban area boards of education—the large boards which the hon. member for Woodbine is talking about—was against payment of trustees.

However, the trustees' council, taking this into consideration with all the facts, decided to again approach the hon. Minister, as they did, with the results of this poll. But I make this very clear—the large boards, including the Toronto board of education which I think has, through the years, voted against asking for pay for trustees and has opposed this measure at most trustee conventions that I have been at—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): That is to perpetuate the incumbent.

Mr. Wells: The Toronto board and the other large boards went along with the results of all the trustees of Ontario and asked for this legislation. As the hon. Minister has said, the trustees' council has seen this bill. The trustees of the large boards have seen this bill. While there may be one or two people objecting, most of them that I have talked to—in fact, the majority—are in favour of this as a good beginning. They agree with this. This is a new principle—an honorarium for trustees—and most trustees in this province, and the large boards, agree with this and support these figures as a good beginning.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 52 reported.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Sections 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 53 reported.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. Mr. Davis: In section 2—and I discussed this amendment with the hon. members for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and York South—I move that section 40 be amended by striking out "11" in the first line of subsection 1 and substituting therefor "12", and by adding thereto the following subsection

Where a township has a population of more than 10,000 according to the municipal census for the year 1963, the Minister may divide the township into two township school areas provided that neither area has in its public schools for the year 1963 an average daily attendance of under 300 pupils, and by renumbering sections 11 to 14 as 12 to 15, respectively.

Mr. Chairman, this was discussed, as I say, with the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for York South. It arose out of the representations to the education committee from some of the more densely populated townships. We are thus enabled, or the Minister is, to exercise a discretion, say, in Pickering or Markham townships, to allow two areas provided that the overall purpose or principle of the bill of having, say, a minimum school population of 300 is not altered, and we feel that this amendment will solve the situation that was brought to the attention of the education committee.

Sections 2, as amended, to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 54 reported.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 60 reported.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 62 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF HERSCHEL

House in committee on Bill No. 64, An Act to set aside a certain tax sale of land in the township of Herschel for the relief of Wallace Bullied and Norah Bullied.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 64 reported.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 65 reported.

THE NOTARIES ACT, 1962-63

House in committee on Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Notaries Act, 1962-63.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 66 reported.

THE VACCINATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 67, An Act to repeal The Vaccination Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 67 reported.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 68 reported.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 69 reported.

THE SECURITIES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 70 reported.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, may I ask whether the hon. Minister would consider an addition to subsection (7), the first clause? I wonder if the hon. Minister would consider giving the chief or the deputy chief the option to recall the full-time firefighter. This section ties it down. It does not give any flexibility to the performance of the fireman in coming back after hours. In small forces where we are limited as to staff, we are cutting our staff from six to four men per shift now. It gives us very limited protection, and if the chief cannot call back unless it is a disaster it ties him down pretty closely. I would like to see added: "If in the opinion of the deputy chief there is need but not a disaster." I mean, make it wider than that. Would he consider that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that I think the words "fire, flood or other disaster" leave a fairly wide latitude.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, yes, I am sorry, I see that now.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 71 reported.

THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Sections 1 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 72 reported.

THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 73 reported.

THE COMMISSIONERS FOR TAKING AFFIDAVITS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 74 reported.

ONTARIO LAW REFORM COMMISSION

House in committee on Bill No. 75, An Act to establish the Ontario Law Reform Commission.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would move that the following be inserted as section 3 of the bill, and that the succeeding sections of the bill be renumbered accordingly. The amendment is a new section 3:

The monies required for the purpose of this Act shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund until March 31, 1965, and thereafter out of such monies as are appropriated therefor by the Legislature.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide some small funds to carry on with the work of this commission.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Attorney General will have to tell us who they are and what they are going to do.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We will make that available soon.

New section 3 agreed to.

Section 4, formerly section 3, agreed to.

Section 5, formerly section 4, agreed to.

Bill No. 75 reported.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Sections 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 76 reported.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 85 reported.

THE RESIDENTIAL AND FARM SCHOOL TAX ASSISTANCE GRANTS ACT, 1960-61

House in committee on Bill No. 86, An Act to repeal The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grants Act, 1960-61.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 86 reported.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 87 reported.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 88 reported.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Sections 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 89 reported.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 90 reported.

THE ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 98 reported.

THE POLICE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, before this bill becomes law, may I state that I am violently opposed to subsection (1).

Mr. Chairman: Order! Wait until the section is called.

On section 1:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, briefly, referring to the Ontario Police Commission as formed, there is no parallel in Canada for a police commission in a province or even in

the government of Canada. We have another case, I would say, by the formation of this Ontario Police Commission, where things are swept under the rug. We have, increasingly, government by commission, where freedoms are controlled not by elected officials but by appointed officials who have no term certain for their appointment. I am glad to see that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) has called for a Royal commission to study the judiciary.

But getting back to government by commission, which we are having more and more of in this province, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has the municipal board to make his decisions for him.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The municipal board does not make any decisions for me.

Mr. Sargent: All right—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the member to be seated, please. This section has nothing to do with the setting up of the police commission.

Mr. Sargent: For the record, I am opposed to the formation of the Ontario Police Commission. It is not representative of the people of Ontario. The elected officials on that board are not representatives. They are judges, magistrates and lawyers. Crime Bill No. 99 is going to go on the record books as being the guidepost for our freedom in this province for a long time, wherein you tell the municipalities that they are going to be under the Ontario Police Commission. This is not organized crime, it is organized confusion we have here. We are passing our powers to the Ontario Police Commission.

Mr. Chairman: Order! This bill does not form the commission, it was formed two years ago.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I would hope, as a citizen of this province, the hon. Prime Minister will appoint to this Royal commission, not a justice to make our decisions for us, but people who are qualified in all walks of life—not just lawyers and magistrates, but people who are—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the member to stay on section 1 of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the Ontario Police Commission. I know the essence of time is in the estimates, but I want to register my objection that the police commission—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: I am not out of order, sir. I am talking on this police commission. I will bow to the chair, but it is a serious thing when we have to take our directions from a group appointed by this government to run our freedom in this province for a long time to come.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Sections 1 to 23, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 99 reported.

THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 100 reported.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 101 reported.

THE INSURANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Sections 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule C agreed to.

Sections 13 and 14 agreed to.

Bill No. 102 reported.

THE MORTGAGES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Mortgages Act.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 106 reported.

THE SHORT FORMS OF MORTGAGES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Short Forms of Mortgages Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 107 reported.

THE WAGES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, following the second reading of Bill No. 108, a number of representations were made with respect to certain provisions of the bill and I should inform the House that prior to that time a considerable amount of correspondence and a number of briefs were presented with respect to the provisions of the bill, and in view of all the material which has been presented with respect to the bill, I feel that perhaps it deserves further study and would ask therefore that it be not proceeded with at this time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat regretful that the bill is not being proceeded with. This means that for another year it will not be in force. I believe, however, that there are complications here so that the bill, although it had a worthy objective, could have had some undesirable side effects. If the legislative counsel are of the opinion that they cannot straighten it out to accomplish the desirable effects and eliminate the undesirable side effects, then I suppose there is no option but to let the bill go for another year. I would hope, however, that the hon. Minister will pursue the good idea that he has here with the idea of bringing in legislation next year.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say from our side, and I am speaking personally as well on this, that every day we meet this situation. I had one yesterday: some poor people who have come up against the abuses meted out by men who really do not deserve to be used-car dealers in the legitimate sense. I think that you recognize the necessity of something being done here. We agree with the point of view being expressed and I concur with the hon. member for Woodbine.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am indebted to both the hon. gentlemen. I might say that some of the representations that were made came from them. The problems which arise under this bill—it looked to me as if you might create greater problems in some respects than you solve and some of the other legislation which will be before the House in the committee of the whole shortly, will take care of some of the situations which we are attempting to resolve here.

Clerk of the House: Bill No. 108 will be held.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-62

House in committee on Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-62.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 110 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill No. 111 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, every person residing or ordinarily resident or carrying on business in Ontario, who brings into Ontario or who receives delivery in Ontario of tangible personal property acquired by him for value for his own consumption or use, or for the consumption or use of other persons at his expense, or on behalf of, or as agent for, a principal who desires to acquire such property for the consumption or use by such principal or other persons at his expense, shall pay to Her Majesty in the right of Ontario the same tax in respect of the consumption and use of such property as would have been payable if the property had been purchased at a retail sale in Ontario,

as provided by Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-61.

Resolution concurred in.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-61

House in committee on Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-61.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 10:

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, in respect of section 10, I move that the proposed subsection 5 be amended

by striking out "collectible" in the fourth line and substituting "payable".

Section 10, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 11 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 112 reported.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 113 reported.

THE RACE TRACKS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Race Tracks Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 114 reported.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

House in committee on Bill No. 115, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 115 reported.

THE INDUSTRIAL FARMS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 116 reported.

THE PENAL AND REFORM INSTITUTIONS INSPECTION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 117 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, during the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965, the expenses of the administration of The Homes for Special Care Act, 1964, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 118, An Act to provide homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care.

Resolution concurred in.

SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL AND SHELTERED CARE

House in committee on Bill No. 118, An Act to provide homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 118 reported.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, regarding Bill No. 118 as proposed by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond); there were some questions I wanted to ask him and he is not here.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 120 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Sections 1 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 121 reported.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 122 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, all land, except an interest in land of the Crown in right of Canada or any province of Canada, in a local roads area is liable to assessment and taxation under The Local Roads Boards Act, 1964,

as provided for in Bill No. 123, An Act to provide for the establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization.

Resolution concurred in.

LOCAL ROADS BOARDS

House in committee on Bill No. 123, An Act to provide for the establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization.

Sections 1 to 41, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 123 reported.

THE ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 124 reported.

THE ONTARIO HURRICANE RELIEF FUND ACT, 1955

House in committee on Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, 1955.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 125 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965, the expenses of The Department of University Affairs shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, as provided in Bill No. 126, An Act to establish The Department of University Affairs.

Resolution concurred in.

THE DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

House in committee on Bill No. 126, An Act to establish The Department of University Affairs.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 126 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the monies required for the purposes of subsection (1) of section 14 of The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 127, An Act to incorporate The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation.

Resolution concurred in.

ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL AID CORPORATION

House in committee on Bill No. 127, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation.

Sections 1 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 127 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the monies required for the purposes of The Public Hospitals Amendment Act, 1964, during the fiscal year 1964-65, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 128 reported.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 129 reported.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, Bills Nos. 130 and 131 deal with the same problem and I would like to make a remark or two on this

problem. Bill No. 131 may be the proper place, but if what I say should have any influence, some changes in Bill No. 130 would perhaps follow. Perhaps I could do it at this point.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, since these two bills passed second reading there has been a great deal of public discussion and some of us have been taking a fairly hard look at them. Certainly the Ontario Association for Retarded Children has been doing a very fine job in the province in setting up schools for retarded children and carrying those schools through. Some municipalities have been making certain grants to the associations and there have been other grants which have assisted the schools, but by and large this has been done outside the framework of the local authorities.

The suggestion is that some radical alteration take place in the whole setup of education for retarded children, and this is good. But when a major move like this takes place we should make certain that that move is in the right direction. I raise a question or two here as to whether or not the local council of the municipality is really the proper place where certain responsibilities should lie, because the council does not have the primary responsibility for education. It has little to do with education except for rather automatically passing the budget of the board each year. It seems to me that the local school board is the place where this responsibility ought ultimately to rest. That is, the education of retarded children should be part and parcel of the educational process of the municipality.

I recognize there are some difficulties, and it seems to me that if this authority is set up, it should be, in effect, a subcommittee of the board of education or the school board, in the same way that a library board is a subcommittee of the local council. The authority should submit its budget to the local school board. That budget should be gone over just as other budgets of subcommittees are gone over. It should be adopted and then the authority should administer that budget within its bounds. If it wants to raise extra funds as well as the many home and school associations may do for local schools, that is its own business, and it might want to do that for specific projects. As far as the operation of that budget is concerned, by bringing it under the school board certain things such as bus transportation and the purchase of materials and general supervision might be

much easier and could be more readily integrated into the total educational pattern of a municipality.

Now, as far as appointments are concerned, I have no quarrel with the bill. Two should be appointed by the local association for retarded children, but the others should be appointed by the board of education. Certainly it seems to me that one or more members of the authority should be members of the board; the rest, I think, logically would be as they are today, in effect, under the present setup, the parents of retarded children or people vitally interested in this field. I think that kind of responsibility would be accepted. Certainly people who are interested vitally in this field would accept such responsibility.

This way the authority becomes the primary concern of the board of education. It is responsible to the board both for appointment and for administration.

Now, I realize that, certainly, where municipalities overlap and *vis-à-vis* the separate school boards, where these exist, there would be certain problems. But I do not think these are insurmountable. Membership of the separate school boards could be represented on the authority and certain charges could be made for children who might otherwise be going to separate schools if they had the intellectual capacity to go there. These details could be worked out.

It also seems to me that since this is a very expensive bit of education, and one which so far has not had too much attention from local authorities, the province should accept more than the 80 per cent of the cost. Certainly 90 per cent, if not all of it. But 90 per cent, at least. That grant should be paid to the local school board, which would be responsible for its administration. Of course, the province would want to know how those funds are administered.

These are matters, I think, Mr. Chairman, that should be given very serious consideration and I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would take this matter back and give it that consideration in the light of the submissions I have made, and in the light of public discussion, and bring the bill back to us at a later date.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious that we all agree in principle that we want some manner or some authority to look after the 2,700 retarded children who are presently in the schools. To take this back at this point could delay this

for a year and none of us, really, Mr. Chairman, would wish this to happen.

As the hon. member has suggested, there has been some discussion in the press. It has emanated primarily from the Metropolitan Toronto council. I met with the chairman and four or five other members of the Metropolitan Toronto council this morning; I explained to them the very complex nature of this legislation and the suggestions made by the hon. member were very carefully considered. It was the judgment—and I think a proper judgment—in the evolution of this type of education that we had to keep local associations very definitely involved. I think we should all agree with this.

We also provided in the legislation that the municipal involvement would give the right to the actual municipal councillors, if they so desire, to sit on the retarded children's authority. This is very specifically in the Act. It departs from the board of education situation where the board of education can go to the council for operating costs and say, "This is our budget." The municipal councils have four members out of the six on the retarded children's authority and as a result are in a position to exert, I would think, substantial influence in the operation of these schools.

Also—and I think perhaps the hon. member notices this in the legislation, this refers to operation—there are no capital obligations imposed on the municipality. This will remain in the hands of the local associations during this evolutionary period. I stated when I introduced this legislation that it did not reflect what the end result may be in this type of education here in Ontario, but certainly it is a piece of legislation that is both unique and of great social significance. This is not purely an educational problem. The interest of the parents, the development of the attitude of parents, in many areas of the province, is still very necessary if we are to get these young people into the school.

I read in one of the editorials in the evening paper last night that there were roughly 40,000. Well, this may very easily be the case, but we only have 2,700 in the schools at this time and I think this indicates the depth or the nature of the problem and that these young people must be encouraged. I suggest that this is not the best way to do it, through our regular school programme. I think they have to be separated, certainly at this stage.

I appreciate the observations of the hon. member and as I told these people who visited me this morning, when the grant

regulations are considered—and these are important as far as this legislation is concerned—as far as we are concerned—we would be very pleased to discuss them with the Metropolitan Toronto council. I have no hesitation in doing this whatsoever.

May I refer to the hon. member's observation as to the amount of grant. We are paying a grant here in Toronto for the regular school system; I am just guessing at this at the moment; it might be in the neighbourhood of 34, 35, maybe as high as 38 per cent. I am not sure of this. We propose to pay a minimum of 80 per cent in this. It may be higher. It has not been determined. But I think it is obvious that the grant that will be paid for the education of these young people will be twice as much as would be paid if it were through the regular school programme.

Mr. Chairman, we have had interest in this from other jurisdictions. I regard this, quite frankly, as a very enlightened piece of legislation. I acknowledge there may be problems and it is not the end as far as the education of the retarded is concerned. I think this House can take some actual pride in what we have done for retarded children in Ontario and that we can all accept some degree of satisfaction for what we are attempting to do through this legislation.

I realize that it imposes some obligation on the municipality. One can go outside the city of Toronto and find areas where, if an attempt is made to do it through the board as the hon. member has observed, in some areas you are involved with perhaps a real problem as to whether it should be a separate school board or the public school board. Indeed, you can get involved in municipalities like my own where there are six or seven school boards that might be involved. After very careful consideration—and I assure the hon. members, this received the most detailed study—it was felt that this was the best way at this time to handle the education and development of the retarded in this province.

I pointed out these complexities and these problems to the group this morning. While I think perhaps that one or two of them still object to the thought of the municipal council being involved, I am satisfied that two or three of them at least realize the attempt that we are making here, and they recognize that perhaps this is the proper way to do it, certainly at this period in the development of this programme.

Mr. Young: May I ask the hon. Minister a couple of questions? He points out that the

capital cost will not be a charge on the municipality. This means, then, that the association itself will have to raise the funds, likely from the people within the municipality or from the parents of the children concerned?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as capital is concerned, a lot of these schools are presently in existence. We will continue our 50 per cent grant to the association. It is our hope that the association will channel into special areas its interests rather than to the education of these young people, that they will get into the adult workshop field where there is a great need, and where there still must be this very personal relationship. So that the associations—and this did not come easily to the associations—are under

this legislation, giving for one dollar or whatever it may be to the authority, the use of the existing school facilities for the operation of these schools.

They will carry on with these other areas of interests in the retarded and areas that I think we should encourage. Capital grants for construction from this government will continue to be the same.

Mr. Young: One more question, Mr. Chairman, if I may—

Mr. Chairman: It being 12.30 of the clock I do now leave the chair and we will resume at two of the clock.

It being 12.30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

(continued from page 2948)

Police Act, bill to amend, reported	2956
Law Society Act, bill to amend, reported	2957
Juvenile and Family Courts Act, bill to amend, reported	2957
Insurance Act, bill to amend, reported	2957
Mortgages Act, bill to amend, reported	2957
Short Forms of Mortgages Act, bill to amend, reported	2957
Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	2958
Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, reported	2958
Resolution re Bill No. 112, concurred in	2958
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported	2958
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, reported	2959
Race Tracks Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	2959
Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, reported	2959
Industrial Farms Act, bill to amend, reported	2959
Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act, bill to amend, reported	2959
Homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care, bill to provide, reported	2959
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, reported	2959
Municipal Act, bill to amend, reported	2959
Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, reported	2959
Resolution re Bill No. 123, concurred in	2959
Establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization, bill to provide for, reported	2960
Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, bill to amend, reported	2960
Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, bill to amend, reported	2960
Resolution re Bill No. 126, concurred in	2960
Department of University Affairs, bill to establish, reported	2960
Resolution re Bill No. 127, concurred in	2960
Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation, bill to incorporate, reported	2960
Resolution re Bill No. 128, concurred in	2960
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, reported	2960
Public Service Superannuation Act, bill to amend, reported	2960
On Department of Education Act, bill to amend	2960
Recess, 12.30 o'clock, p.m.	2963



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 7, 1964
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Department of Education Act, bill to amend, reported	2967
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, reported	2970
Planning Act, bill to amend, reported	2970
Resolution re Bill No. 133, concurred in	2970
University of Guelph, bill to incorporate, reported	2971
Mothers' Allowances Act, bill to amend, reported	2971
Resolution re Bill No. 135, concurred in	2974
Ontario Housing Corporation, bill to incorporate, reported	2974
Resolution re Bill No. 136, concurred in	2974
Sheridan Park Corporation, bill to incorporate, reported	2974
Legislative Assembly Act, bill to amend, reported	2975
Hotel Fire Safety Act, bill to amend, reported	2975
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, reported	2975
City of Toronto, bill respecting, reported	2975
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mrs. Pritchard, Mr. Villeneuve, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Young, Mr. Cass, Mr. Wardrope	2975
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to	2999
Executive Council Act, bill to amend, Mr. Robarts, second reading	2999
Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Robarts, on second reading	2999
Recess, 6 o'clock	3003

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1964

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

House in committee on Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, one further question I wanted to ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). He mentioned that so many municipalities have within them a great many local school boards. But in many cases there are a lot of local municipal governments, too, which cover very small territories. I was wondering if the hon. Minister interprets the council in this case as a county council, or as the council of Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): We interpret it as the council, not the county council. Actually, Mr. Chairman, the city of Toronto brought one matter to our attention and I intend to move an amendment. It is in 112, where it says: "request of the local municipality." The word "local" has caused some confusion and I am going to move that it be deleted.

Mr. Young: Cannot it refer to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. It does not refer to a county council, but it refers to the Metropolitan Toronto council.

Mr. Young: But a county council would not set up this kind of an organization?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, but I was speaking to some of the people, I think from Essex county, and indicated that I thought we would look into this when the regulations are drafted. There the county council is presently doing it. We think we can work this into the regulations to allow the county council to continue making the grants on behalf of all the municipalities.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I have followed the progress of this bill with great interest. In addition to that, I have listened carefully to the remarks made in the House, particularly by the hon. member for Yorkview, and noted with some interest the

various editorial comments and the comments put forward by Mr. Bascom St. John in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. I have been amongst those who, for the past five years, have constantly prodded the government to take some action in the field of the education of retarded children. I have, on previous occasions and I will again this afternoon, compliment the hon. Minister of Education for his approach to this subject. I have said before and I say again this afternoon that he did not change his mind, or his views, once he became a Cabinet Minister. He is carrying out the ideas he expressed as a private member. I think he is carrying them out in this field, which is of utmost importance, in a most commendable fashion.

I deprecate the thought put forward by the hon. member for Yorkview that the bill be taken back for a further look. This idea of examination and re-examination, because possibly we have not come up with all of the final answers, has so often been used as an excuse to postpone indefinitely any action, that I wonder if this might not have been in the mind of the hon. member for Yorkview when he put forward this suggestion.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, this House has not yet prorogued. We have time between now and the end of the session to examine this bill carefully, and to bring back whatever recommendations we may wish to bring. I had no intention whatsoever of delaying the passage of this bill because I feel, as the hon. member for Downsview feels, it is a very important thing to get action—and action quickly—on this. All I was concerned about was that we get action of the right kind. Now, certainly, I would not want to delay the passage of the bill. But this House still has time to give it whatever examination it needs and to finalize the third reading of this bill before we finish our session.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am very appreciative that the hon. member for Yorkview has cleared his position. I would have thought—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting to hear the gold dust twins parrotting away as usual, full of sound and fury and signifying absolutely nothing.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I am most pleased that the hon. member for Yorkview has cleared the record and stated his position that it was not his intention to delay this bill. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Yorkview is not nearly as naive as he would have us think he is. He has been in politics for a long time and he recognizes at this point that, had the hon. Minister accepted his suggestion, that this bill would not have gone through in this session of this Legislature.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Nonsense.

Mr. Singer: You can nonsense as long as you like, but the facts speak for themselves in this matter, the same as they did for your approach to Bill No. 99 and the supporting bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to say a few words about the bill. This is a very difficult situation with which to cope in legislation. I recognize the difficulties that are involved in bringing together the various groups. I think the series of suggestions that are brought forward in this legislation seem to be eminently reasonable. Certainly, we do not want to discourage, nor should we, those selfless people who over all these years have created an opportunity for education of educable retarded youngsters.

These people, by and large, are the parents of these youngsters. But there are other interested people who have engaged themselves in this work. I think these people should continue to have some sort of a say in how this education system is going to be carried on. This I would imagine would be the reason, and in this my good friends from the NDP can recognize I am imputing motives to the hon. Minister, I would think this might be the reason why he has two people to come on the board who will come from this group of parents, or people who have been charged in the past with the education of these youngsters. I think this is most commendable.

This perhaps is one of the reasons, as well, why the conduct of these schools will not be carried on by an elected board. So many of these parents have such intolerable burdens in maintaining their family and in running their homes in view of the great tragedy that has been visited upon them. In my opinion it

is most unlikely that, had this been thrown open to an elected body, that these people whose experience has been so valuable and who know what the problems are in this field, would have been in the position to offer themselves for public office.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there has been an outcry reflected in the papers, and from other places, that we are taking away from the elected people the right to control this spending of public money. If this was, in fact, the case, I would have joined the criticism. But Mr. Chairman, this is not the case at all. What the hon. Minister is proposing is that the council, which will be responsible, will appoint four people of the six who will serve on the board to carry on these educational matters. The council can appoint four of their own members. What could be more responsible to the elected people than giving the council absolute control of the conduct of these schools? So I say, there has been no infringement at all on the rights of the elected members in dealing with this matter. There are other bodies that have done this, but this is neither the time nor the place to deal with that sort of criticism. But in this case such criticism is not true, in my opinion.

Then there is the suggestion made by the hon. member for Yorkview that these boards of education could do it better. Well, to some extent, and I say to some minor extent, he made a point. They do have administrative set-ups. They have mass-purchasing facilities. They are familiar, perhaps, to a greater extent with running buildings and maintaining them and that sort of thing, and to that limited extent only it might be a better administrative move to fix some responsibility on them.

But to suggest, sir, because they are concerned with education, that they know more about this type of education than the council or the board that is going to run these schools for retarded children, I think is a real error. The boards of education in the province of Ontario are not trained in providing education for retarded youngsters. And any hon. member who has concerned himself with the problem of these youngsters, will recognize that this is an abnormal problem. Unfortunately it is an abnormal problem, a problem that needs a different type of person from those we find in our education system, to take over, administer and control such a system. And for these reasons, I think it is important that the responsibilities be separated.

There is one more reason why I think the responsibilities should be separated and that is because of the difficulty in the split juris-

dictions that exist in our educational system between public and separate schools. If you gave the responsibility to boards of education, would you give it to the public school boards or would you give it to the separate school boards? Or would you give each board its own responsibility? Then would we have to face the problem of having public schools to be run for retarded youngsters and separate schools to be run for retarded youngsters? I do not propose to get into the argument about whether the system of public schools or separate schools is good or bad. But I say that if into this serious problem we inject an argument between public and separate schools, then we are ignoring the urgency of providing public aid for retarded children.

Retarded children have a common problem and it does not depend on which religion they happen to belong to. But I would say that in giving jurisdiction to the boards of education, you would have a very serious problem and perhaps end up with two competing systems of schools for retarded youngsters. This would do the whole cause that we are espousing today no good; it would do it serious harm.

For these reasons, I commend the hon. Minister on the legislation he has brought forward and I have no hesitation in suggesting that it will be supported this afternoon. My criticism is that it was not put on the statute books some years ago. It should have been there five years ago or even earlier. We do not make too much progress in these matters too quickly, but here in this instance there is progress being made. In my opinion this legislation deserves the support, not only of all hon. members of the House, but all members of the public of Ontario, because there is an awakening social conscience which recognizes that the horrible misfortune of retardation can be visited upon any family in Ontario through no fault or for no reason that medical science has been able to tell us about. With the social conscience we like to believe that we have in this province, we must accept as a communal responsibility, the best care and system of education for these youngsters that government is able to provide.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister for his comment on the situation which prevails in North Bay. As he very well knows, we have a very fine school there now and many of the children are sons or daughters of parents who live in the city of North Bay and in Widdifield and West Ferris. When we speak then

of the council, would it be—since the building is in the city of North Bay and since the city of North Bay donated the land on which the school is erected—the council of North Bay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two comments on the observations of the hon. Minister this morning. First of all, the hon. Minister said something to the effect that it was not appropriate to integrate the education of retarded children into the regular school system, since clearly the problems are quite special.

I would just like to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that there was absolutely nothing implicit in the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkview that there should be such integration. The point that the hon. member for Yorkview was trying to make—and which he made quite successfully, I think—was that the administration should be in the hands of people who are primarily concerned with education.

The hon. Minister stated that this is not exclusively an educational problem and I agree with him. It is, nevertheless, primarily an educational problem. We believe that the administration should be the responsibility of the school boards, not with the idea that there will be an integration necessarily into the regular school system, but that the same people will be responsible for the administration of this phase of educational effort. After all, for school boards, education is the sole preoccupation; that is the sole thing they are concerned about. Municipal councils are only secondarily interested in education. They have before them many problems which in terms of their responsibility are more pressing than educational problems. That is why we feel that the people who spend all their time, in their capacity as elected representatives, concerning themselves with educational problems are the people who are best qualified to deal with this matter.

I am aware that there are administrative difficulties, some of which the hon. Minister outlined and others of which were outlined by the hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Chairman. I would point out, however, that there are going to be administrative difficulties whatever way it is done. I suspect that as far as small municipalities are concerned, the long-term solution is going to be to arrange some sort of system of transportation of pupils into the larger areas.

I doubt if even in terms of our municipal organization, every municipality is going to be able to have a school for retarded children. The fact that there are even more school boards than there are municipalities, I do not think is a significant point. The point is that in the areas in which—certainly in the early stages at any rate—you are going to get the schools for retarded children, the school boards are quite capable and large enough to handle the problem. We feel that in view of their experience and interest they are best qualified to deal with it.

The second point that was made by the hon. Minister and was emphasized at great length by the hon. member for Downsview, was to the effect that if we took time to take a good hard look at the policy involved in this bill, and Bill No. 131, it would mean delaying all action for a year.

Mr. Chairman, we in this group do not accept that proposition. I do not know if the hon. member for Downsview is prepared to accept the idea that when the Tory back-benchers get tired, everything has to be compressed and we have to rush through at the tail end of the session, and if we ask for further consideration of a bill—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the member to deal with section 1 of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: We believe that if further consideration appears to be in order, then we should give it that consideration. We should stay here as long as is necessary to give necessary consideration and to arrive at a final conclusion. As far as we are concerned, Mr. Chairman, we have raised certain points. The hon. Minister may consider that they are not valid or do not have sufficient validity to merit any further consideration on his part. That is his privilege and that is fine. But I suggest the fact that we are suggesting further consideration does not, in any sense of the word, imply that we do not want this bill passed at this session.

Certainly we want it passed at this session. All we are concerned about is to make sure that it is the best possible bill that we can pass. I will say quite positively for this group in regard to this or any other legislation, that we are prepared to stay as long as is necessary or to come back if necessary, to give complete consideration and all consideration that is necessary to any legislation before the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, certainly the observations made by the hon. member

for Yorkview were considered very carefully. What he suggested here this morning really was part of the consideration that was put into this bill, there is no doubt about that whatsoever. We had to weigh the various avenues that this problem might be approached through, and it was the decision in weighing all the problems that this would cause the least difficulty.

I said earlier and I say again, that we do not say this is to be absolute, that this is the end. I think that there will be further evolutions of this type of legislation and this type of education. These are the things that we only learn through experience.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 130 reported.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

On section 1:

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I move that section 1(12) as set out in section one, be amended by striking out "local" in the second line and in the fifth line.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 131 reported.

THE PLANNING ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 132 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the property vested in the University of Guelph and any lands and premises leased to and occupied by the University of Guelph are not liable to taxation for provincial, municipal or school purposes, and are exempt from every description of taxation so long as the same are actually used and occupied for the purposes of the University of Guelph,

as provided in Bill No. 133, An Act to incorporate the University of Guelph.

Resolution concurred in.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

House in committee on Bill No. 133, An Act to incorporate the University of Guelph.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 12:

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I move that clause (b) of section 12 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The heads of academic departments within (1) the university, (2) the Ontario Agricultural College, (3) the Ontario Veterinary College, and (4) the Macdonald Institute.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who proposed the amendment, whether this means that the government would not consider the agricultural college and the other institutions he mentions as being colleges under the whole university. Why would the amendment be required?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, if there is any discussion in connection with this bill, perhaps we could leave it until the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is back. He sponsored the bill.

I could read the section that is being taken out. It has only to do with the setting up of the senate. The section that is being taken out is: "the heads of academic departments within the university" and in place of that is the amendment, as I have stated:

The heads of academic departments within (1) the university, (2) the Ontario Agricultural College, (3) the Ontario Veterinary College, and (4) the Macdonald Institute.

Mr. Nixon: My question, sir, was simply that the amendment would indicate, for example, that the Macdonald Institute would be on a par with the university. Surely the university has overall jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I know something about this. The problem arose when the faculty group at OAC and OVC were concerned that subsection (b) referred to the heads of the academic departments within the university only. We felt, quite frankly, that this included the academic heads of the colleges. It does not place the colleges on a par with the university, but it makes it quite clear that the academic heads will have representation on the staff from the colleges. This was only to clarify this for the people there.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question of the hon. Minister in the light of this answer? The amendment recognizes that there are both departments and colleges. I wonder if, looking to the future, it might not be better simply to put it in that form without naming the colleges. It is conceivable, in the growth of the university, that other colleges may be established within it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Chairman, that if this occurs we should do it then because you can also run into situations, say, of faculties. We are trying to keep it as uniform with the other university bills as possible. I think at this time we are covering the immediate problem. If other colleges are created there, we can add them to this legislation.

Section 12, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 13 to 32, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just before the bill is carried, I would like to ask someone on the Treasury benches what the position would be of the staff at the new university. The understanding is that they are presently considered as civil servants, and have rights under the pension plan as such. What disposition will be made of this difficulty? I understand there was a similar difficulty when the Ryerson Institute was chartered a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows. I cannot give you the explicit answer. I think this was discussed, actually, when the hon. Prime Minister was debating. I believe it was Tuesday evening. I think it was indicated then that the matter would have to be considered and studied as to how the transfer may take place. I think that there was a discussion at that time on it.

Bill No. 133 reported.

THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

On section 1:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this section of the bill because it seems to me that again the peculiar psychology which permeates the department reflects itself in this section.

I refer particularly to subsection two dealing with dependent children born out of wedlock. The hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) has, in this instance reduced the period of time from six months to three months, after which time the mother will be eligible for mothers' allowance.

I suppose, in the general pattern of government, one could say that a reduction in time from six to three months was a step forward. But I might say to the hon. Minister that the legislation flies in the face of logic. I do not pretend that logic underlies legislation, but in this particular section it certainly does not do so.

It may be that the government wants to encourage mothers to give up their children by forcing a three-month period before they become eligible for mothers' allowance. In certain instances it may indeed be desirable for mothers with illegitimate children to do so, but that is a highly undesirable way of having it accomplished.

It may be that the government wishes to have these women and their children on general welfare for a three-month period prior to the mothers' allowance, but why they should be receiving a lesser amount when they are entitled to the greater, again defies logic.

It may be that you feel that to provide mothers' allowance from the outset will be an inducement to more children born out of wedlock, but this of course is also irrelevant and has no logic in the bill.

The point is, I think, Mr. Chairman, that illegitimate children, and mothers who give birth to such children, need financial support from the moment of birth. To place this three-month restriction on them is absurd, and to suggest in reply that they will have general welfare allowance is to discriminate against them in the amount of money they will ultimately receive. As always, it is the children who are penalized for the folly of a piece of government action.

If any investigations have to be conducted, if the children's aid society has to look after the children, if the mothers have to be stabilized, if there are certain domestic factors that have to be looked into, all of this can be done while the mothers' allowance is being paid from the date of birth. We in this political party think that the three-month stipulation is an objectionable one and I would therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that subsection two of section one of Bill No. 134 be amended by striking out the words "and her dependent child is three months or more of age" in the proposed new clause four.

Mr. Chairman: Members, you have heard the amendment. All those in favour please say "aye."

All those opposed—

Mr. Troy: Could we have a comment from the hon. Minister?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I was listening very closely to that amendment. I would like to have it to read, because I do not know exactly what it purports to do. What I am doing right now is reducing what is in the statute from six months to three months, rather an encouraging factor—

Mr. S. Lewis: We are trying to remove the restriction altogether.

Hon. Mr. Cecile:—rather an encouraging factor to have the woman take care of her child, not encouraging her to have more of those children, but rather—

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, that is in fact the psychology, I would not have believed it!

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I do not agree with the hon. member on that.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister seriously suggesting that the difference between paying mothers' allowance to the mother immediately as against three months later is going to encourage illegitimacy? Surely there are other reasons for it, than a certain amount of money that may be involved for the benefit of the child and for the benefit of the mother after she has given birth to the child, and surely both of those are matters that should be taken into consideration.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the reason for it is that before this, as you know, first of all, in the law there was no recognition at all. Originally this came about in a matter of a year, it came about later on in a matter of six months, and we feel now that with the ability that there is at our command, with the law and everything else for investigation purposes, that it does not maybe take that long to find out about a putative father or that sort of thing.

At the same time, if the mother shows a willingness to take care of that child, instead of waiting for six months we would like to give her mothers' allowance in three months, and I think that she has that privilege of doing so if she shows good will. Otherwise, the

child is taken care of, either by the children's aid society or other means, and it gives also the opportunity of—just as in adoption cases—seeing how the child is and if it is normal and in every way physically fit, and also mentally fit. There are many reasons for this. The only thing this is really doing is reducing the time from six months to three months as far as the statute is concerned.

Surely if it was understood, that I was trying to encourage that—that is what I gathered from the hon. member's remark, that he was thinking that I was trying to do that. I am encouraging nothing, I am just providing a lesser time for a mother to be able to receive mothers' allowance.

Mr. Bryden: Why not go the whole way and do it right?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I think it is quite proper and, as I have said before, these matters are quite elastic and in such a way that we can look at it further, and as we go along we develop them.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, we in this party feel that the child, whether it is born out of wedlock or in wedlock, should be treated the same across the board. It is too bad that the government again is taking a mincing, half-hearted step, and we support the amendment, that the word "three" should be taken out entirely.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the amendment please say "nay."

In my opinions the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I find that the amendment is out of order. This has been drawn to my attention and is the reason for my bringing it to your attention at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, we are in the middle of a vote. You cannot change your mind on the matter; you had the vote.

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. It has been brought to my attention that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would say that it has been brought to your attention too late.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Oliver: No, surely I can speak on this for a moment—on a point of order. What is the hurry? I want to talk for a moment.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Surely a ruling has been made and the proper procedure is to—

An hon. member: It has not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, the Chairman is quite competent to make rulings but there are times to make rulings and there are times when that ruling is not valid, and this is one of the times. This question was asked and the question was put and the vote was called. Surely, at this stage of the game we are not going to go back and say that the motion itself is out of order because of some technicality my hon. friend raises.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): You sound more like Agnes Macphail every day.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! If you wish to appeal to my ruling that is your privilege.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I wish to appeal your ruling.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it has been a well established principle of this House and of the legislature of Great Britain that once the division bells have rung, nothing can be done until the vote is taken. Mr. Chairman, for you to fly in the face of that established tradition because a Cabinet Minister suddenly has discovered something and tries to raise it completely out of order, is against all of parliamentary traditions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. We are in committee and this is the method in which we work.

Mr. Bryden: I hope not.

Mr. MacDonald: You cannot make up the rules as you go.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think as the mover of the amendment, I might have some small place in suggesting something. I fear we are making a mockery of the process. The amendment was made; the Chair accepted the amendment. A vote was called, the vote was held. We are now asking merely to register the vote. You do not stop or suspend a vote in

these proceedings. You are not even giving the Opposition an opportunity to discuss the basis on which you rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. Bryden: We have not even heard it yet.

Mr. S. Lewis: And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it flies in the face of all parliamentary procedures.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Are you afraid you will not win the vote?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I have made a ruling and if you want a standing vote on my ruling, five members may stand and ask for one.

Mr. Singer: It is just fantastic to abort the rules of the House.

An hon. member: Ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman: Will you sit down, please? Order.

All those in favour of the Chairman's ruling, please stand.

Several hon. members: Which one?

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members. Are all the members satisfied that every member is in? All those in favour of the ruling, please stand.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Let us see all the Socialists stand up together.

Mr. Singer: You cannot distinguish between principle and—

Mr. Chairman: Order. All those opposed to the ruling, please stand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Now the question is who is the leader over there?

Mr. MacDonald: It is a good question over there, too.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 55, and the "nays", 28.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the ruling is upheld.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 134 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the monies required by the Treasurer of Ontario,

(a) to purchase any debentures, bills or notes of the Ontario Housing Corporation; and

(b) to make advances to the Ontario Housing Corporation in such amounts, at such times and on such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in council may deem expedient, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 135, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Resolution concurred in.

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION

House in committee on Bill No. 135, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Sections 1 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 135 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the monies required by the Treasurer of Ontario,

(a) to purchase any debentures, bills or notes of the Sheridan Park Corporation; and

(b) to make advances to the Sheridan Park Corporation in such amounts, at such times and on such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in council may deem expedient, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 136, An Act to incorporate the Sheridan Park Corporation.

Resolution concurred in.

SHERIDAN PARK CORPORATION

House in committee on Bill No. 136, An Act to incorporate the Sheridan Park Corporation.

Sections 1 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 136 reported.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to. Bill No. 137 reported.

THE HOTEL FIRE SAFETY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Hotel Fire Safety Act. Sections 1 and 2 agreed to. Bill No. 139 reported.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 142, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act. Sections 1 to 17, inclusive, agreed to. Bill No. 142 reported.

CITY OF TORONTO

House in committee on Bill No. Pr17, An Act respecting the city of Toronto. Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to. Preamble agreed to. Bill No. Pr17 reported.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves that the committee rise and report certain bills without amendment, and certain bills with amendment, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report it has come to certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The second order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into committee of ways and means.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the member for High Park what member follows the member for Glengarry on the Budget debate?

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): The hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent). I think the strain of the last vote was a little too much. I will arrange to have them in here if we could just go on with the debate.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask who follows the member for Grey North?

Mr. Cowling: The hon. member for Hamilton (Mrs. Pritchard).

ON THE BUDGET

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the Budget. First of all, I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister on Bill No. 118, which provides special home care, and the hon. Minister for the Bill No. 135, which incorporated the housing programme for the province of Ontario.

But mainly I am concerned with the report in the *Hamilton Spectator* of last night and the night before in the matter of nursing homes. I have had a great deal to do with the nursing homes in Hamilton. In my reply to the Speech from the Throne, I emphasized the need for more rigid inspection. I was appalled when I read this report, although I have reservations, some of the things stated in this report have certainly not been brought to my attention. When I have had complaints, and there have been many, immediate action has been taken.

In this report it says that people have been brutally treated, chained to the bed or made to sleep in soiled linen. I am wondering why the city of Hamilton, on a report like this, has not immediately rescinded the licence of the homes involved.

Nursing homes, by and large, have played an important role in taking care of our aged citizens. We have been very thankful that we have had these institutions available, but with the conditions prevailing in those mentioned I certainly feel that drastic action should be taken. In Hamilton we are building a 100-bed care wing attached to Macassa Lodge, which will be opened in the fall and should relieve some of the existing conditions.

In last night's paper, the director of the board of St. Peter's Hospital has confirmed that they are willing and able to place 30 to 50 senior citizens. They are handicapped by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission not recognizing this need. I am hoping that the commission will meet with the directors and see if it is possible for something to be done.

I feel very concerned that perhaps two or three very poor nursing homes are being criticized; because they perform a necessary service. Many of them I have inspected myself. I know exactly what they are like. I do not look, in a nursing home, for hospital cleanliness and the standards maintained

where sick people requiring medical attention are being cared for. I think that we have to widen our eyes and open our minds to the fact that the care of the aged is not necessarily medical, or very highly specialized. The important thing is that when these people enter nursing homes kindness and consideration of their needs is paramount. I am always shocked by the attitude of some of the relatives who completely reject their responsibility for looking after aged parents. Where it is not possible, then we are only too happy to assist, but it is not a nursing home with the high standards of a hospital. It is a nursing home where the aged will receive proper care, both mentally and physically. This is one reason why I, personally for six years, have urged that the addition be built to Macassa Lodge of the bed care wing.

The problem of the aged is one of the most vital things that we are facing. I am sure the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) will agree with me when I say that I think, perhaps between health and welfare, there is some conflict of jurisdiction. Most of these cases that go in through welfare should be under The Department of Health. It is a health matter. There is a great need for a very close look. I am hoping, in view of the expressed desire of St. Peter's Infirmary to participate in this, that the hospital commission will at least meet with these people and see what can be done. It is very urgent and I am very critical that nothing has been done.

I see that the veterans have been accused in the press of being indifferent to the veterans who are in these homes. The veterans' spokesman said wherever they have had a complaint they have investigated it. In my own case, I have personally removed one woman from a nursing home that I considered undesirable. But the urgent need for proper care for people in this age group cannot be overemphasized. I am hoping that this will result in the hospital commission meeting with St. Peter's Infirmary, and doing something quickly about this matter.

One other matter, in talking about housing. Perhaps now I could take the opportunity, with reference to the comments made by the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn). I have been very familiar with the Hamilton housing authority. They have an excellent reputation for the management of project. Under their care they have about 1,120 families. It is quite possible that a few of these families will be discontented. But by and large around the province this has been recognized as one of the best projects. I think that the authority should be com-

mended on its standards of housekeeping. It is most important in any public housing authority that a standard of high housekeeping is maintained in the interest of protecting the large investment made in these corporations.

The necessary action has been taken by the provincial government in the Hamilton urban renewal development, but nothing has yet been done by the federal authorities. I understand that the mayor and the chairman of the urban renewal are attending in Ottawa to see if at long last they can get action, Mr. Speaker. I am saying again to this House, as I said at the beginning, I am hoping that the departments concerned will review the situation with regard to the necessary standards in the nursing homes and the rigid inspection, not only from the standard of food and cleanliness, but from the standard of the type of care that is necessary to deal with aging people. Thank you.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, before speaking on the ARDA programme, I would like to complete my summation of the agricultural industry in general as it affects the farmers of Ontario.

I have concentrated on the dairy industry, since it affects the greatest number in my area. But the beef and hog producers are, at the moment, seriously affected by chain buying from the United States.

In 1963 Canada increased its imports of pork products from the United States by 270 per cent over that of 1956, the highest import of that product in history—up from 29 million pounds to 78 million pounds. Top steers in November 1962, sold in Toronto at \$29.50 per hundredweight. By April of 1963 this price had dropped to \$23.50, a loss of \$6.00 a hundredweight. In January of this year, the price dropped lower, to \$22.90, yet during this same period of time barley brought in from western Canada to eastern Ontario increased by as much as \$15 a ton. The producers in the west did not get this increase. The feed dealers in the east claim they did not benefit by it. In other words, the grain brokers are the people that benefited, at the expense of the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, these are problems that are most difficult to resolve, but are allowed to continue in such a manner that the individual farmer is victimized. It would appear that the cost-price squeeze is still plaguing the farmer and will continue for some time. The cost of goods a farmer buys will continue to rise while the price of his commodities will not increase materially.

As a result, the farmer will have to earn more dollars each year in order to net the same amount of money. The only way he can meet this is by increasing production. The average farmer today is not able to give his family the living comforts that the average good plumber or carpenter is able to do.

I have a short clipping here from Tuesday's *Globe and Mail* and it reads:

WINNIPEG YARDS

NOTE CATTLE IMPORTS RISE

A Winnipeg livestock market spokesman said yesterday that nearly 700 cattle—ten per cent of the total killed in Manitoba last week—were imported from the United States.

The Winnipeg spokesman said most of the recent Manitoba imports are from North Dakota.

Back of the imports, the spokesman suggested, was a price differential. Choice steers at Winnipeg last week sold for between \$24 and \$25 a hundredweight while they could be bought across the border for as low as \$19.

Mr. Speaker, this had the net effect of the prices being dropped in the Winnipeg markets for Canadian cattle of \$1 per hundredweight. Again, it proves the statement the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) made when he said that 60 per cent of farm produce today was bought by a chain organization.

When the ARDA programme was first conceived a few years ago, it appears that the emphasis, and most probable application, of the Act was on alternate uses for marginal land. I am interested in seeing marginal land that has become unprofitable to farm developed for other uses. I am convinced that the application of ARDA offers the most in the way of economic improvement for eastern Ontario and Glengarry in particular, in the field of drainage development for productive farm land. A great deal of drainage development work has been accomplished in the last ten years. In an old economic report written for the county in 1929 the first sentence read:

Lack of drainage is the greatest single factor retarding improvement of the economic position of farmers in Glengarry county.

Our position has not changed too much after a lapse of 35 years.

Considerable emphasis is being placed in the programme of making crops pay. We have the soil, we have the natural fertility to produce higher yields of pasture, hay, silage,

and grain corn, as well as cash crops. However, we still have not eliminated the risks involved in late seeding, flooding after seeding, difficult weed control and impossible harvesting conditions, all associated with imperfect drainage.

I would like to see ARDA funds made available for at least the construction and improvement and extension of municipal ditches. The provision of outlets is often expensive. Under our present legislation, grants of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent are paid on municipal ditches by the province. This barely covers engineering costs. I believe that under the present Dominion-provincial ARDA agreement, grants of up to 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent could be paid on approved drainage projects out of federal funds and that the province of Quebec has taken advantage of these in their drainage and stream bank improvement programmes.

I can see a great deal of wisdom in reforestation marginal lands, creating grazing areas, developing parks and construction of farm ponds. However, I do hope that at least a portion of ARDA funds are invested in projects that will yield rapid returns within the lifetime of our present generation of farmers.

I am most interested in the conservation programme being developed in this province under the new Department of Energy and Resources Management. It has been said that by the year 1990, unless something is done Canada is going to run out of wholesome water. The provinces find it is impossible to act on their own and the municipalities say they cannot finance same.

The federal government passed legislation with allowances for improved projects for sewage disposal and water treatment programmes. A write-off percentage of the cost of the projects in the amount of any such loan undertaken by municipalities was passed on to the benefit of the said municipalities. This has been extended by the present Ottawa government and, Mr. Speaker, this has been a wonderful stimulant toward public works and employment improvement in large urban centres. But our smaller towns and villages, confronted with this problem, cannot benefit even with this generous condition offered to them because it is financially impossible.

I would recommend to this government to give the water resources commission the powers necessary to apply this consideration in smaller municipalities where they have not the necessary industrial assessments to perform this work, and to give the same serious consideration toward assisting in some similar

manner a percentage write-off on these costly projects. This may stimulate the trend back to the smaller towns in reverse to what has been taking place in the last number of years—people leaving the rural areas for the larger urban centres because the rural centres cannot attract industries to give employment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to support my colleague the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon) in his demand for a technological institute in the city of Cornwall. This would afford an opportunity to many students to receive technical training and have the advantage of commuting to this institution daily to better equip themselves for employment in present-day needs. Otherwise, many of them will be denied this opportunity since their parents have not the finances to send them to institutions of higher learning.

I would also support his demand for a highway between the city of Cornwall and Ottawa. This is long overdue and I certainly, for one, would appreciate it if The Department of Highways would give priority to this project when Highway 401 is completed to the Quebec border.

I sincerely want to thank all the hon. Cabinet Ministers whom I have had to interview, for the courteous reception they have given me at all times and their co-operation, with their staffs, in trying to resolve any problem that confronted me in a particular department. From my observation, I believe they are all trying to render the best service possible to the province of Ontario. I also believe that this government's administration in general in this province has been one of the best in Canada. But changing conditions make it very difficult for all governments in challenging times. And I would suggest this government, in setting up various committees to work in between sessions, should give them sufficient latitude to come up with recommendations that will be of benefit to the population of this province as a whole.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, in this final Budget analysis, may I say it is difficult to be critical of such a fine group of men in the government, but I will try.

However, I might say while I am on my feet in this 59th day of this session that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) or the government should never worry about having a labour government over there because it does not pay union scales in salaries. I should say it is worth it, probably. We have a taxi driver in Owen Sound who says it is not his job he likes so much, it is the people he runs into.

In speaking against this 1964 Budget in summary, I learned a long time ago in selling that no one gives a darn how good your product is; what counts is how good your product makes him. I submit to the hon. members that the Budget you have brought forward is not good for the people of Ontario. In fact, from my years in municipal government I would suggest that this Budget you have brought in is about as amateurish as any small township council could present. There is no trail-breaking and there is no vision whatsoever.

President Wilson defined politics as the science of progress in society and I ask you what kind of progress it is when your government needs \$50 million to bail itself out of the trouble it is in financially? You sought, not the top levels of our society, the big corporations, but put the bite on the little fellow, on the man who could least afford to pay it, by the gasoline tax and the 54-per-cent increase in hospital fees. You have put this province into debt amounting to some \$2 billion. You are paying this year over \$53 million in interest and you decide to nibble at a half-baked approach to some of our needs. Again, I say, who do you approach for the money—not the big corporations?

I would like to suggest that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) did not go to his backbenchers when he decided to draw up this Budget. He probably said, in effect, to his department heads, "Give us your estimates for 1963 and we will build a 1964 Budget." He did not say, "We are out to cut taxes like every other administration in this country of ours." You are building mistakes upon mistakes. You have Parkinson's Law in full gear.

We are constantly receiving reports on municipal taxation and here we are in 1964, 60 years later, using this same basic tax form as was used in 1904.

To summarize my remarks on the Budget, Mr. Speaker, two of the most important problems facing the people of Ontario today are the scandalous tax on the home owner and the inequities in the assessment base and taxation base and secondly, farm poverty. Very little, if anything, in this 1964 Budget will help either. So briefly, I would say that when governments generally are trying to cut taxes, the taxation is not only at the cross-roads in Ontario, you are doing a cloverleaf job.

The crime bill will long stand as a monument to the ineptness of this government. In Ottawa, I am told that the Queen's Printer

cannot set a line of type to a bill to prepare it, unless it has the Rt. hon. Prime Minister's signature on the bill. Now, it would seem that when this crime bill came to the House the hon. Prime Minister had not read it.

Now, we have on the other end of the spectrum, I am told, and I believe this is right, that the former Attorney General (Mr. Cass), was one of the finest Cabinet Ministers this government has had in a long time. His record of efficiency along the line was as a brilliant Minister. And here we have, in effect, if he is the scapegoat for the government, this man's career is shot down in flames to bail the government out.

The primary fact, then, basically, was not what was in the bill—and that was bad enough, it could not have been worse. But it is a fact that it got before this House, conceivably, without the hon. Prime Minister knowing what was in the bill and so finally, in summary, the Minister was given the heave-ho and we ask as citizens of Ontario—"Who is kidding whom"? How many bills come before this House in the same way?

In the same way we had the formation of the police commission. I said this morning that there is no parallel in Canada to the one we have in Ontario. We do not have any police commissions in the other provinces like the one we have here. In other words, I suggest it is a similar case to the one where the government two years ago was in trouble with this scandal our leader brought up. So, to take the decisions out of the hands of the government and away from the Attorney General, they form a police commission. All down the line we have these commissions run by appointed civil servants, making decisions for the people of Ontario. This is a dangerous situation.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) took exception to my remarks this morning when I criticized the commission form of governing municipal affairs. If we have a problem in my municipality the department head from the OMB comes up and makes a decision. Regardless of his decision, it is the decision of the Ontario Municipal Board and we have no recourse. And right down the line we have the Hydro under a commissioner. That is publicly owned and should be answerable to the people of Ontario.

I realize that time is important. Along this same line of thought, Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that in the Royal commission the hon. Prime Minister is setting up to review the judicial system, it is a call to all of this that it not be composed of judges, lawyers and

magistrates but of people in all walks of life, in the unions, women's associations, and so on. I say we are fed up. It is nauseating to see the power these purveyors of our justice have, and how they interpret our laws. Do you realize that justice is the only commodity in this country of ours that we cannot purchase on the instalment plan? And it is said throughout the province that there is one law for the rich and one law for the poor and, believe me, this is true.

As I said before, when we were talking about organized crime—my colleagues bear me out—this is organized confusion. Throughout the whole judicial system—which reflects, believe me, a more incline of injustice against our citizens than crime ever would, or ever could. In our estimates we came across a case where one judge received \$35,000 from this government in one year to sit on hearings, while jurors get from \$6 to \$10 a day. And so on down the line you could cite cases. I think it behooves this government in this judicial probe by a Royal commission, that this commission be composed of people who are representative of the people of Ontario, not one strata of our society.

One thing that is very important to the small man, is what happens when a fellow breaks the law and goes to jail. I would like to cite the case in Sweden. When a person breaks the law and a jail sentence is imposed there, it is recognized that the guilty party is in debt to the state and must repay it as directed by the court. It is also recognized that when a guilty person goes to jail, two other parties are apt to suffer loss: the state which has to provide for the detained person; the wife and family of the jailed party, by virtue of loss of earnings during detention and by the probable loss of his job. The state may well suffer serious loss of revenue by virtue of having to keep the defaulter's dependants during the jail term, which we will call a welfare case if loss of funds result.

Now, in Sweden they apply a bit of logic to it and handle it thus: A jail sentence does not necessarily mean a continuous day-and-night detention; it does mean a certain amount of time must be spent in jail to satisfy the law. The difference is in when. The Swede sentenced to a jail term for minor offences is not taken away from or deprived of his job by the state. In this country a person sentenced to jail is called upon in practice to pay a far higher price than the law specifies. The law requires that a convicted person must satisfy his debt to society for transgressing its rules. The court sentence is a payment of his debt. He has been deprived of his

means of making a livelihood, his family is often caused to suffer through no fault of its own. Employers do not want a man whose services are withdrawn from them arbitrarily. So the person is often fired and his past is brought up to his disadvantage in gaining new employment.

This goes, I think the hon. members will agree, far beyond the concept of paying a debt to society with a jail term, or does it? If breaking the law is considered more serious than the state says, and these side effects are meant to happen, at least let us be honest about it. The Swedes interpret their laws more literally and apply them to the letter. A person sentenced to jail there goes to jail but not in a manner or a time that will affect the person's job or livelihood or the welfare of his family or dependants. So much time has to be served in jail. It is served in non-working hours, over weekends, holidays, and, I believe, in the evenings.

It is common, I understand, for a Swede to go to his work in the morning from the lock-up and return there after work in the afternoon, and from jail again to work in the morning. The time is deducted from his sentence and when it is served he is then free. No loss of working time, no loss of pay, no loss of job, and no poverty-stricken family to be maintained by the state, and no great social stigma.

About a month ago an Owen Sound man, a sailor, was convicted and sentenced to two months in jail, but he went sailing and they issued a warrant to take him off his boat. They took him off his boat and they locked him up in jail. He lost his job and his family is on welfare, so everybody suffers. Going further, I think this should be seasonal. This, of course, only applies to a special category of offences, not including serious crimes, crimes of violence, or continual offenders who must be dealt with in a more severe manner. It is applicable to the person who occasionally puts his foot wrong severely enough to warrant what the law considers a case for detention.

I am not certain about this further step, and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) may think it is far reaching, but inmates of jails in many places are all put to work on essential duty and are paid at the going rate for wages outside. The prisoner's keep is deducted and the remainder credited to the prisoner for the upkeep of his dependants, or rehabilitation in the case of single persons.

The final point I wish to bring before this House, Mr. Speaker, is the lake levels in

Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. Making this matter as least controversial as possible, I would like to suggest that when I requested the hon. Prime Minister the other day to call a top-level conference of the governors of Illinois, Michigan and New York, and Canadian authorities, along with himself as liaison, to do a crash programme to find the answer, all I got from him was the fact that the government was concerned, but no real indication of coming to grips with it.

Reams and reams of newspaper space have been taken up with pictures showing the docks high and dry, and boats high and dry. In some cases on our shoreline the shore is now 185 feet from the water. Tourist operators, commercial fishermen and cottages on Georgian Bay have been left high and dry. Yesterday Collingwood Shipbuilding had to turn down a contract which it could not accept because of the water level. The water is so low at Collingwood that the town's main industry may have to shut down, throwing 1,000 people out of work.

Lake Huron has dropped four feet in the last two years and the manager says, "If it falls another foot we could go out of business." Two boats ran aground there last week.

The situation is serious all over the Owen Sound area and at Parry Sound. Georgian Bay residents blame the crisis on the dredging of the St. Clair River. They say the deepening of the channel is responsible.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Detroit says an underground water dike should be built at Sarnia to compensate for the flow into Lake St. Clair. "Cottage- and home-owners along the St. Clair River are howling," it says here in a report from the *Telegram*.

I am trying to make this as short as possible, but we know that this has increased Hydro rates \$12 million. The *Telegram* of Tuesday, May 5, said:

In Michigan last week, U.S. Senator Philip Hart called on Secretary of State Rusk to discuss with Canadian officials a plan to divert water from the Arctic watershed to help raise levels.

The hon. Prime Minister of this province says the government is concerned. What must come is a diversion of water from Hudson Bay. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) yesterday said that the water would have to come from the great north. Secondly, we must put dams and locks at Port Huron and Sarnia. We must call a joint commission meeting as soon

as possible to get this matter under study and under way and get some action.

Going back to basics. We submit the low water in our area, and being a Liberal I concur in it, is a result of a Diefenbaker government deepening a channel three and a half years ago at Sarnia, causing all this grief. Regardless of politics something has to be done about it.

The other night on CBC there was a documentary film showing the vast dams and the power projects that Canada is initiating. Each dam that is built will create a lake or reservoir behind it. It is going to take two, three or even five years to fill these reservoirs after the dam is built. It seems to me that for Georgian Bay, Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, having been depleted by a good five feet to date, even control locks at Sarnia at this point would result in a very slow filling up of the areas affected. Even immediate action is not going to provide an overnight cure, and a crash programme of dredging is a temporary must to save, in one section, 1,000 men their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that we of the Opposition here have to go to so much trouble to tell the hon. Prime Minister of this province his barn is on fire. We have trouble of major consequence. As the old preacher said, "Unless a man is in trouble his prayers ain't got no suction."

We saw the jam the hon. Prime Minister was in when the crime bill was before the House, and the fury of the public, and the very fortunate way that he stickhandled out of this mess. May I suggest that if the hon. Prime Minister thinks that was trouble, wait till he sees the mess this province will be in—I am not speaking from the government standpoint; I am talking in terms of the farmer, of the people who will be affected economically—if something is not done about this catastrophe facing us.

One hundred thousand square miles will be a shoreline of disaster, with shipping, jobs, resorts, and so on, feeling the result. Again I ask this government to quit stalling, call a top-level conference of the governors of Michigan, Illinois and New York, and Ottawa representatives, as I said before, and do the crash programme we need. It is all right for this Chicago gang on my left here to be laughingly referring—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): It is true, a noisy crowd.

Mr. Sargent: But they should drive around the desolate areas of our region. I think it is

a disgrace that we have the apathy we have, Mr. Speaker, on the government side, which says, "We are concerned."

Mr. Speaker I have much more powerful material here; I have reams of it here—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): He should have brought that out first.

Mr. Sargent: —but I would say in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I have been here 59 days and I have made a lot of friendships, but I see a lot of things that amaze me in the way democracy works. I have a list here I have compiled of the expenses you fellows will spend in travelling this year, and it amounts to over \$6 million. That is a lot of money. Further, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if I were ever in that seat where the hon. Prime Minister sits I would—I do not like to go down here at night and see the big Cadillac with a chauffeur, waiting to drive a man for an 80 cent cab ride down to the hotel. I think there is too much fat in this government. I would like to see a big auction sale held, like Mitch Hepburn had here, and sell all those Cadillacs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Now, we are probably going to have a whitewash when the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass) speaks to us, but I will leave this very important aspect of lake levels and talk about something that is very important to people in my riding, in the final analysis.

One more quotation which is very important. Dr. Langford said in the *Toronto Telegram* of May 5th, to a question as to why Lake Huron was so low—and this is in Georgian Bay, too—and he says Lake Huron is low because of mismanagement and because there are not controls to hold up levels as for other lakes. Huron is an unregulated lake; in my opinion it needs controls in the form of locks at its outlet.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Do you agree with that?

Mr. Sargent: The former speaker (Mr. Villeneuve) was concerned, in his talk on agriculture, about farm property.

Many of us come from rural ridings and we know that 50 per cent of the people in the farming industry are faced with farm poverty, with 50 per cent of them grossing less than \$2,000 per year. We hear a lot of talk

about ARDA. I did not interpret from the hon. member whether it was a combination of the agricultural policy or not, but it could be interpreted that way. I would suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the ARDA programme is bogging down miserably. I quote from an item which appears in the *Rural Co-Operator* April 28th issue and the headline says: "ARDA is all talk so far." It goes on to say:

There is a tremendous lot of talk about rural development, but the Canadian and Ontario governments have not accomplished much, declared an executive member of OFA addressing a zone rally in Smiths Falls.

He has been to many meetings on rural development but felt he has wasted his time attending them. I have always come away, he said, with a frustrated feeling that there is quite a bit of this feeling in this country. He finalizes by saying that ARDA is just a mess, as it were, regardless of what people in the government think about this. This man is an executive of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. Of course his word would not mean too much against that of the government people, but he is an executive member of that body.

Mr. Speaker, the government is holding up ARDA as a magic wand to rural rehabilitation and economic development. But no one knows around the province what ARDA is and the limited use to which it can be put. This ought to be explained. There should be an education job here. Rural economic development is the greatest need in the economy of this province of Ontario. New jobs, new secondary industry, decentralization of industry from the golden horseshoe, expansion of government, field work in forestry, conservation, recreation to employ local people. This problem has been recognized in the United States and they are doing something about it. But here we are in Ontario, giving lip service and getting no plan of action.

In summary, the greatest threat the farmer has today, in my discussions with them, is the problem of vertical integration. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) has dealt with this in his estimates, indicating that he is aware of the problem, but nothing goes into the statutes to protect the farmer. I would criticize the OFA for not insisting that he does. He pointed out the dangerous trends which could lead to taking over of the farms by large corporations either by farming themselves, purchasing farms, renting farms and putting the screws on farmers

and on the farm families of Ontario, and eventually destroying the healthy agriculture atmosphere we have in this province today.

The hon. Minister spoke of studies being made of this problem. Here again, we have an indication of the way this government works—sitting, studying a problem, but taking no action, coming up with no plan or policy to protect the farmers of this province against the big corporations, the Bay Street boys and the ticker-tape brokers who are now moving into farming and the production of food. The big food corporations—the chains, as I believe the hon. Minister said—have 60 per cent of all the food sales and they are putting the squeeze on the farmer, and the small processor of farm products. Either they take the price offered or their food can rot on the ground. Also threatened are farm marketing boards and co-operatives who are trying to bargain collectively for the farmers against the high-powered concentrated buyers in big corporations.

These big corporations say we will not go through your market boards if you do not deal with us on our terms. We will go into farming ourselves, or rent lands and turn your farmers into tenants and peasants. This is what they are saying, these types.

Finally, the government says that they are studying the problem. But this has been going on for years and it is getting worse year by year. So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my riding I ask this government: When do these studies come to an end? When do we stop setting up committees and when do we begin to see some action, some steps by the government to solve this serious trend of vertical integration in agriculture?

This government has a responsibility. The hon. Minister admitted it to this House and thus, is responsible for finding solutions and not bury the problem in the depths of the civil service, from which it never seems to emerge.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to make a few comments regarding the speech made by the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mrs. Pritchard). I believe, if I heard her correctly, she was making remarks concerning Bill No. 118, and I express concern over that bill along with her. I received a representation from the Association of Ontario Nursing Homes and they told me that if this bill were enacted into law it would almost force them out of business. They asked the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to give Bill No. 118 his very serious consideration. I think that

he should reconsider what he has brought forward in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, before embarking on the main text of my speech, I would like to make a comment on the 52 per cent rise in the Ontario hospital insurance rates. A great deal has been said about this previously, but I did feel that it was sufficiently important to make another comment at this time. It seems to me that this sharp increase in hospitalization rates affects the people in the low-income brackets most severely. These are the people who can least afford to pay this increase and as a result many of them will be dropping out of the plan because they cannot afford the premium rates.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the people who need a hospitalization plan most. I will not make any further comments on this subject. Suffice it to say that people regard this as a regrettable step on the part of the government to obtain extra revenue.

I want to confine most of my remarks to the Great Lakes water levels which are, as we all know, critically low at the present time. In doing this I am more or less following along the same line as my colleague, the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent). I am doing so at the risk of being somewhat less controversial. Some of the points that he touched on I will also touch on and I hope that there will not be too much overlapping in this regard.

Let me preface my remarks by saying that our federal government, the United States government, and the Ontario and Quebec governments all have a responsibility in this regard and once again I would say of my colleague, the hon. member for Grey North, that I echo his words in saying that, regardless of politics, the government should take action on this matter.

However, in view of Ontario's position in the economic life of this country, I feel the onus falls particularly heavy on the shoulders of the government. From a constitutional point of view, certainly in some regard at least, these matters fall under the jurisdiction of the province. Low lake levels are causing hardships from the Lakehead to Montreal. Lake Huron is three feet below normal, which is the lowest level on record, dating back to 1860. Lake Michigan is about as low. Lake Ontario is down two feet. Lake Erie is about 1.5 feet below normal and Lake Superior, one foot below normal.

This undoubtedly affects many people because 25 per cent of all Canadians are within the Great Lakes basin. There have been many reasons given as to the possible causes

of the low lake levels. These include lack of rainfall, a mysterious tilting of the earth, evaporation, the Chicago drainage canal and the removal of the forest cover from the shores of the Great Lakes. The deepening of the channel at Sarnia and Port Huron—and I would like to interject into the record, an editorial from the Walkerton *Herald-Times* of April 2, 1964. It reads in part as follows:

In Lake Michigan, the Chicago drainage canal takes an estimated two per cent of the water but the trouble here—

and that is referring to Lake Huron:

—was created when the canal at Sarnia and Port Huron was deepened another six feet. This had the same effect as pulling the plug in the bath tub, the bath tub in this case, being Georgian Bay. Those who have enjoyed our beaches know that the level of the bay has gone down three feet since the channel at Sarnia was deepened three-and-one-half years ago.

It is reasonable to assume that the level will continue to drop until it finds its level which appears to be equal to the six feet that the canal was lowered.

My friend, the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), in what I might refer to as his water speech, has pointed out the fact that precipitation has been below normal for the last few years. This is undoubtedly true. This has certainly contributed to the present problem of low water levels. In 1963, rainfall was 17.15 inches below the average in the London area. It was 8.47 below average in the Chatham area for the same year and 7.19 inches below normal in the Guelph area.

Every inch of rainfall amounts to 14.5 million gallons of water per square mile, or approximately 23,000 gallons per acre. It is easy to realize what effect this drop in precipitation has had in the areas where rainfall has been short for one or more years. My hon. friend indicated that sufficient quantities of water could be obtained by sound conservation practices, such as conserving the run-off which amounts to 160 million gallons of water per square mile across the province. I suggest that this is idealistic in that it is highly unlikely that we will ever reach the point where we could conserve all the run-off or even half of it, although we should certainly constantly work toward the goal of conserving as much run-off as possible.

It is rather obvious that we cannot depend on progress in that direction to replenish our dry wells and lower lake levels. According to the report of the select committee of the Ontario Legislature on lake levels of the

Great Lakes, established in 1952, precipitation and evaporation are the dominant factors controlling the levels in the Great Lakes. However, only when precipitation is persistently above or persistently below average for a number of years does it raise or lower lake levels. Excessive precipitation in only one year following a period of average or below average precipitation has little, if any, effect on the levels of the Great Lakes, according to the report.

Now, similarly, only one dry year following years of average or above average precipitation, has little effect in lowering the lakes as the land will deplete its storage into the Great Lakes to maintain their levels.

It seems to me that there is a direct correlation between the dry wells last year all across Ontario and the lower lake levels. The report also mentioned tilting movement of the earth's crust. Now, during the centuries since the Pleistocene ice sheet has retreated, the land toward the northeast has risen considerably. The old shorelines in Lake Erie are much more nearly horizontal and geologists claim that it is near the hinge line. That is the line along which crusted movement does not take place. Present-day deductions indicate that the hinge line runs from slightly south of Duluth, crosses the entrance to Green Bay, passes close to Goderich and on through the Niagara Peninsula. North of this hinge line the land is rising and south of this line the land is subsiding. The natural consequence of this tilting is that the lakes with outlets north of the hinge line, such as Lake Superior and Ontario, tend to become deeper and to flood their southern or southwestern shores relative to the amount their outlets are raised; while the lakes with outlets south of the hinge line, such as Huron, Michigan and St. Clair, tend to have their general level lowered, relative to the amount their outlets are depressed.

Indeed, this is a very complex and complicated subject. The rate of tilting, according to the select committee's report is very slow but apparently constant. If continued long enough it would eventually cause the Great Lakes to drain southward towards the Mississippi. This, of course, would not happen for centuries at the present rate of tilting.

I have mentioned the foregoing reasons simply to indicate and to underline the fact that the alarming lake levels are not due to any one particular reason but a combination of reasons. A combination that has resulted in consternation being expressed by people whose lives are and will be affected if some-

thing is not done to maintain the normal lake levels. I do not want to dwell on the causes at any great length other than to say that they are numerous and certainly varied. The problem now remains: What should be done both in terms of long-term planning and in terms of a short remedy to correct this very serious situation?

In order to offer some constructive suggestions I am going to outline to the House a number of proposals urged by the Georgian Bay Development Association. Once again I emphasize that three proposals are things which could be done in the way of short-term remedial measures to correct, at least in part, the low levels in Georgian Bay and Lake Huron.

Number one: It is suggested that the level of Lake Superior be lowered by 18 inches to bring Lake Huron, Lake Michigan and Georgian Bay up just over one foot. It has been estimated that a one-inch drop in the level in the Lake Huron basin costs the shipping interests \$250,000, or one-quarter of a million dollars. At the present time Georgian Bay is six inches below the 1952 level. There is also a tremendous loss encountered by hydro-electric power and lake levels have dropped to disastrous proportions. That is point number one, now I come to point number two.

The second point was to assist the marine operators currently out of water by giving them a 50-per-cent subsidy on the cost of dredging and dock rebuilding.

Thirdly, a recommendation for an emergency investigation of Collingwood harbour and an immediate investigation of the conditions in the harbours of Meaford, Port McNicoll, Southampton, Owen Sound, Kincardine and Goderich.

Number four: as an intermediary term project within two to five years, the Georgian Bay Development Association wants the control point established at the foot of Lake Huron. The Lake Huron basin has averaged a fluctuation of as much as five feet over the last ten years, and during the period of record of 103 years, the maximum fluctuation has been six feet. Lake Superior has had, of course, a control dam for many years dating back to around 1901, I understand. This dam has been successful in controlling the low level to within a few inches.

Number five: the association's fifth point is one directed at the long-term possibility of diverting water from the James Bay watershed to the Great Lakes. A scheme somewhat in the dream stage at the present but possibly feasible.

My colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) and others have spoken about this scheme at great length earlier in this session when we were discussing the estimates of Energy and Resources Management. This scheme has commonly been referred to as the Kierans plan. It has been tagged with all sort of derogatory connotations, such as "pipe dream", "prohibitively costly" and "simply not feasible." These statements do not reflect imagination and vision—something we must have to cope with this problem.

The recent statement by Teno Roncalis—the United States co-chairman of the International Joint Water Commission—issued after a four-day conference in Washington on April 15, said:

We need men of vision to consider radical new plans if we are to overcome this adverse cycle of nature.

I do not want to take up much more time of the the House, Mr. Speaker, and so I would close by urging the government to display leadership and sincerity by negotiating with all governmental authorities confronted with the problem of low water levels on the Great Lakes. The time for action is now, and I hope that I, along with others in this Legislature have contributed to easing the government into uncharted waters in an endeavour to thwart a situation which nature has thrust upon us. The state of the Great Lakes is a matter of vital consequence to the future of our province.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, as we are coming toward the end of this Budget debate, and, I suppose, close to the end of this session, those of us who have been new this year have gone through a real course of education. We have learned a lot and we have learned something of the processes of parliamentary government and something also of the processes by which government is able to attain its will in a parliament of this kind.

During the session we heard much from the new members both on this side and on the other side of the House. There is a great deal of freedom of speech.

Ideas were expressed, sir, which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said were good and he said: "This is where we get our ideas—from the freedom of expression of the people in the back benches." That is fine. But when it came to the work in the committee, that was where the back-benchers were able to express themselves not only in speech but in action. And so it was that when a certain bill for the city of Toronto came before that com-

mittee, one of the sections of that bill dealing with Maple Leaf Gardens was thrown out by the committee. And so the back-benchers had their day of triumph.

There were two other bills which had the same sort of fate—the Westminster and the Rochdale bills. These two were also spoken to by a great many people and, again, certain aspects were passed in this case against the will of many on the Treasury benches. This is interesting because, in the one case, the Minister was against the Maple Leaf Gardens and so the will of the back-benchers prevailed. In the other case, the Minister was against the principle of the bill but the back-benchers still prevailed and the bill was supposed to have been reported.

But those bills are still on the order paper, Mr. Speaker; they are sitting here and so far have not been reported. I wonder if the talk is allowed but the action is severely frowned upon. This is an interesting matter for speculation.

An hon. member: Very interesting.

Mr. Young: Another thing in this connection: I remember very vividly the haste with which two other bills were passed which did what these bills, or so some of their opponents said, were doing. They were subsidizing certain groups of students, in this case, with the taxpayers' money.

But two other bills—the Hershey bill in Smiths Falls and the one from Cochrane which had to do with Cochrane industries—were passed in very great haste, and they went through this House long ago. Those bills were heavily subsidizing two private corporations at the expense of the taxpayer. Action came fast.

But the two bills which are said to subsidize the students at some expense to the taxpayer still sit on the order paper. We shall watch with interest, Mr. Speaker, to see if the back-benchers who supported these bills in committee are now going to have their will carried through in this parliament.

A few days ago we heard the earth-shattering announcement from the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) that we are to have the early establishment of a minimum wage of 85 cents for men and 80 cents for women, gradually rising to a dollar an hour across this province by the end of 1965. But this excludes two groups, the farmers and domestics.

Now, why it should exclude the farmers is a question which many people are asking, but as I look around at the number of representatives on the government benches who

represent farm areas, it is apparent that this becomes a political decision rather than a decision having to do with justice.

The thing that has been told us—and I have been told many times—is the Ontario farmer just cannot afford to pay the \$1 an hour or the 85 cents an hour. In fact we heard that this afternoon from the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) and we heard it from the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent). If this is true—and I have no reason to dispute it—it is one of the most damning indictments possible of the agricultural policies of this government and the government of the leader of the Opposition in Ottawa over the past few years.

The Canadian farmer today farms about 12 per cent of the population, but he is getting only six per cent of the national income—half his share. If this is true, Mr. Speaker, then there is something fundamentally wrong with the agricultural policies of this government, that the farmers of this province do not get their share of the national income and of the wealth they produce.

For some time we have seen the difference, as the hon. member for Glengarry pointed out—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would permit a question. I was trying to find out, Mr. Speaker, if they do have a minimum wage in connection with the farmers' rates in Saskatchewan?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): They do not need them; they get their income and pay their debts.

Mr. Reilly: I am asking the hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Saskatchewan, I might say, Mr. Speaker, has had a minimum wage for many years.

Several hon. members: The farmers?

Mr. Young: All right, the farm labour; you will have to look that up, I am just not sure. We will leave that to Mr. Thatcher to establish.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): That is beside the point.

Mr. Young: It is beside the point but I will say this, that the farmer's income in Saskatchewan is one of the highest in this country.

Mr. Speaker, during the past few years we have seen the cost-price squeeze taking place that the hon. member for Glengarry spoke about. That cost-price squeeze has increased. We have seen the processors and the packers and the brokers taking perhaps more and more of our food dollar as time went on.

I have here a clipping from The Canada Department of Agriculture report in the spring of 1963. It is headed, "The farmer's share of the food dollar." It points out that for each dollar the consumer spends on the following food items, the farmer's share is: beef, 57 cents; fluid milk, 53 cents; butter, 80 cents—getting up pretty well there—broiler chickens, 57 cents; potatoes, 42 cents; fresh apples, 31 cents; grade A large eggs, 67 cents; bread, 11.5 cents. The remainder of the consumer's food dollar—and I am quoting from The Canada Department of Agriculture:

—goes to pay transportation, packaging, processing, wholesaling, retailing, and other charges.

But the farmer's share of the retail value of the food that he produces is shrinking. In 1950, his share of the consumer's dollar was 58 cents and by 1960 it had dropped to about 44 cents. The reason for this drop is that while the farmer receives no more for his produce today than in 1950, the consumer pays more for his food because of increased costs of processing and marketing and extra services.

Compared with those of other items, our food costs have risen less since 1950, according to the consumer price index. For all food the increase in cost to urban dwellers during the 1950-60 period was 19 per cent, for rent it was 32 per cent, and for medical care it was 63 per cent.

I have here a copy of the brief from the federation of agriculture which I think all hon. members received. It points out what the net income of the farm population of Ontario has been. The average income, summing it up, for operators, labour and management per farm, assuming the same number of farms as in 1961, would be about \$1,850. At least two qualifications need to be added: 1. Off-farm income. Many farmers work off the farm. A farm operator with a family would almost double this return on a family income basis; 2. Farm numbers are undoubtedly padded by reason of a loose sense of definition of "farm." Despite these qualifications and the uncertain accuracy of the income and the capital figure, farm income, from whatever source, is certainly low by urban standards.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this matter is clear, that there is this gap. Costs are up, and even though in the last period of time, as the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) pointed out, because of the Russian sales of wheat the general income across the country has gone up, the farmers are still in that kind of situation. If this process continues, and I see no reason why it should not, then the family farm as an institution may well be doomed and the corporate farm become the food processing item in our civilization.

If farmers are making as little as this, and evidently they are, then I say to you that this government should be carefully examining its agricultural policies with a view to revamping them so that agriculture gets its fair share of the wealth that is produced. Then it will be able to pay its minimum wage or whatever it may be, to its hired help. There is no reason why a man who works in industry should get a certain wage and a man who works in the agricultural industry should get a smaller wage. The only reason is the complete lack of forward-looking agricultural policy in this country over the past years. It is time that we changed present policy and that we should bring our farm workers, as well as the farmers themselves, into line. Any man who is producing food should be able to get enough income from that food to pay the help on his farm commensurate with the help in industry.

I mentioned that the hon. Minister of Labour had announced the minimum wage. During his announcement, he made certain comparisons of wage rates. We had some criticism from certain quarters when the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) talked about poverty in this province. But then the hon. Minister of Labour went on to tell us that poverty is fairly widespread. He says that about ten per cent of the estimated 408,000 wage and salary workers in Zone 2 make less than \$1 an hour. In the large Zone 1 about five per cent of the 1.6 million eligible work force are paid less than \$1 an hour. The hon. Minister said the surveys indicate that about 6.5 per cent of Ontario's non-farm wage and salary workers make less than the \$1 minimum now.

The hon. Minister puts these facts before us, which, I think, he is facing in a fairly realistic way. He is trying to get the minimum up over a period of time. I quarrel with him in that I think that minimum should be somewhat higher than he has named it. But when we realize that 6.5 per cent of our workers are on pay which is less than the

present minimum, and add to that the farmers, the farm workers, the domestics, the welfare people, the unemployed and all the others in that category, we find that indeed too large a proportion of our population in Ontario is having a very difficult time making ends meet, and struggling below the borderline of poverty.

When the question is raised, "Why should we set the minimum at the 80 or 85 cents, gradually rising to \$1?" we are faced with certain facts, of which the hon. Minister is aware, but which I would like to bring before this House. Last year the gross national product of Canada ran to about \$44 billion, and I am using round figures in my presentation. Squeezing out duplication, the national income was about \$32.5 billion in 1963. Ontario's share of that was around \$13.6 billion. We have in Ontario something like 1,796,000 families. This means that as far as the Ontario families are concerned we are producing wealth at the rate of about \$2,100 per capita, or slightly over \$8,000 per family per year, or, if we bring it down, about \$160 a week. That is our wealth production.

I am not standing here today to say that this wealth production should be divided evenly among our people. I have never said that. I never intend to say so, because the man with more responsibility and who works harder, perhaps has some right to more income than the guy who is categorized as a loafer and all the rest of it. But the fact remains—

An hon. member: Glad to hear you say so.

Mr. Young: The fact remains that in this province we are producing now an average income of something in the nature of \$160 per week. Why should we be content—I hope the hon. Minister is not content; I do not think he is—to set a minimum at 80 and 85 cents an hour, rising to a dollar an hour by the end of 1965? A province as rich as this one, with the great productive capacity we have, should be thinking in terms of far more than this.

I would hope that the climate within government will change to some extent perhaps. With pressure from our friends on the back benches, and others, by the end of 1965 the hon. Minister may well see fit to set this figure, not at a dollar, but at a dollar and a half or some other figure even better than this. Because after all, today we have to face the fact that labour costs per man are dropping. Unit labour costs are going down as productivity increases. If we are to

distribute the goods that we are producing, we must distribute the purchasing power to the people who are producing these goods.

I know the argument is advanced that there are certain marginal industries, and marginal businesses, that might be put out of business if higher minimums were enforced too soon. But let me submit, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of marginal industry is doomed in any case by the onward march of automation. We can never hold it. The better way to attack this problem is to assist these marginal industries to modernize and rationalize their production. Then, if necessary, to retrain their workers for higher skills and new jobs which may carry with them higher wages. In this way, we bring up the whole distributive process. We make the great wealth that we are producing available, in purchasing power, to all of the people.

I think we have to recognize this fact when we talk about trade and the relationship of wages to trade. This is a whole treatise in itself and I am not going to impose it on the House today. But we have to recognize the fact that the free nations, who are at the top of the trading nations of the world, United States, Sweden and Canada, are also the nations with the highest average industrial wage rate. Certainly, too, those commodities which are at the very top of the foreign trade pyramid are the industries in which the wage rates are the highest. They are the most efficient. In an economy like ours, wage rates and efficiency go together. We have to work out the method by which the distribution of purchasing power through wages and other income can be made so that our people have the advantage of the wealth that we produce.

Mr. Speaker, during this past few weeks we have had some problems in the work force of this province. I had today—and I might as well deal with this first—a representation from the Independent Cab Owners Guild of Metropolitan Toronto. This matter has been discussed by several hon. members of this House, but I want to bring before the House once more the problem that they face, and urge upon this government that some action be taken.

As we know, under Bill No. 80 the authority over taxicabs is delegated to the Metropolitan Toronto Council, and Metro has delegated that authority to the commission. That commission has seen fit to do two things: first of all to increase the licence rate for cabs from \$50 to \$100 per year; and secondly, to increase the number of cabs which are on the streets from one per

thousand to one per nine hundred of population. This means that we have an increase of something of the nature of 400 cabs in Metropolitan Toronto.

Alfred Beasley, the chairman of the Independent Cab Owners Guild, told me today that this has the effect of lowering income for the cab driver. Whereas he used to average something like \$28 per day gross income, out of which expenses of \$10 to \$14 have to come, he now is grossing \$23 to \$24 per day. In other words, the cab owners are losing income to the tune of \$3 to \$4 per day at the present time, Mr. Speaker. What they are asking is the right of review to a higher authority than the commission, a review of their problems in respect to the increase in the number of cabs, the matter of their income and their licence fees. So I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that this government, after all the nattering that has taken place in this House and all the times that this problem has been brought before this House, would take some action to bring some justice here. Or at least to give to the guild some review of their problems in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the simmering situation in the Ontario Civil Service. Last week, or a couple of weeks ago, I raised this matter in the House and, perhaps in some respects justifiably, was read a couple of lectures by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman). Following that lecture, we had a statement from the hon. Prime Minister which was reported in the *Globe and Mail*. In response to a question The hon. Prime Minister told the Legislature he was not aware of any disruption within the civil service.

The following day, Mr. Harold Bowen, executive secretary of the Civil Service Association of Ontario, announced an emergency meeting of all branches of the service to be held in Toronto on May 13. The association board called this meeting, it says, only after continual mass complaints against low salaries, long delays in revision, and dissatisfaction with negotiating procedures.

Mr. Bowen charges that the government has repeatedly by-passed negotiating machinery provided by the Ontario Joint Council in favour of arbitrary and unilateral action. He says that revision of some pay scales is more than two years behind schedule. The story, which was presented in a brief which all the hon. members received, is one of bargaining in bad faith by this government—a government that insists that other employers in this province bargain in good faith with their

employees. It is high time that this government faced up to this challenge and to this situation. The introduction to the brief says this:

The distress of the many members in the low salary bracket, aggravated by the exceeding slowness in the adjustment of their pay rates, the universal concern of all employees with the apparent apathy of the government and its agents to employee matters, and the continual retreat of official-side personnel behind "sovereign" rights, have all combined to force the association into a position not of its own making or liking.

Mr. Speaker, after years of struggle for some sort of recognition by the government, the civil service association succeeded in 1962 in getting an amendment to The Public Service Act. This amendment provided for the setting up of a joint council to negotiate matters in dispute between the association and the government. The joint council began its work last August. The right of arbitration, when agreement could not be reached, was provided for. And to quote the brief:

To the public service generally negotiation and arbitration meant the right to participate in decisions concerning rates of pay and working conditions. There was hope at least that the many discrepancies, particularly in pay rates, would be corrected through orderly and timely negotiations by responsible persons with authority to make decisions.

The joint council is made up of three members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council on recommendation of the membership of the association, plus one staff member, which is also recommended, and four members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

But the joint council is today running into stormy seas. The employer, the brief says, has reserved unto itself the same old rights of unilateral decision, and class specifications were revised without reference to the joint council or the association; pay rates were published without prior negotiation; changes to working conditions were made without negotiation; experience was contrary to expectation.

Once the joint council was set up, the government by regulation—or this happened long before, even though the brief points it out—over the protests of the association, excluded the Ontario Provincial Police from the bargaining unit. Now, I am not arguing that point here. But when the association

wanted to bargain regarding medical, hospital and surgical insurance, it was discussed briefly last September. On October 7 it was agreed to meet informally to clear the way for the official side to prepare a counter proposal. That was October 7.

In November the official side stated that the government would arrange without delay a study of fringe benefits. On April 13, six months later, the official side of the joint council blandly stated that they would not have a report until May. A further meeting on April 20 brought the suggestion that the report would be ready in June. Frustrated and disgusted, the association took steps to notify the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) of the situation. He arranged a meeting attended by representatives of both sides: the chairman of the civil service commission, and a labour lawyer retained by the government. Apart from assurances that better negotiating procedures would be devised, nothing has transpired.

Something of the absurdity of the situation can be realized from the fact that the bargaining committee set up, the joint council, has on occasion become aware of changes in the working conditions when they were announced in the *Ontario Gazette*. There has been no negotiation on salary. The brief says:

On occasion we have been invited to discuss salaries for certain classification, but only in one instance did our protest against rates to be recommended by the commission, result in any improvement in rates. In other instances, the rates disputed were subsequently announced without negotiation and in defiance of our protests.

There is a very interesting angle here which has emerged in the matter of pregnancy of female employees. Maternity leave was provided for in the contract but when one woman applied for a second maternity leave it was denied. She took the matter to arbitration, and note this—the decision handed down was that she had a right, and the employees had a right to a second maternity leave.

This was established as a right of the association, but then the government changed the rules. It changed the regulation under which this was operating. So now female employees in the civil service just cannot have second pregnancies, though how this can be enforced I am just not sure. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Labour or the hon. Provincial Treasurer can tell us how this could be done. The hon. Minister of Labour was acting here, I understand.

Now, this will be terrific news for those concerned with the population explosion, and if it can be enforced I am not sure but what the government may be to some extent indirectly in contravention of the federal birth control regulation. I do not know, but the fact remains that this rule was changed and now the various female employees in the civil service are told, "no second pregnancies or you have to take leave at your own expense," in spite of the fact that arbitration established their right in this field, the government unilaterally has changed it.

This is a case of the employer saying, "If we do not like a certain clause in the regulations or the contract or whatever it may be, then we shall change it, we shan't bother to bargain for it." No wonder that the association is a little incensed by this. This is a concept that we thought had gone out with the last century. "It is sufficient to say," says the brief, "that losing a grievance at any other jurisdiction would not give management the right to change the rules of the game, unless and until that change has been bargained for."

One more quote from the brief demonstrates confusion:

In 1961 a well publicized job-evaluation programme was commenced to be completed within one year. It is still not completed in 1964. The long delays, the lack of reasonable explanation for the delays, and the confusion in the processing of the findings have resulted in frustration and bitterness at all levels of the service. The whole rate revision process is in a state of chaos and in some cases employees recently promoted are now receiving less pay than they would have received had they not been promoted. The planned, orderly, two-year programme which was publicized far and wide has become a disorderly jumble with no apparent end.

So says the brief.

That fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this government is refusing to bargain in good faith with its employees, and as a result, frustration and bitterness have resulted at all levels of the service. In an article by Eric Dowd, in the *Globe and Mail*, he points out that, according to the associations surveyed, government electricians, for instance, get a maximum of \$4,600 a year, compared to an average \$5,000 in an industry. Labourers get \$1.50 an hour compared with \$1.80 outside. Training machine operators get \$1.67 an hour compared with \$2.57; surveyors, \$6,300 compared with \$7,200. Unattractive salaries, he says, are holding up recruits.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is one which should concern us very seriously. Part of the problem, of course, is the very structure of the civil service association itself. It is not all perhaps with the government, because within the civil service association you have, in effect, management and workers in the same general bargaining group. I raised the question of the Guelph institution a week or so ago. One of the problems there of course is a very fundamental one, that in that unit—branch 11—you have the superintendent of the institution and the deputies, who, I stand here to say, are among the best men in the service; you also have the officers and the non-coms and the custodial officers, all within the same bargaining unit.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the question always is, how can management in that case and the other lower echelons of the service sit down together and talk frankly about their problems? After all, the management has the final say about working conditions, and all the rest of it, within the framework of a contract.

And so I think the civil service association has to take unto itself certain advice. It has to cut itself off from the managerial part of its association at some place at the foreman level in each department where that can be established. They must regard the upper echelon as management, and the rest as the bargaining unit. That is the job they have to do if they are going to face their problems realistically. I think this government has to assist and co-operate in that kind of a fundamental change within the bargaining unit, to create a bargaining unit similar to those now in effect in so many municipalities across this province.

But until this is done, we are not going to solve the long term problem. Today, tomorrow, if this government will, the joint council which is now in the process of negotiation can solve certain fundamental problems within the civil service and then the unrest which is all too evident there, and the difficulties which have shown themselves by an emergency meeting being called next Wednesday can be resolved and resolved to the satisfaction of this government, of the civil service and to the people of Ontario. I think we have to recognize the fact that people who work for the public have the right to a scale of income commensurate to the people who work in the private sector of the economy and that they have a right to the same kind of bargaining and the same obligations in bargaining that the others have.

So, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I urge upon

the government that these matters be taken very seriously and that in this whole field where there are problems between management and labour, where there are problems of minimum wages, where there are problems in the field of agriculture, which has been outlined so clearly by those in this House during the session, these matters must have the serious attention of this government, and if they have, Mr. Speaker, then I am sure that a solution can be found. But only the government can bring about that solution and bring it about speedily with a sense of justice and with a sense of understanding and fair play to all concerned.

Mr. F. M. Cass (Grenville-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset of my remarks express the pride which I feel that a native of my own area of Winchester should now be so capably, and with such graceful dignity, the occupant of Mr. Speaker's Chair in this House. And I am also sure that all hon. members have been grateful during the stormy periods of the session to have had your firm but sensible hand at the control of House debates.

On March 26, 1956, I had the pleasure of making what is commonly known as a new member's maiden speech in this House. On that occasion, I had the opportunity of stating that, as member for Grenville-Dundas, I represented two of the oldest counties of this great province—counties which in days gone by had each furnished Ontario with a great Conservative Prime Minister; counties populated not only by the descendants of UEL settlers but by people of many countries who have chosen to make Canada their new home; counties populated by the most sincere and loyal constituents it has ever been the privilege of any member to represent.

These facts I would only reiterate and re-emphasize.

During the same speech I also stated and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close today without saying a word about an organization which is an integral part of this Parliament and without which the hon. members of this House could not efficiently carry out their responsibilities to their people. I refer to our permanent civil servants. They have been frequently discussed during this session of Parliament, but they have been carrying on with their work the same as before.

I found, Mr. Speaker, that the civil service comprises a body of sincere and helpful people who give pleasant service

not only to the hon. members of the House but to the people of Ontario as a whole. The great success and prosperity we all foresee in the future of this great province rests in the government, but it is of little avail unless the decisions of the executive can be properly and efficiently carried out.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the past has shown our confidence in the future in both of these to be amply justified.

And now, sir, after several years of the closest association with a great many of these public servants in three separate departments of this government, I can only state that never had I, on any occasion, even the slightest reason to change, in any particular, my early evaluation of our provincial civil servants. To the very many of them in every degree of official responsibility and appointment who have these past years been of such wonderful assistance to me, as their Minister, and to the government, I do acknowledge my great debt and my sincere gratitude.

Over the past decade, I have listened with awe to the successive budgets with their spiralling figures which have been introduced into this House by our Provincial Treasurers. Each one, Mr. Speaker, has been a record of achievement and an augury of progress and sound expansion. The 1964 Budget is, of course, no exception to this trend. However, Mr. Speaker, we should all caution ourselves and our people against the ever present and most pleasant tendency to consider that the consolidated revenue fund is an inexhaustible source of revenue for even the most worthy cause. The tremendous burdens which have been placed upon, and accepted by, our people for educational and welfare purposes surely must remind us all daily that each one of us is a taxpayer and that we must be the only source of provincial largesse and that, for what we demand of our provincial government, we, in turn, must be prepared to pay in taxes of one sort or another.

In this age of civil liberties sensitiveness, we are all most conscious of our rights and freedoms as individual members of society, often being blinded to the necessity of certain curtailments for the general public good. Because during the past year or so in my then official position, it had been my aim to enlarge and secure many of these rights, I would review the results as they appear on the records of this House and in our statute books.

And may I emphasize, sir, that this record of accomplishment is that of this Robarts administration which has always recognized

that our progress, prosperity and happiness as a people depends on a free society. For convenience in following these various items and for reference, I shall resort to a numbered sequence.

1. The Proceedings Against the Crown Act: For some ten years, through the regimes of successive Attorneys General, this Act lay on our statute books unproclaimed while the individual citizen of Ontario was kept deprived of the right to take to the courts his claim, fancied or real, against government. The re-drafted Act was enacted at the last session.

2. The Expropriation Procedures Act: Those of us who had the duty of serving on this assembly's select committee inquiring into all phases of expropriation learned firsthand of the many instances where the individual's rights had been denied or greatly infringed by governments of every level, and the committee's recommendations to re-state and protect in great measure, the ordinary citizen, were adopted in all salient features by the government in this bill enacted at the last session.

3. The Securities Act: One of the great difficulties in securities legislation is to protect the investor from his own speculative desires and indiscretions and, at the same time, to avoid strangulation of the flow of risk capital so necessary for the development of our province. During one of the many frenzied periods on the Toronto Stock Exchange some years ago, certain provisions were placed in The Ontario Securities Act which had the effect of allowing a broker-dealer, whose licence was in jeopardy, to have his case heard before the director of the commission with the only appeal therefrom to the full securities commission—the chairman and only full-time member thereof being the director, the self-same person who had made the order being appealed. This denial of fair hearing was corrected at the last session of the Legislature by an amendment to the legislation providing for the appeal to be heard by the commission which was then to be composed of persons having no prior connection with the case.

4. A potpourri—The Collection Agencies Act, The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act, The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act: While it is an accepted fact that, in these areas, the majority of operators are honest and keep in the forefront the best interests of their customers, there are and always have been, those who advance first their own personal interests. The legislation on the statute books of Ontario provided means

whereby a licence could be suspended or cancelled by the authorities without the opportunity of hearing being given to the man whose livelihood was thus pre-emptorily taken from him. The amendments to these Acts passed at the last session of the Legislature provided not only a hearing in the first instance, in all cases where the person concerned could state his case, but also provided an appeal to another tribunal entirely unconnected with the official holding the first hearing.

5. The Act Regulating Deposits solicited from the Public: This legislation, introduced at the last session to protect the individual small investor attracted by unrealistic returns on investments promised by certain corporations and others, has proved most successful in giving just such protection to the citizen unused to the ramifications of present-day high finance and credit operations.

6. The County Court Amendment Act: Here again at the last session legislation was passed giving the individual a right of appeal to the higher court from interlocutory orders which had not, prior to such time, been possible.

7. An Act to afford Protection for the Payment of Wages Materials and Services on Public Works: During the past few years, when construction of government works of every kind reached an all-time high, it became apparent that the wage earner and small material supplier was losing out in his battle for payment for his work and materials when the prime of the sub-contractor became financially involved. And, despite the fact that these were government works being paid for by the Ontario government, the provincial authorities in most cases were powerless to help the individual. This Act which was passed last session allows, and indeed empowers, the provincial authorities to take necessary steps to secure payment of these small claims so that the wage earner and the man of business need no longer always be the loser.

8. The Fire Departments Act: Amendments to this legislation, passed last session and introduced into the House this year, provide for the bringing into negotiations of salaries and working conditions for full-time fire fighters, and practices which, under the guidance of our provincial Department of Labour, have proven so successful in protecting and advancing the rights and privileges of the individual. Similar provisions were also contained for police in The Police Act introduced by me at this session.

9. The Wages Act: Earlier this session, I

introduced a bill to amend The Wages Act which would have had as its effect the provision to the wage earner of a larger share of his earnings free from assignment and garnishment and would enable him to use his only means of credit—his future earning power—to his best advantage in these days of credit economics.

10. The Magistrates Act: The bill, in amendment of this Act, which was introduced this session, had as its aim the orderly reorganization of the business of magistrates' courts under a chief magistrate. It was patterned upon the most successful operation in administrative matters of the chief judge in county courts and chief justice high court in the Supreme Court trial division. The great majority of our people experience their only taste of Ontario justice in these busy magistrates' courts and, despite an able and dedicated bench, the increasing volume of work has, in many cases, resulted in an administrative chaos which can only, and does, adversely affect the rights and freedoms of the individual who is brought into such courts.

11. The Mental Incompetency Act: The amendments to this Act, earlier introduced by me, were to effect transfer from the high court, which sits only at certain times each year, to the county court where an able and experienced judge is always available in each county and district, to transfer their jurisdiction with respect to estates of incompetents. In this manner, the ordinary citizen, at any time and without being required to travel outside of his own area, could receive the often most immediate and necessary court order to safeguard a family's property.

12. The Police Act and Regulations: Provisions in the original bill and regulations thereunder would give the policeman not only the recognized bargaining rights to which I have made previous reference but also contained the means whereby charges against him must be properly heard with right to counsel and always an appeal to an independent commission, and thence either to the Ontario Police Commission or to the courts.

13. The Mortgages Act and The Short Forms of Mortgages Act: This session's bills to amend these two very important Acts contained, with other provisions, one which would require in every case, notice to the mortgagor before a sale could be effective stipulating a reasonable time to enable the delinquent mortgagor to refinance his home or his property. It also provided that a person could not contract out of this provision for

his protection as now so often is done under the pressure of profit-hungry money lenders.

14. The Used Car Dealers Act: Upon this new legislation I shall not expand. Suffice it to say that it contained the necessary provisions to enable the authorities to deal efficiently with the bad operator without penalizing the good one and, at all times reserving the right to everyone to a hearing and to an appeal.

15. The Credit Unions Act: This bill provided not only protection for the small credit union member who wished to use his union credit for many banking purposes, but also recognized the right of a sound credit union to engage in such business practices. In view of the recommendations contained in the recent report of the Dominion Commission on Banking and Finance, it would appear that we in Ontario were following the modern concept.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention three other fields in which careful investigation is in progress and which will inevitably lead to long-awaited and very necessary legislation:

First, legal aid. It has always been my opinion that much was still to be desired in the system whereby the poor man or woman was entitled, and advised of such entitlement, to aid when before our courts, with property or person in jeopardy. A committee established recently by the treasurer of the Law Society of Upper Canada and myself, is engaged upon the Herculean task of studying this whole matter from every angle.

Second, personal property. The rights of ownership, difficulties of transfer, tangle of encumbrance records and so many other difficult matters with respect to personal property have, over the years, presented great problems to our courts, confused the legal profession and this has usually been to the detriment of the individual. My predecessor in office as Attorney General (Mr. Roberts) initiated a study of the whole matter which was to be culminated by the introduction of an entirely new approach to the whole subject based upon the American Uniform Code in a Personal Property Security Act to be laid before this House for study and discussion.

Third, during recent years the matter of profits by insiders in corporate transactions, the refusal often of corporate officials to make full disclosure of corporation affairs to shareholders, and similar matters have been the subject of much public discussion as well as extensive investigation by the appropriate authorities, both in the United Kingdom and

in the United States. Last year, I appointed a strong committee drawn from both business and government to inquire exhaustively into all phases of corporate financing and related matters, so that thereafter appropriate legislation might be prepared to safeguard the rights of the small investor. I am happy to report that this committee has made very considerable progress.

The foregoing, Mr. Speaker, is only a brief highlighting of the measures recommended by our capable and experienced law officers in The Department of the Attorney General, headed by Mr. William B. Common, QC, a most distinguished and respected deputy Attorney General.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in the light of what I have just recounted to this House, and in closing, may I make some comments with respect to certain of the amendments to The Police Act introduced by me before Easter. A very great deal has been said in many places and in various media about these matters, remarks which in many cases, I am sure, were made in good faith but with a sketchy knowledge at best of the whole subject matter. Indeed, in this House, many unnecessary, indeed unkind, remarks were directed at me although I was perforce not able to be within this Chamber. For the record, I may state that, prior to the opening of this Legislature on Monday, March 23 last, my resignation as Attorney General had been tendered and accepted. I no longer had the right to occupy my theretofore customary place in this House, and no other seat having then been assigned me, I was, of course, by the rules of this House unable to take my place or speak. For similar, though not identical reasons, I have been absent for some time from the sittings of this assembly.

I have endeavoured today to indicate my preoccupation with the task of securing the individual's or ordinary citizen's rights within the great mass of laws and rules which govern our society. With respect to The Police Act, I submit that I did not deviate from my usual views or actions. Let me explain.

We who have been brought up in the wonderful tradition of British freedom and justice, and particularly those of us who have in other days gone to war in their defence, have always feared and abhorred any semblance of what recently and in common parlance has been often referred to as "The Police State." For such a monster to become a reality, there seem to me, in addition to a weak democratic or non-democratic government, to be two fundamental requisites, concentrated in a body not responsible to

the people—first, control of the police, and second, the powers of inquisition and imprisonment; either of these without the other would be unfortunate but not dangerous.

When I became Attorney General, I found both of these conditions existing in the Ontario Police Commission, that independent body created especially to aid authorities solve the problem of the threat of organized-syndicated crime. I must say that never did I espouse the view of a former Opposition party leader that crime was rampant in Ontario any more than I could accept that of the then Attorney General that we in Ontario were unthreatened and crime free.

I then concurred, and still do, in the reports of both inquiries into this problem, namely, that Ontario, through the excellence and vigilance of its law enforcement agencies and people, has as yet escaped the inroads of U.S.-type crime but that our prosperous economy was a prize for which the syndicates had made, and from day to day could be expected to continue to make, great efforts to penetrate. It was, therefore, my opinion that greater powers should be available to the appropriate authorities—but always bearing in mind the dangers of control and inquisition together in a body not directly responsible to the people.

A careful study of the means whereby other police forces were controlled, particularly our justly famous Royal Canadian Mounted Police, convinced me that control of any state police force must remain in the elected representatives of the people through the appropriate Minister of the government. Only in this way could we be sure that the will of the people would be the final governing authority. I hasten to state, Mr. Speaker, that my resignation as such a responsible Minister in this government when it was apparent that a section at least of our people was displeased with, and fearful of, the proposed legislation, is the best proof possible for my proposition just stated.

I was encouraged in my view by the patent danger when the independent authority was headed and actually controlled by an experienced, dedicated but very ambitious man. Consequently, I proposed that control of our Ontario Provincial Police be returned to the elected representatives through the Attorney General and used wording identical to that in the statutes of Canada with respect to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. At the same time, I proposed certain additional powers be given to the Ontario Police Commission with respect to investigations into matters pertaining to crime. I did this with full confidence that the present Ontario Police

Commission was a unit governed in its actions and deliberations by great experience in such matters and a real appreciation of the freedoms and rights of the individual.

May I for a moment digress to discuss briefly an aspect of the powers of the Ontario Police Commission? The former chairman was strongly of the view, in which I unreservedly concurred, that powers of inquiry as contained in the bill proposed by me were necessary if the threat of organized-syndicated crime was still to be held in check. During an interesting period last fall, one Toronto newspaper consistently attacked me for not providing the measures so recommended by their adviser on such matters. It has been most intriguing to me and, I am sure to others also, to find this self-same newspaper leading in the attack on just such legislation when it was proposed.

In any event, my proposals as embodied in Bill No. 99 and discussed with my hon. colleagues—and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, they were so discussed—are now history. With others, I have welcomed the Royal commission recently appointed to look into the very broad picture of individual rights and freedoms as presently outlined in our Ontario laws.

Mr. Speaker, I occupy my place in this House as the honoured representative of a wonderful constituency, a proud member of the Tory Party and a firm supporter of the Robarts government which is providing Ontario with the good government and leadership so necessary to keep Ontario prosperous.

Finally, may I quote a most interesting statement by Dr. Wayne D. Booth, Professor of English at the University of Chicago:

It is a commonplace to say that democracy depends for its survival on an informed citizenry but we all know that mere information is not what we are talking about when we say such things.

What we mean is that democracy depends on a citizenry that can reason for themselves, on men who know whether a case has been proved, or at least made probable. Democracy depends on free choices, and choices cannot be in any sense free if they are made blind: Free choice is, in fact, choice that is based on knowledge—not just opinions, but knowledge in the sense of reasoned opinion.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this debate, it is the first opportunity I have had to congratulate you and compliment you on the

way in which you handle your arduous duties and add dignity to the Chair which you have the honour to occupy.

I also wish to mention for a moment the Budget, which I believe most reasonable. I want to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) to my right, who provided, I believe, many benefits to the province of Ontario and was able to keep our tax rate on a very reasonable basis.

And I want to congratulate the new hon. members in this House. To me it has been an inspiration to see so many new members of all parties come in this House and do so well in debate and seem to be very knowledgeable of the needs of the communities that they represent. I think the debates have been especially good. I know, sir, that this session has been very stimulating to me and I believe it has been the means of bringing forth beneficial legislation that will benefit all Ontario citizens, the people that we have the honour to serve.

As I speak on this debate, Mr. Speaker, I admit that I do so in a much better spirit than I was at the time I delivered the speech on the estimates for The Department of Mines before the Easter adjournment. At that time, we were faced with a very considerable decrease in the productivity of Ontario's mining industry. I was obliged to point out that for 1964 the outlook was not bright, with the virtual certainty that before the end of the year all but one of our uranium mines will have closed for lack of markets, and within the next two years some of our largest and oldest gold mines will also have suspended operations because of the depletion of ore reserves. These are facts, Mr. Speaker, and nothing that has happened in the intervening time is likely to change them. However, I admitted at that time, and I repeat now, that the somewhat sombre view I expressed could have an application of shock therapy designed to promote the speeding-up of the steps required to bring the mining industry back to its former healthy condition.

I would be very pleased and proud if I could believe that the dramatic cure which now seems to be well started stems even indirectly from my admonition. I am sure that the events of the third week of April, 1964, are still fresh in the minds of all hon. members. For several days at the first of the month, rumours of an important base metal discovery in the area of Timmins grew and spread with increasing rapidity. It was on April 15, when an hon. member asked me if I could give the House any information on this reported find. I could only reply that at

that time I had no pertinent information but since I had had a conversation earlier in the day with Mr. R. D. Mollinson, the vice-president in charge of exploration for the Texas Gulf Sulphur Corporation, I was able to add that the company would be issuing a press release the next day.

About the time that this release was issued in New York I received a supplementary statement from Mr. Mollinson which I made available to the press gallery. What happened immediately thereafter is history—history in the annals of Canada that is still being written. It was evident from Mr. Mollinson's statement that a discovery had indeed been made, a discovery that will possibly rank as one of the major developments in the whole history of Canadian mining.

Although the analysis of the diamond drilling that had so far been done was still incomplete a deposit of at least 25,000 tons of copper-zinc and silver ore was indicated. The total value—25 million tons, did I say less? I beg your pardon, 25 million tons!

The total value, based on the assay of one core and drilling to date would put the gross value of this deposit somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$850 million, which is more than equal to one half of the total output of all the gold mines in the Porcupine in all the years they have been producing.

I think that I should point out that the assay of a single drill core is perhaps not a sufficiently sound base on which to establish so optimistic a forecast, but I think it is sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), who I am glad to see in his seat today, who in the course of the debate on the estimates of The Department of Mines said, and I quote from *Hansard*, page 1058:

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the mining industry in Canada is sick. Nowhere is it sicker than in the province of Ontario, where the mining industry is dying.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Nowhere is it sicker than in the back row up there.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All I can say to that, Mr. Speaker, is that if the patient was as sick as the hon. member appeared to believe, we have here the evidence of a remarkable recovery.

Mr. Sopha: Keep it up!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: If the patient was dying, this is certainly a glorious resurrection. I know that the hon. member for Sudbury

rejoices along with all of us at this resurrection. I believe sincerely that the current events and those which are to ensue in the next few weeks were more accurately forecast in my own speech in which I said, and I quote:

I would like to emphasize most definitely that the present ailments of the industry are or should be short-term ones. That if remedial action is taken promptly the patient will recover his complete health and be stronger and more robust than ever. As could be expected there have been expressions of regret that the major find was made by an American company rather than by one of our Canadian-owned mining or exploration groups—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They are busy in the cement business.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Certainly, we would all have preferred that the triumph should have been won by a Canadian organization if for no other reason than more of the benefits of it would have accrued to Canada. But the fact remains that the find was not the result of any fly-by-night effort but rather it was the fruit of five years of intensive and costly exploration efforts.

It may yet show, of course, that some of the frenzied activity on the stock market was in the nature of a chain reaction, that there was more buying and selling of stock in some of the companies that held property in the general area of the major strike than the situation would actually justify. Time alone, Mr. Speaker, holds this answer; but naturally my department is not directly concerned with the operation of the market, although it is of vital importance to the mining industry for which I have the honour to speak in this House. For that reason it is most gratifying to me, and I am sure to most hon. members, that it has been shown that the apparent apathy toward mining in Ontario of the last year or so was not deep lying and Canadians are as anxious as they have ever been in our history to demonstrate their faith in our country and its great mining industry.

Apart from the assurance that Texas Gulf Sulphur intends to begin mining operations, I am not able at this stage to give the House any sort of timetable for their development work. That, of course is a company decision. We have the assurance that a very large open pit mine will be established as quickly as possible and as soon as work starts it will mean a new lease on life for the town of Timmins and a great resurgence of activity throughout the whole mining industry. It

will certainly mean a great deal in profitable freight traffic for Ontario's own railway, the ONR.

Now it has been said, Mr. Speaker, of the old historic Cobalt camp, that its greatest contribution to Canada and the mining industry lay not so much in the value of the production of its mines as in the impetus it gave to prospecting and developing the vast mineral resources that still lay unrevealed throughout the breadth of Ontario and farther afield. Even at this early stage I think it might safely be said that the same thing applies to the base metal discovery in Kidd township. Prospecting in this province has been at a relatively low ebb for the last two or three years, but so far this year, I am happy to say, there has been a very distinct upturn.

Reports received from the offices of mining recorders throughout the province show that during the first three months of this year there were 5,986 claims staked and recorded, an increase of 2,227 over the total for the same period last year. At the same time, the number of miners' licences issued and renewed showed a sharp upturn and there was a reduction in the number of claim cancellations. All this happened before the definite announcement of the Kidd township strike, and certainly the in-rush of prospectors to that general area since then would indicate that there will be anything but a falling off when the snow is off the ground and the chances of successful discoveries are much greater.

We have had to bring our mining recorders from Port Arthur, Kenora and all our western points—10 in all—to man the office in the Timmins area, where we had two previously. We cannot keep up with tags, forms and other necessities, but we are doing our best, because there have been in the neighbourhood of 10,000 claims staked in that area alone. I would point out too, Mr. Speaker, that although the Porcupine division in which Kidd township is located showed the greatest activity and the greatest increase in the number of claims recorded, the resurgence was much more widely spread than that. Indeed increases were reported in seven of the 14 divisions in this province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I might justly point out that the amendments to The Mining Act, which the House approved this year were for the most part drafted specifically to give encouragement and assistance to the very type of prospecting activity which led to the present discovery. In many parts of this province, including specifically Kidd township, most areas in which rock outcroppings occur

have already been subjected to intensive investigation by prospectors. Thus the prospector must look deeper to find what lies beneath the surface.

The amendments to the Act, therefore, are designed specifically to encourage geophysical methods of prospecting through the use of magnetic, electromagnetic, gravimetric or other forms of geophysical examination. The efficacy of this sort of work is borne out by the fact that the Texas Gulf discovery was made under 23 feet of muskeg and the mineral could have lain there forever if only the conventional methods of prospecting and rock sampling were available.

In the short time since the discovery was announced, the chief geologist of the department has rearranged the schedule of this year's field staff so that now two geological parties are to be sent in to examine the area north of Timmins this year.

There is just one other phase of this government's activity which I want to mention indirectly with the Kidd township discovery. I have spoken before at some length on the programme of constructing mining and access roads and roads to resources designed specifically to open areas of the northland for full access and development. Without these roads, Mr. Speaker, many areas which are now richly productive of minerals and forest products would still be completely undeveloped. In the years since 1951 when this government's own access roads programme was initiated, and since 1959 when we entered into an agreement with the federal government to share costs of approved projects, more than 1,100 miles of roads have been built or are now under construction.

There have been 62 mining and access roads and three roads to resources completed; four others in the latter category are now under construction. The longest and most ambitious of these intergovernment projects is a road running northwest from Pickle Crow 260 miles to the Manitoba boundary at Lingman Lake. The route for this road was selected after the first series of airborne geophysical surveys which are to be flown over the entire province. By the end of this year 192,000 square miles will have been flown and mapped. The survey indicated areas of potential mineralization, and it is through or close to these areas that the road is to run. Mr. Speaker, I am able to say that my department will be watching with the keenest interest and optimism, developments in the vicinity of Timmins and elsewhere throughout this province. Perhaps

before too long it will be possible for me to make further reports on success to this House.

I want for a moment to speak to you about the Ontario Research Foundation on which the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) spoke so forcibly during his estimates, and what that great plant under Dr. Miscner is doing for the iron industry in this province.

They are now processing all these iron ores with the hope that they will be able to find a process that will make it much cheaper to bring these ores to the market and perform a great service for the iron industry in this province. We have deposits containing iron, Mr. Speaker, which total at least six billion tons. It is from these and other sources which have not been outlined, that our mining industry will draw a great deal of its strength in years to come. It is in relation to the still undeveloped ore bodies that the major importance of the research now underway will prove its worth. A happy combination of geography, geology and photography resulted in the location of the trans-Canada pipe lines from the gas fields of Alberta to the markets of southern Ontario, through the Pre-Cambrian shield. In many cases it will be within reach of some of these iron deposits. The availability of this fuel supply in virtually unlimited amounts, provides the answer to one of the principal problems related to the use and development of these iron resources. Many of our still undeveloped iron reserves are of relatively low grade—that is, in 100 tons of rock there might be as little as 25 tons of iron. Under the standard procedure of shipping ore to the smelter it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of moving so much waste rock would be prohibitive. Some companies have adopted the practice of concentrating and pelletizing the ore at the mines and shipping only the high grade concentrates. This, however, requires a very costly plant. The objective of the jet smelting process on which the Ontario Research Foundation is working, is to provide a method for converting the iron ore concentrates into molten metallic iron, using natural gas as the reducing agent. The process consists essentially of feeding fine ore through a natural gas oxygen fired burner system to produce a molten metal which can be cast into pigs or used directly in the molten state to produce steel.

As a preliminary to the jet smelting, of course, the ore must be ground very finely and concentrated through a magnetic process which separates the iron from the waste rock. Development of the jet smelting process was begun in 1957 by the research foundation on

a laboratory scale. A small pilot furnace was built on the ORF location in Rexdale, about which the hon. Minister of Economics and Development was speaking the other day.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in 1963, control of this project became the responsibility of The Department of Mines. The process has been developed and improved progressively during the years that it has been under way. Revisions are constantly being made in the equipment and procedures to increase fuel economy. For example, hot exhaust gas is now being used to preheat gas and oxygen being fed to the burner system. Some exhaust gas is being recycled and soon the ore feed will be preheated and pre-reduced by this exhaust gas.

Of course, the whole programme is aimed primarily at the reduction of iron ore, experiments are proceeding at the same time with other minerals. For example, copper oxide has been reduced to metallic copper, and glass has been made from a standard glass batch mix. Some of the work which has been done on a pilot scale seems to warrant continuing study. Tests in the near future are planned in the smelting of titaniferous iron ores. If it is found that this titaniferous iron can be successfully smelted, a use can be found for large deposits of it which exist in Ontario, particularly in the Chapleau area.

Great interest in the jet smelting process has been shown and the research foundation has had inquiries concerning it from all over the world. Success in so important a field will certainly be of major importance to Ontario's own iron mining industry, and this, in turn, Mr. Speaker, will add hundreds of millions of dollars to the economy of this province.

Now there are six other objects of generally similar nature currently being carried out. The secondary research is in the practical use of three new types of machinery for the separation of ores. Perfection of this equipment is expected to lead to more efficient operation.

I think it would be fair, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the government of Ontario, through its interest in the work, has been instrumental in the progress which has been made along a number of lines. The Rexdale plant of the research foundation was built in 1957, as you know, with assistance from the province amounting to \$180,000; another \$35,000 was provided in January, 1962, for the construction of storage buildings and office space. The work that this section of the Ontario Research Foundation is doing on behalf of The Department of Mines is of great tangible value to the mining industry.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad to have an opportunity to say something about it at this time. Again I congratulate Dr. Misener and his staff, and I was most pleased to hear from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development of his plans for enlarging this research centre. We will have, I hope, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) announced, a select committee on mining which will be meeting shortly. We need new thinking for mines. We want to find out all other ways we can to spur the finding and development of our great mineral resources. We need to do that and I am looking to this select committee as a great incentive for the future of the mining industry, because mining, Mr. Speaker, has many fields. It is mystifying, true; it is provocative, it is intriguing, it is perplexing, it has its moments of disappointment and despair, its hills and valleys, but in the end it often brings rewards that compensate for all the trials that those connected with it are forced to endure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all hon. members of the House to try to interest young men to come into this great mining field in this province. Try to teach them in university to go in for geology, mineralogy, mining engineering, because we need new men in those fields.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I said that I had enjoyed this session immensely and I have. I have been quite intrigued with the knowledge of the new hon. members and the other hon. members. I have enjoyed the speeches, many of which were brilliant. I want to say that in my opinion we have a great young Prime Minister—and I am not saying that to curry favour. Hon members should know it. He is a man of integrity, a man we know we can trust, a man with ability and a man who is a humanitarian. It often makes me laugh when I hear some of the slings that are passed across to this part of the House. As far as I am concerned, I do not care, but very seldom do I hear anything of a complimentary nature said when certainly I realize that complimentary words should be extended from those on the opposite side who have been helped by the leader of this government, the Prime Minister of this province. However, I suppose that is politics, and I do not blame the Opposition members very often for being critical and so on; that is their side of the House to look after—the critical side of politics.

And so I say this has been a great session for me. It has been stimulating, and in closing, I hope Mr. Speaker, that you and

every hon. member of this House have a very, very happy and successful summer and that you come back again in the fall, filled with good health and happiness and the realization that this government has done a great job. Mr. Speaker, my last words are God bless you, each and every one.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I now move an inspired adjournment to the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The eleventh order.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves second reading of Bill No. 141, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves second reading of Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-63.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, just before the hon. member starts, may I say we decided that this bill could be a form in which the question of pensions in a broader aspect than just what is contained in this bill could be discussed. In this regard I would suggest that if the House would like to deal first with the principles of this bill within the bill itself, I would be pleased to make a statement. I made a very full statement on the first reading as to what this bill in fact accomplished. Now I can continue that, or if hon. members have some debate on this bill itself, we could deal with it and then deal with the subject of pensions generally, because I would like to make some remarks in that regard.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Would that mean that members might conceivably speak twice?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments relating specifically to the bill itself as it is before us on the order paper.

I think this bill, which is the culmination of about four years of consideration by this House and the technical committee set up by the House, provides an interesting case

history of how a Tory government can take a good idea, kick it around, play politics with it, milk it for all the publicity it is worth and finally leave it with very little substance.

As this group tried to indicate several years ago when the question of portable pensions first came before the Legislature—I think pretty well one could say on the initiative of the Opposition parties, and I use the word in the plural advisedly, I think both of them were pursuing it in their own ways.

I think as far as this party was concerned, in the 1960 session, the first session of the 1959-63 Legislature, our hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald) placed a resolution on the order paper, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of portable pensions and in the following session I introduced a bill which was discussed briefly.

From the very beginning, this group tried to indicate that there are really two quite distinct problems in the field of portable pensions, as it has popularly come to be known. First there is the question of supplementing the federal old age pension; the basic, flat rate old age pension payable to every citizen who reaches a certain age and who has been here a certain number of years. There is the problem of supplementing that with a wage-related pension plan, since most of us recognize that the old age pension is at best a bare subsistence, and we would like both for ourselves and for others to see supplementary pensions available.

So there is that problem of providing to everyone as far as is possible a wage related pension to supplement the basic pension. Our group has taken the position from the beginning, and from prior to the time actually when we raised the matter in the House, that the only adequate and satisfactory way to do that was by a universal and contributory pension plan. We have stated on a number of occasions in this House that in our view such a plan should be brought in on the initiative of the federal government and as a federal statute. Since we became somewhat impatient waiting for the federal government to act, we suggested last year that if the federal government did not act soon then the provincial government should act and set up a universal contributory wage-related pension plan for the people of this province. We were always of the opinion however, and still are, that the proper way is through a federal plan.

Well, a good deal of water, as we know, has flowed under the bridge, and it appears that we will within a couple of years achieve

some sort of federal universal contributory plan in addition to the basic pension that is now provided.

There is the second problem in the field of portable pensions that we tried to outline four years ago and every year since then. That is the problem of guaranteeing some degree of portability for private pension plans. I brought in a bill, I think it was in the 1960-61 session, that had as its purpose to deal exclusively with the private pension plans that existed at that time and will continue to exist no doubt even when we have a universal plan if, indeed, we get one in the next couple of years. There will still be cases where people want to supplement their pensions beyond anything that the public plans provide.

We have always taken the position that these two problems should be regarded as separate problems. We agitated four years ago that the government could proceed immediately with the second of the problems, that is with guaranteeing portability in private plans. That was what my bill, which I introduced three or four sessions ago, was exclusively concerned with. It set forth basic principles relating to portability for private plans. It did not purport to deal at all with the other area of a universal pension plan. It was our view that we should start with the easiest part of the problem. Guaranteeing portability in existing plans and private plans that might come into effect in the future was, in our opinion, the easiest part.

Unfortunately, the government set up a technical committee which contrived to get itself into an almost interminable blind alley and ended up last year with a bastard bill, that became enacted into law, which tried to deal with both the problem of universality and the problem of portability in private plans. It did not deal very well with either of them. It did not tackle the problem of universality in a sensible way at all, and now that phase of its recommendation is going down the drain. I say good riddance to it, it never was any good anyway and we are glad to see the end of it. The direction in which policy is now moving is much superior, that is the direction of a government-sponsored universal plan.

We still, however, have before us the question of portability and in this area too, we still have a very inferior piece of legislation before us. The amending bill that is now before us will cut out of The Pension Benefits Act of last year those provisions that purported, quite inadequately, to establish universality. The provisions that are left are

essentially the provisions of the original Act with regard to portability of private plans.

I am going to suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that they are totally inadequate provisions. This group takes the position—and this is the principle that was embodied in the bill that I put in on this subject a few years ago—that wherever a pension plan was set up for employed persons, a basic condition should be that it is fully portable, that the pension benefits are fully portable.

Perhaps I should suggest that a better word to use, actually, is vesting, rather than portability. I understand that what we mean when we popularly talk about portable pensions, is pensions in which the contributions made by or on behalf of an employee, are vested in him, so that to him accrue the benefits that those contributions justified. A pension is portable to the degree in which contributions and the benefits arising therefrom are vested in the employee. I think that is really what is meant by portability. A pension is fully portable, a pension plan provides full portability if it is fully vested; it provides partial portability if it is partially vested.

Before the government's legislation came into effect, the effect of income tax interpretations or rulings made by The Department of National Revenue—whether or not with lawful authority I do not know, but they made them and they had their effect—was that pension plans did have a certain degree of portability in this country. I think the rule of thumb was that they would be recognized as costs for income tax purposes if employer contributions were vested in the employee after not more than 20 years of service. I think all existing plans long before this Act was considered—and at this time the Act still is not in effect—provided for vesting of employer contributions in the employee after not more than 20 years. Some provided it earlier. I know of plans that provide for vesting of most of the employers' contributions after five years and there are some plans, not very many, but some, I think, in public service, that provide for full vesting from the very beginning.

I submit to this House, Mr. Speaker—perhaps just before I go on to that, I should mention a point that I had intended to make. The Act that was passed last year and is not now in effect but is to be reaffirmed by the bill now before us, does not really take much of a step forward over what was already the case as a result of income tax interpretations made by The Department of National Revenue. The effect of The Department of

National Revenue's action was, as I said, that there would be vesting of pension rights after 20 years of service.

The Pension Benefits Act of last year—and it will be reaffirmed by this bill if this bill passes in its present form—provides that employer contributions will be vested in the employee after 10 years of service, but only if the employee is 45 years of age. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of employees will have put in 15 or even 20 years of service before they reach the age of 45, so that for a great many employees this legislation, if it passes in its present form, will make no difference at all. It will mean simply that after they have been there 20 years the employer's contributions will be vested. For some it may mean that they will only have to serve 15 years, but it will certainly not mean, even for a majority of employees, that there will be vesting after ten years as the bill appears to mean, if you look at it quickly.

It says after ten years, but then comes the real rub: You have to be 45 years of age. And even if it did provide vesting after ten years of service for all employees covered by a plan, I am going to make one more appeal to this House that there is nothing fair or reasonable about such a proposition.

Pension plans covering employed people have grown up as a form of deferred wages. The growth of pension plans for wage earners developed at a rapid pace after trade unions got interested in the field. They frankly were negotiating for pension programmes as a form of deferred wages. They took lower wages now so that they could get benefits in the future and that is the way in which pension plans have been justified even where they have not been introduced by union negotiations.

The proposition put to the employee which I think is a sensible proposition, has been: "Take a little bit less now and we will set up a plan whereby you will be reasonably well cared for in your old age." But then without complete vesting, that is without full portability, many employees are cheated out of the wages which they agreed to defer. They never get them. The employer's contributions stay in the fund and accrue to the benefit of some other person, not to the employee's benefit, although they were supposed to have been made for his benefit.

In all too many plans, Mr. Speaker, they accrue to the benefit of the employer himself. He, in effect, gets them back through dividends from the insurance company that is underwriting the pension programme. This is

one of the reasons why there is so much opposition to the principle of disclosure of information even to the employees covered by pension plans. The employers know that the employees and their union representatives would be more than interested to know about how much they get back from insurance companies in the way of dividends in pension plans. This information, of course, is carefully kept from the employee and under the bill, as it now stands, it will continue to be withheld from the employee. That is another point which I will not go into at this time—we will deal with it in committee—but another gross injustice in this bill is that employees and their representatives cannot find out what is being done with their own money in pension plans and will not be able to, as of right at any rate, if and when this legislation becomes operative.

I want to go back again to the question of portability. I submit that it is unjust that pension plans should be put into effect, which are not fully portable. Such plans are a form of skin game on the employees, who are led to believe that they are going to get benefits which they may not get at all. Under the legislation now before us they will not get the benefits unless they have been there at least 10 years and are 45 years of age. I can see no justification for such a limitation at all.

It is also suggested that there is more at stake than just the rights of the employee. There is also the whole question of the good health of our economy. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) has frequently emphasized in this House the need for increasing mobility of labour. Now, we all know that pension plans which contain deferment of vesting are one of the greatest obstacles in the way of mobility of labour. In fact, many employers deliberately defer vesting as long as they can to use the pension plan as a way of freezing the employee to the job. That may be sensible from an employer's point of view but it is not sensible from the point of view of the economy. There may be many cases where it is desirable for the employee to think of moving to another job. It may be desirable, in terms of our economic development, that he should move, but the pension plan stands there as a bar to his moving; and the longer he stays with one employer the more solidly he is frozen to the job.

Let us take an employee who starts with an employer, say, at the age of 25 and say he starts contributing into the pension plan at that age, as I think he should. By the time

he is 42, none of the employer's contributions would be vested under this legislation. It may be desirable in the economic interests of the province as a whole for him to change his job, and yet he has 17 years of employer's contributions standing to his credit that goes down the drain if he changes his job. He is frozen there for another three years. He is frozen there until he is 45, and we all know that, unfortunately, as conditions stand now, by the time a man reaches 45 he had better not change his job unless he has an ironclad assurance that he has a good, permanent job to which to go. If he leaves the job he is now in, even if he does not like it, he runs a grave risk that he will never get another job.

So, then, we can effectively freeze the fellow there until he is 45, and then he is frozen forever. It is very difficult for a man to change jobs after he has reached the age of 45 in the situation as it exists at the present time. So we have legislation which will continue to create this most undesirable limitation on the mobility of labour.

For this basic reason, Mr. Speaker, this group is most unhappy with the bill now before us. We had hoped that when the government had finally, by force of events, made what was surely a logical division in the first place and concentrated its attention on the sole problem of providing portability, it might have done an adequate job. It could have thrown out the window that bill we passed last year, it was no good anyway, and started anew with a new Act dealing with the portability feature only and providing for full vesting of benefits.

This was the principle contained in the bill I brought in on behalf of this group a few years ago. I am satisfied that the bill I brought in a few years ago was much better than the legislation we now have before us, notwithstanding the fact that the government had a technical committee sitting on the thing for three years. I agree that my bill was expressed in terms of basic principles and that the details were to be worked out by regulation, which was the only way in which I could draft a bill on this subject. But the basic principles incorporated in that bill were sound principles. In my opinion they ought to be adopted by the government. I can say only that we support this bill only on the basis that half a loaf is better than none; in fact, I think one should say that a tenth of a loaf is better than none.

It is a most inferior piece of legislation, but it is admittedly somewhat better than the situation that now exists. There will be some

improvement in vesting, there will be some minor increase in portability as a result of the bill. To be fair, however, I should also say there will be an important step forward in another direction. For the first time, when this legislation comes into effect, there will be adequate regulation to ensure that the funds in pension plans are adequately invested and that the people covered by pension plans will indeed receive the benefits that they are promised. That is a step forward and we agree with it.

However, I would suggest that everything that is now to be done in this legislation could have been and ought to have been done better about four years ago, if we had not gone off on a great tangent with the technical committee, that went into an area that it dealt with very poorly and did not get down to brass tacks in the area that it could have dealt with in reasonably short order.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 7, 1964
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964



CONTENTS

Thursday, May 7, 1964

Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Robarts, second reading	3007
Collection Agencies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	3027
Mortgage Brokers Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	3027
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	3027
Registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen, bill to provide for, Mr. Wishart, second reading	3027
Tourist Establishments Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	3027
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	3027
Collection Agencies Act, bill to amend, reported	3027
Mortgage Brokers Registration Act, bill to amend, reported	3027
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, reported	3028
Registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen, bill to provide for, reported	3028
Tourist Establishments Act, bill to amend, reported	3028
Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	3028
Executive Council Act, bill to amend, reported	3030
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, reported	3030
Third readings	3031
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3033

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1964

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1962-1963

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to see the progress which has taken place in establishing a comprehensive social security scheme in Ontario. You will recall I have raised this question in the House on several occasions. As noted in *Hansard*, Thursday, November 29, 1962, the former Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. hon. John Diefenbaker—

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me, I wonder if I could ask the member what he is proceeding with?

Mr. Morningstar: Bill No. 140.

Mr. Speaker: On the pension bill?

Mr. Morningstar: That is right, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Fine; proceed.

Mr. Morningstar: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to see the progress which has taken place in establishing a comprehensive social security pension in Ontario. You will recall that I have raised this question in the House on several occasions. As noted in *Hansard*, Thursday, November 29, 1962, the former Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. hon. John Diefenbaker, asked the Prime Ministers of the provinces to give their views on a contributory social security scheme. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) replied as follows:

DEAR PRIME MINISTER:

I learned with much pleasure of your proposals to develop a contributory social security scheme for the aged, which will also include and extend to the disabled, and survivors (including children) of contributors who have died.

It is our considered opinion that the only proper way to add strength to our social security planning for the future lies in the establishment of a contributory scheme, enabling contributors to establish their right to receive benefits on a pre-

scribed basis in keeping with their previous contributions.

May I say, therefore, that the government of Ontario would concur in and facilitate proper and reasonable plans by your government resulting in a contributory social insurance programme becoming a reality.

(Signed)

JOHN P. ROBERTS

Mr. Speaker, this is the end of the letter. It is a good letter from the hon. Prime Minister, a good reply. It is another indication of how this government is concerned about the needs of all the people.

I am personally satisfied that the people of Ontario want an improvement in pension coverage. An extension of pension plans in Ontario would secure for everyone who contributes, the basic necessities at least. Income would be assured where a person was retired or disabled, or for a family in the case of the death of the breadwinner. I live near the international border and I know how much the people in the United States are "sold" on compulsory pension contributions.

One of the most important features of the proposed pension plan is its portability—in other words, employees are free to move from one location to another and take along their accumulated pensions. Then, too, the Canada pension plan is going to be all across the country and this portability will apply when moving from province to province, as well as from job to job.

It will readily be seen that the hon. Prime Minister and the government have been fully in support of the opportunity to bring about this social security measure and I am sure that the good people of the riding of Welland will be delighted with the progress to date. Just another progressive step put forward by our leader, the hon. Prime Minister, the man for all the people. Thank you.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to answer some of the points raised by the hon. member for Woodbine. A good many of his points I will

not bother with because what we heard this afternoon was a rehash of what we heard a year ago when this legislation was introduced. But I would say that when we commenced these studies, we knew full well that we would not be able to run the 100-yard dash before we had learned to crawl. We did what we considered to be a necessary amount of study in order to be able to introduce this legislation without completely disrupting the affairs of those who were engaged in this area.

The ten-year service qualification and the 45-years-of-age qualifications are for vesting and locking in. There is more to portability than comes from the two features, and not just the vesting. There must be some restraint put upon the man who would, if he could, spend his accumulations every few years as he goes along. We knew full well that the plan as we introduced it was not perfection and indeed was not close to what our ultimate goal was. However, for reasons of their own, many people have misinterpreted the position we took on this.

I have made this statement before. Our position has been misinterpreted for political purposes, I think. I say this quite frankly and quite freely, that an attempt has been made, for instance, to equate our plan and the part of it which is being taken out of this bill, with the national plan that the federal government introduced. Of course, there was no comparison between the two, and when we get into the fuller debate on the broader area of pensions, I think I will be able to establish quite clearly that at no time did we ever consider what we were doing was any substitute for a national plan. This has been made clear from the very beginning of our discussions. The fact of the matter was that when we started our investigations into this area and started to develop this legislation, there was no national plan and there was no mention of any national plan.

We at that time had no intention of introducing a state-operated plan in the province of Ontario. We started where we could start at that time, and I might say we started where nobody else started before. So everybody wants to get on the bandwagon. In fact, when this legislation was passed through this House, there was no similar legislation anywhere on the North American continent. Perhaps I can recognize the hon. member's desire to get on the bandwagon and say, "I thought of it before you did," but we are the people in fact who introduced the bill.

I would say this, that the private pension plans that we have in this province are going to have a very difficult time indeed in

integrating, if this is the term, or adjusting, to a national plan. I will not deal with this at any length at the moment except simply to say that I have been asking the federal government for a good many months how it proposes to do this, and this is one of the great questions for which I received no answer. We are working on it here in the province ourselves and I will point out some of the difficulties involved. This is going to be a very major problem indeed and anyone who knows anything about pensions recognizes this.

If we were to attempt at one time to make all private plans portable, and if, in anticipation of the difficulty that there is going to be, in any event, to get some form of locking together of the plans that are presently in effect and people have paid into, we could create such confusion and we could create such administrative difficulties we would in fact do more harm than good. We have to work these problems out as we go along. We have to build, in the first place, the administrative machinery to do what is in this bill. We have that, of course, well under way. When we get all these plans registered, we get the necessary forms and all the administration there is to be done, and we have it working, then, of course, we will look to the extension of it. Our ultimate goal is the same as anybody else's who really gives this matter any consideration, and that is to make all our pension plans portable, from whatever source.

As you can see now, a great many of our retired people in this province are going to have income from three sources: they are going to have the old age pension, they are going to have a contributory pension, and they are going to have a pension to which they have contributed themselves. This is liable to produce some very peculiar results. We will look at these as the plans develop.

It is possible for people to be retiring on more money than they earned when they were in the labour force. These are many of the difficulties that occur when you start to put together situations that have developed in different areas and at different periods of time. I only point out to you that in asking your approval of this bill, we are not looking upon this as the be-all and end-all of what we choose to accomplish. This is the first step and when we have this done we will progress and move on to develop it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister and I think I have followed, as closely as I have been able in any event, the various discussions that have

taken place in these halls and in other jurisdictions. I must admit that I am quite confused about what the future of pension plans in the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada is to be.

I do not want, nor have I any right, and I am sure the hon. Prime Minister is going to object to my attempting to put any words in his mouth. I was wondering if at this stage it would not be fair to say we do not really know where we are going in any detail insofar as our pensions are concerned.

What seems to have emerged—and I am just sort of thinking out loud if I may for a moment or two—from all these discussions that have taken place is that we are about to have a common pension plan all over Canada, and that Ontario will take its role in being a part of that. The detail is not clear, at least it is not clear to me. I do not know what the amount is going to be, what the fringe benefits are going to be—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If I may interrupt my hon. friend—perhaps the hon. member was not in the House, but we arranged the procedure for this debate. We have before us the bill which deals with a very specific matter and we decided that it could be used as a vehicle for the debate on pensions as such. This afternoon, we decided in order to get some order into what we were doing that we would first speak about this bill and my remarks were addressed only to what we are attempting to accomplish with it. When we have disposed of this area we will get into the broader area, and my intent is to spell out, as far as I can get it from the federal government and as far as I know, exactly where we are going and what we are doing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister highlight the overall thinking that I had, even though I perhaps breached inadvertently the agreement that was arrived at earlier. I think that what is being done in this bill is an adapting insofar as it can be seen at this moment, of the provisions of the present Ontario bill to what seems reasonable to expect in the future in the overall scheme. Am I right in saying that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes. The purpose of this bill is to remove the necessity for obligatory pensions in this province. Then there is an extension of the portability aspect of supplementary pension plans, as we refer to them, those that will be in addition to a Canada-wide pension plan.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, then let me say this. I am quite satisfied that we are not going to obstruct the progress of this bill within the broad limits that the hon. Prime Minister has outlined. It seems to me—and perhaps I am infringing on the rules that we decided earlier in the day—there is so much doubt about the final form of these things that are probably going to emerge in the course of the next few months.

I wonder if at this stage it would not be reasonable to outline a future procedure. It may be that in one month, two months or three months the picture will be much more clear than it is this evening. When that picture has clarified, and I do not think it is clear tonight, is the hon. Prime Minister prepared to suggest to us that before any final commitment is made in the overall picture, that this House will be called back again and given an opportunity to discuss the final plans before Ontario is committed? I recognize that I am going to be told that the hon. Prime Minister by himself cannot commit the Legislature, but on the other hand, the hon. Prime Minister, when the House is not in session, can go a long way in making that commitment without discussion.

If I can get to the nub of the argument that I am trying to put forward, as these plans emerge in the future, perhaps in a month, two months, three months or four months, before, in the normal course of events this Legislature is likely to sit again, it may well be that the die will be cast. I think we are entitled at about that point, to get some sort of an undertaking from the government that we will be called back and allowed, in light of what seems to be the plan, to discuss our views in regard to those matters.

I think this is important. This is a difficult sort of debate to undertake because there are so many things that do not present themselves in a clear light at the moment. It is my thought—and I address this to the hon. Prime Minister in the hope that he will come along with this, and I think he well might—that these discussions will continue as they have been, and that close to the point where final arrangements are being made, he will be prepared to call this House back into session and allow us to discuss these arrangements before this province is finally committed.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about section seven as I understand it, or are you—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I understood that the hon. Prime Minister was planning

to make a statement, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to say anything I have to say on the general issue at some other time. But if the hon. Prime Minister makes some comments now, I may wish to comment on them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, all right. I am quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to go first. What I want to do really, is to sketch out some history of this whole pension situation that arose originally with the federal White Paper of July, 1963. Let us recall that that is where this whole matter started, or perhaps it started a little before that. I believe it started with the federal Liberal Party manifesto, if that is what it was called.

In any event there was a leaflet put out in 1962 as part of the federal Liberal Party platform and it was called, "Benefactions for All—the Answer." I will go into the proposals, Mr. Speaker, in some detail, sketching what that plan said, what the paper said would be, what changes were made as we went along through an election campaign in Ontario, what changes were made through a couple of federal-provincial conferences, what Quebec proposed and where we stand today. At least on the record we will have a factual position on pensions as they are as of now.

That pamphlet or leaflet put out in 1962 promised graduated pensions of one-third of earnings up to \$6,000 based on a contribution of one-half of one per cent each from employers and employees. That is as far as it went.

Three months after the new federal administration took office, and this was part of the famous 90-day programme, a White Paper on pensions was issued—

An hon. member: Sixty days.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Sixty days. Well then, this was 90 days, it did not get in under the 60 days.

Mr. Bryden: Very little did.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What did probably should not have.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: However, I have problems of my own, Mr. Speaker, and I am not in the least bit involving myself in the problems of the federal government.

But I would say this, three months after the new federal administration took office, it issued a White Paper on pensions. This was the thing that interested me so much

during the election campaign when I was being coerced, bullied, shoved and pushed around to say, "I accept this," and "this" was the White Paper. It was not a bill, it was not a piece of legislation, it had never had scrutiny in the House of Commons, and I was to accept this or die, you see?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Who was doing the pushing—Judy?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Pardon? You know better than I who was doing the pushing. I was not in on all the conferences, I was just in on the receiving end of it all. This was the type of question that I was pushing off.

Mr. Bryden: Do not blame Judy, she brought your campaign back to life.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, it helps. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that we did pretty well. But let us get off the politics, Mr. Speaker, and back to the pensions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I want to put these facts on the record so that they will be there for people to understand and so that people can make comparison. I think one of the great problems in this whole pension picture in Canada today is that the people themselves do not understand what we are talking about. I do not think that I am responsible for the confusion.

The White Paper on pensions was issued as of July 18, 1963, as I have said, and the plan set out in this White Paper, which was the second step, said pensions and contributions were to be based on earnings up to \$4,000 a year maximum, with the ceiling rising according to an index of average wages. In other words, the ceiling upon which you would pay could increase as the index of average wages went up. This would mean that the contribution would increase with the increase of wages in the community, whether this would be through inflation or increased standard of living or whatever reason.

Included in the plan, and this is a very interesting point, included in the plan on that White Paper was a flat \$10 increase for all persons receiving old age security payments. They were then \$65 and they were to be raised to \$75, plus 30 per cent of average pensionable earnings. So this is what was to be paid out: the collection was to be on up to \$4,000, and then the payout was a \$10 increase to everybody on old age security

payments, plus 30 per cent of average pensionable earnings.

In calculating this average, in order to get the figure on which you would take the 30 per cent to get the pension, the earnings in past years and the earning ceiling would be adjusted according to an index of average wages and a dropout of low years would be permitted. These are technical details, but nonetheless, they are the detail of how you were to arrive at the amount the pension would be. And there was a provision that would permit low earning years to be taken out in the computation of the average.

In the first ten years of the plan, the earnings-based benefit would be paid on a graduated basis, rising by ten per cent each year so that at the end of ten years of contributions the full pension payments would be received. I will go into this a little later, because this is one of the things about this plan. This feature of it has been carried forward into the other plan and I think it is something that everybody should understand. I will neither agree nor disagree with it, but I will put it before hon. members so that they may know what it is.

The contributions here were set at one per cent from employees, one per cent from employers, and two per cent from the self-employed who elected to join—that is if they elected to join, they were not forced to join. Provision was made here that the old age security pension plus the extra flat \$10 payment, and the graduated pension would be available from the age of 65, at the option of the individual, without a retirement test. Retirement test is in effect I suppose a means test, but it is a test of how much money you were earning: that is: Are you really retired or are you not? In some pension plans and in some state pension plans you have to be retired before you can draw your pension: that is: The amount of income that you are permitted to have is limited, and you will find that this turns up later on in these schemes as well.

The amount of a pension commencing before age 70 would be reduced on a basis depending on the age at which the pension began, the reduction being 32.5 per cent at age 65, so that if you wanted to take your pension before you were 70 you could take it at 65, but you would take it on a reduced amount. Of course you would receive it for the extra number of years.

The graduated pension of a surviving spouse, payable if over the age of 65, would be 60 per cent of the combined graduated pension of the couple. Now note: payable if

over 65. This is where the constitutional problem arises, because when the federal government published this White Paper, constitutionally they were not able to pay the survivor a pension below the age of 65. They are still not able to do so today, and they will not be able to until we have an amendment to The British North America Act.

We agreed to that amendment in this House back two or three years ago and I think that was what the hon. member for Welland was referring to, sir. Mr. Lesage did not agree to it as far as Quebec was concerned until just recently. This is what is presently before the House of Commons in order that we may get survivor benefits, but at the time of this White Paper they could not pay a survivor benefit to anyone under 65.

The plan would be compulsory for employees, aged 18 to 70, in all provinces, except where the collection of contributions would not be feasible, and leaving out the armed forces. The plan would be optional for self-employed persons and for provincial government employees. The contributions to the Canada Pension Plan—and this is another point that I found interesting—the contributions to the Canada Pension Plan collected from the employer and the employee would provide the \$10 flat increase in the old age security payment as well as the graduated benefit and the extra cost of paying old age security before the age of 70. So here we were putting together, in effect, two plans—old age security and the contributory, wage-related pension plan.

On September 9, 1963, there was a conference held in Ottawa, and Mr. Pearson's statement had the point that Quebec would be allowed to contract out of the Canada Pension Plan. Here is where some of the complications arose. He stated that the proposed Quebec plan was not an obstacle to the federal government's national objective; these were his statements. He stated also:

That the contributions under the Canada Pension Plan would not normally be required in a province with a universally available pension plan providing comparable benefits.

Now that was his statement and hon. members can see what it means. In other words, if a province develops a plan that, in the opinion of the federal government I assume, was comparable, then no contribution would be required from the residents of that province to the Canada Pension Plan.

Furthermore, the additional flat \$10 payment would be provided under The Old Age

Security Act and not under the Canada Pension Plan. So here we have the first variation from the White Paper. Because if Quebec is to be allowed to contract out, you cannot collect money from the other nine provinces of Canada on a contributory basis from the employee and the employer and use that money to pay an additional \$10 of old age security to the residents of Quebec. So here we have the first change in the plan designed to accommodate the province of Quebec. Part of the payment out disappeared and personal income tax, which we all pay allocated to the old age security fund, was raised from three per cent with a maximum of \$90, to four per cent with a maximum of \$120, and then this amount was used to pay the additional \$10 of old age security. We then had that element dealt out of the situation, so to speak.

This is, in my view, where the problem of accumulation of funds in the plan first raised its head, because with this removed and the payment of \$10 additional a month made to everyone receiving old age security, then the amount of money being paid into the Canada Pension Plan fund would be greater than that which was needed year by year. In other words, it would cease to be a purely pay-as-you-go fund and become a fund that was partially funded. I am sure you are all right with me.

Mr. Bryden: We are indeed, so the people got soaked—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, but it could not be done any other way if—

Mr. Singer: This is the difficulty about understanding what either of you—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, when I am finished my statement and hon. members can get *Hansard* they will find it all there if they want to understand it.

Mr. Singer: The history of the negotiations, yes; but a plan, no.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am speaking about the actual mechanical computations, the amounts to be paid in and the amounts to be paid out and where they are going to come from. It will all be here.

In January of 1964, Mr. Pearson sent a memorandum to all the provincial leaders and made a number of further changes in the Canada Pension Plan. These were embodied in Bill C-75 and it might be interesting to note that Bill C-75, which is the first piece of legislation having to do with the Canada Pension Plan fund, was introduced

into the House of Commons on March 17, 1964. So this is the first time we have seen the legislation. This embodies many changes which I have outlined to hon. members, but this is what I was supposed to accept completely last August, with no examination and no questions asked. From those days forward, it was March before the legislation actually got into the House of Commons so we could see it. Bill C-75 includes the following:

The range limit was raised from \$4,000 to \$4,500. This limit would not be raised for five years and thereafter it would be adjusted in \$100 steps according to a three-year average earning index. The maximum graduated pension at age 70 would be 20 per cent of \$4,500, instead of 30 per cent of \$4,000 in the White Paper. That is to say, in actual dollars, \$900 instead of \$1,200.

At age 65 the benefit would be the same as at age 70, hence the new benefit at age 65 would be \$900 compared with \$810 in the White Paper of July, 1963. The graduated pension would not be reduced if taken before age 70 but a retirement test would be imposed. Old age security benefits would be age-reduced and not subject to retirement test.

The extra cost of paying old age security before age 70 would be charged to the Old Age Security Fund and would not be paid for out of contributions to the Canada Pension Plan. In consequence, the Canada Pension Plan would develop a large reserve fund and the provinces in the plan would control 50 per cent of the investment of the fund.

Those are the proposals contained in the bill of March 17.

In a letter of February 25, 1964, the Prime Minister of Canada stated that the federal government would be willing to consider what rules on funding could be spelled out and he was willing to have consultations with provincial officials on methods of integrating private plans.

That is Bill C-75. Perhaps I should go next to the plan unveiled by the Prime Minister of Ontario at Quebec City at the conference there. What he provided for originally—

Mr. Singer: Is this Ontario or Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry—the Prime Minister of Quebec. He unveiled this at the conference in Quebec City. He provided for compulsory coverage of all workers including the self-employed, except those under federal jurisdiction. Contributions were to be based on earnings between \$1,000 and \$6,000 and those earning under \$1,000 per year would

not pay any premium. In other words, if you were earning less than \$1,000 a year, you were included in the plan and you benefited from it but you did not pay in.

The pension would be paid on all earnings up to \$6,000 so that those with average earnings under \$1,000 would make no contributions but would receive a pension. The contribution range was to be four per cent—two per cent from the employer and two per cent from the employee of pay above \$1,000 and up to \$6,000. This would give an equivalent of 2.9 per cent of total pay for a person with an average pay of \$3,600. Pensions under this scheme would be available at 65, subject to retirement tests—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the interest in pensions cannot compete against that.

Because of the graduated payments in the Quebec scheme and no need for payment under \$1,000, the pension would be the equivalent, if you took the middle position, of 2.9 per cent of total pay for a person with average pay of \$3,600. The pension under this plan would be available at 65, subject to a retirement test, as I have said, and contributions would stop at that age.

The transition period in this plan, before full pensions would be paid out, would be 20 years. The pension benefit was to be 25 per cent of the average adjusted income over the contribution period and this income would be adjusted by the national consumer price index, but it could not be raised by more than two per cent in any one year.

Mr. Lesage has the ability to deal with dependants constitutionally, which the federal government did not. In his plan was included 37.5 per cent of the husband's pension plus \$25 a year payable up to age 70 for a widow but ceasing on remarriage. An orphan's pension would be payable to age 18 or school leaving age and a disability pension would be payable on total disability. A death benefit is provided where there are no dependants entitled to the pension.

That is the proposal of Mr. Lesage. Then the revised Canada Pension Plan announced on April 17 by Mr. Pearson contained the following provisions, and this is where we stand today:

Coverage is to be compulsory for all employees including the self-employed except that no contributions would be required from an employee earning less than \$600 per year

or from the self-employed earning less than \$1,000 per year. The new earnings limit is to be \$5,000. Pension payment is to be 25 per cent of average adjusted earnings to a maximum of \$104 per month, and then of course the old age security payment of \$75 per month is in addition to this. Contribution suggested is 1.8 per cent for both employer and employee on earnings between \$600 and \$5,000.

The earnings basis will be adjusted according to a wage index, and pensions in course of payment will be adjusted with the cost of living. The transition period in this plan is ten years. In other words, someone who pays in for ten years can receive full benefits. Until that time they will increase at ten per cent per year. Pensions presumably rise by ten per cent each year from the time the plan starts until the full 100 per cent of payment is reached. There is to be a widow's pension and a disability pension but details of these have not been specified. I assume they are being worked out and I suppose really the government of Canada could not spell out these pensions until they are constitutionally able to provide them.

Mr. Sopha: Why is it necessary to amend the constitution?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Because that is the way The British North America Act was originally drawn. Then there was an amendment which is 94-A. I am not here prepared to give you the full particulars of the constitutional problem. It is a relatively simple amendment.

The question of survivor benefits is completely within the jurisdiction of the provinces, and it will—

Mr. Singer: Below the age of 70.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Below the age of 65. That was taken care of. At one stage of the game there was no power in the federal government to deal in pensions at all. There was one amendment but it did not go all the way. I cannot talk about it any more completely than that but I can—

Mr. Bryden: It created concurrent jurisdiction, I believe, and said nothing about survivor benefits.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is not a difficult thing if we can get all the provinces to agree, because we have not yet in this country been able to figure out how we can amend our own constitution, much less what we are going to amend.

In any event, the final detail of this plan that I wish to mention here is that the provinces are to get 100 per cent of the investment fund that is created by payments from employers and employees in and out of that province. Any province is free to pass its own legislation and to administer its own plan. That is the situation factually, in these proceedings to date.

I wanted to make a couple of points here that I think should go on the record. As I said before, I am going to quote from an address given by Robert M. Clark at the Canadian pension conference held at the Royal York Hotel on April 23 last. Dr. Clark is a professor from the University of British Columbia and—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He was proved to be basically wrong about his approach.

Mr. Bryden: He certainly gave us a wrong steer.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It all depends on what your basic approach is. In any event, I am going to quote his computations. These are mechanical computations as to what can happen under this plan and I point this out simply from the point of view of information so that it will go on the record.

This plan simply means this, that those people in Canada who are aged 65 when this plan is introduced will receive no benefits from it whatsoever.

This is just a straight fact. The plan, as drawn, will not benefit anyone who is 65 at the time it is introduced.

In 1961 there were 1,391,000 persons aged 65 and over in Canada, so if anyone says to you that we have a great universal plan, factually it is not so. The plan does not cover this age group—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could address a question to the hon. Prime Minister?

Are these remarks of Dr. Clark's criticisms that the hon. Prime Minister is presently levelling against what is proposed? Does he associate himself with them or is this just sort—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. I am setting these things out, Mr. Speaker. What I am attempting to do here tonight is place before the hon. members of this House the facts, nothing more than the facts. There are no conclusions in what I am saying except perhaps some conclusions I mentioned about the events of last September.

Mr. MacDonald: They are the analysis of one of the nationally known critics of the plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I took them because it was the easiest place I could find where research had been done and the figures had been dug out. There is no opinion of Dr. Clark's in the fact that this plan does not cover anyone over 65 years of age and in the 1961 census there were 1,391,000 people in Canada who were over 65. There is no opinion involved in that. That is straight fact and I am not attempting to give opinions here tonight. What I am attempting to do is to give the facts of this whole pension—the whole procedure of dealing with this pension and what—

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, does this analysis bear upon the Lesage-Pearson understanding?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, this is simply an analysis of the final plan as I have sketched it out.

Mr. Oliver: But not the latest—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, the latest.

Mr. Singer: The final one, or the final final one.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The final one from the point of view that it is the last one that I have received.

Mr. Singer: And this is a comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This is a comment on that, yes. There may very well be more changes in it and do not think for one minute that I am criticizing anybody for making changes in it because I am not. I think it is a matter of such enormous complexity that to approach it with anything other than an open mind and to examine all these things and see what they mean, would be the height of folly if we did not.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would criticize no one for making changes in this because through changes we have been able to achieve something that might have been impossible, if certain actions that had been urged upon us were taken some time ago.

This is the type of thing, in my view, of which an analysis should be made. I am not saying this is right or wrong, I am simply saying that these are the facts. If you have two contributors under this present plan who

are aged 55 at the inception of the programme, one of whom earns \$2,400 a year and the other who earns \$5,000 or more, over the ten-year period while the plan matures to full payment of pension, the man earning \$2,400 a year will contribute \$324, and the man earning \$5,000 a year will contribute \$750. So the man with the lesser income contributes \$324 and the man with the larger income contributes \$750.

If you assume that each of these men lives according to his life expectancy after age 65, then the man who will have paid directly \$324—this will have been his contribution into the plan over the ten-year period—will receive a graduated pension on top of his old age security of \$600 a year for 13.53 years, according to the life insurance tables. This means that he will be paid a total of \$8,118.

The man who directly contributed \$750 over the ten-year period will receive a graduated pension of \$1,248 a year for the same period, or in total, estimating his life expectancy according to the table, he would receive \$16,885.

You can see that with a ten-year maturity, the man who earns the most pays in the most and takes out the most, and the man who earns a lesser amount, pays in a lesser amount and takes out a lesser amount, but he needs the pension the most. This is—

Mr. Singer: How else can you start unless you wait the 40 years as was originally suggested, and nobody gets anything until the year 2005?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You can do it in 40 years, you can do it in 20 years, you can do it in 15 years or you can do it in ten years. All I am trying to do is point out that you will get a degree of equity, regardless of how you do it. But is it not wise that the people who are going to live and pay for this, should know this? That is my point. I am not saying that this is wrong. Perhaps socially, it is the right thing to do. Let us be knowledgeable about what we are doing. That is my only point.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, if this comment or criticism, whatever it may be, that is now being attributed to Dr. Clark is not exactly the same criticism that the hon. Prime Minister himself was making in his words and on his own responsibility a couple of months ago. If it is, has he moved away from it personally but still thinks it is a good one for Dr. Clark, or how does he explain the present method of presentation?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will go through my own position in this matter in a moment. I keep reiterating it and probably I shall be criticized in any event for having said it, but I am simply trying to point the facts out. I am making no comment on them. I am not saying they are right or wrong. All I am saying is that this is what will happen, and those to whom it is going to happen should know.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): May I ask the hon. Prime Minister: Are we listening to statements of opinion or statements of facts by others? Are we going to hear a statement of opinion or a statement of fact or are we going to hear how the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario stands on this plan?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just be patient, I will get to it.

I would like to remark upon some of the comments that I have made and the positions I have taken in this matter, and this is what the hon. member is waiting for.

Mr. Sopha: No, pick up the one that is yours.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The one what?

Mr. Sopha: The one that is yours.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote from some statements that I have made over the past year or so. This is a statement I made in Ottawa on July 26. I said:

The Canada Pension Plan has undeniable attractions. It provides a quick and generous payment and I am sure will have appeal and will meet many pressing needs. However, where irrevocable and irreversible decisions are made which will affect our people for generations, frank and full discussion with adequate time for examination of the subject is not only desirable but imperative.

This statement was made at that conference on July 26, and I believe that was made before there had been any comment as to what I should do or should not do. I am only pointing out that my position has been the same since the beginning.

I continue to quote:

And I cannot emphasize too strongly that pension legislation is for all practical purposes perpetual and irreversible. Once instituted, it is not likely to be rescinded and therefore we should approach these questions with great care, not only to ensure that

the benefits are in accordance with needs, but also to ensure that the financial impact and burdens are kept within manageable dimensions.

We live in a highly competitive world and our progress and future prosperity depends on how sensibly and soundly we plan and legislate today. The pension plan, like other vital measures, must be examined and considered fully and dispassionately. I do not think it would be unreasonable for us to expect full and ample opportunity to be given for discussion and examination of these important questions.

I have outlined a number of important changes which have taken place since then, so in retrospect it does not appear that this request was too unreasonable.

On August 2, 1963, I was quoted thus:

While Ontario has reservations as to the overall effect of the new federal contributory scheme as proposed by the Ottawa government, Mr. Robarts said Ontario is not raising any constitutional questions, and is fully in accord with the announced intention of advancing monthly payments of \$75 to those who qualify. Mr. Robarts stated his willingness to attempt every means possible to bring about a suitable arrangement whereby the portability principle for those who are committed to payment under private pension schemes will be recognized.

Then on September 9, 1963, in Ottawa, I said as follows:

At the outset may I make it crystal clear that Ontario will co-operate with the federal government to the fullest extent in initiating and implementing a sound and equitable pension plan for the people of Canada. We are prepared to join with our sister provinces and the federal government in working out such an agreed plan.

It is well understood that any province has the power to initiate and operate a pension plan, even one such as proposed by the federal government, but we recognize that a pension plan that is nationwide has advantages.

Mr. Sopha: That is when the hon. Prime Minister dashed into the meeting and dashed out.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member is quite right.

Extensive studies leading to the enactment of The Ontario Pension Benefits Act,

1962-63, have always emphasized the desirability of a plan national in scope.

So if I wanted to document it fully, I could go back to where this has been said time after time over a period of years.

The federal government can count on the fullest support from Ontario in working out such a plan. I do not come to this conference to magnify difficulties but rather to find ways and means to give to our people the very best contributory plan which can be devised. I have already indicated—

Mr. MacDonald: It was a good political statement in the middle of the election campaign.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am prepared to make the same statement here. I am reading it into the record tonight, so it could not have been made for purely political purposes.

I have already indicated that I would approve in principle a pension system operated by the federal government. I am prepared to recommend the amendment of the Ontario plan to conform with such an agreed national system, subject to the protection of Ontario workers from double imposts. In other words, there should be ample time and provision for integrating the new plan with existing employee-employer pension plans and contracts.

I think we all recognize that this must be done.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): The hon. member for Sudbury nods his head in approval.

Mr. Singer: Did the hon. Prime Minister say that before he said he would not talk to Judy, or after?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I cannot recall. I forgot about that as quickly as possible. That whole incident is in the past as far as I am concerned.

November 2, 1963—this is after the election—I was quoted:

Once again Mr. Robarts, in an interview at Queen's Park Thursday, repeated his belief that a national pension plan has advantages over a provincial scheme and stated that the federal government could count on the fullest support from Ontario in working out a national plan.

On November 23 in Toronto:

We support any action by the federal government to develop a pension system

best suited to our needs. First, we are prepared to amend our Act to conform to such a system because I believe that with flexibility, goodwill and a respect for facts on both sides, differences between the Ontario and federal approaches to pensions will be overcome.

I could go on but I think perhaps I do not need to.

The next point I want to make—

An hon. member: Hit them again, they are still breathing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I really did not expect a much wider approach to this problem than that. None are so blind as those who will not see, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: What is the hon. Prime Minister's position?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think from all these quotes, you can see what we were seeking. We were seeking the best plan possible. We have not the full details. The hon. member for Downsview has already admitted it in this debate and almost said, "Don't bother saying this tonight because you really have not got the final details." But I am just trying to give him the details as far as we have gone, and of course we have not the complete details. We did not have the complete details last September when I was being asked to accept the plan regardless of the amount of detail there was.

I made a statement here in the House in April after Mr. Pearson made his statement and I am not going to put that back into the record—

Mr. Bryden: It was not quite as conciliatory.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not being conciliatory, I am just telling the hon. member what I said. Everything I have said here I have said before.

I think that we are approaching some of the objectives that I have had over this period of time. First of all I think we are developing a plan, with the changes that have been made and have been influenced by all these events, and this plan is developing into a better plan than previously. Certainly we have achieved what has been my ultimate objective. It is rooted back in the bill that we were considering before this debate

started under the aegis of which this debate is taking place, and that is national portability.

Mr. Singer: There is little similarity in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We in Ontario are unable to legislate for all of Canada. When we started there was no portable legislation anywhere in North America. We started where we could. Even when we started there, we said time after time that a national plan was better than what we were doing, but we were unable to create a national plan.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to ask the members to address their questions to the Chair. I have been lenient for the past half hour in permitting the members to speak back and forth across the floor. I think perhaps we could have more order in the debate if the members who have questions to be addressed to the Prime Minister while he is making his statement would ask the Chair if he was prepared to answer a question.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, what I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is just to state some of the problems that we are faced with in this province. I said that I would accept a national plan. I think we are getting to that point. I have indicated to the federal government and I have indicated in this House that we are very pleased with this legislation as it is coming out. We have not yet seen it, and I am not rushing the federal government to produce it. I understand what they have to do, I understand the constitutional difficulties, and I would like eventually to see a piece of legislation similar to Bill C-75 to which I have referred, and the particulars of which will be spelled out and we will be able to study and assess in minute detail.

I think the problem that faces the province—and I think this is obvious from the discussions over the past few weeks—is really whether we want to avail ourselves of the provision that it appears will be in the bill, and that is to pass legislation and operate the scheme ourselves. Now mind you, in the operation of a pension plan, this will not make any difference in the actual day-to-day operating or functioning of the plan whether it is done by the federal government or the provincial government. There are questions of administration, of course, and these are very great, and they are being very closely investigated now as to which is the most efficient way of doing it.

There are, too, the questions that arise as to the security of the plan. If we have our plan in the province of Ontario then, of course, we have control over it and if there are to be changes made—and I have made this point many times before—if there are changes to be made in a national plan, we, as a province, will have to be consulted. I see some virtues in this as far as our own people in the province are concerned, because this government is very closely controlled by the people of Ontario and if we have to decide in this Legislature what changes are going to be made in the plan certainly the people of this province will have a good deal to say about it.

This might be achieved in other ways. There are other areas of approach that we could take. For instance, it could be done by the federal government administering the plan in Ontario on some form of contract basis, just as they now collect certain taxes for us. This is a possibility which in my view would bear a lot of exploration. This would leave us with control here but then it would leave one collecting organization on a national basis—with the exception of the province of Quebec. This might be a good move from the point of view of ease of administration and efficient administration and at the same time would reserve to us the control which I think we must seek in the interests of our own people.

There is another problem, and at the present moment there is research going on and we will come forward with proposals in this area, but now I am putting forward to you some of the things that I think we have to consider. There is the question of the investment fund that will be created; how is it to be dealt with by this province? The federal government has indicated that if they administer the plan and put it into effect, and if it is their plan, they will still put this money back into the province. This is a matter that will require a great deal of very close investigation and the position of this fund *vis-à-vis* the overall economic position of the province, how it is to be used, by whom, how it is to be divorced from politics—there are a whole host of questions in connection with that fund that I cannot answer here tonight and which the government is having investigated so that we will have an intelligent position to put before the people of the province in due course.

The other very large problem which faces anybody who administers it—and it has no bearing as to whether the federal government or the provincial government does it—is the question of the integration of private pension

plans with this plan, regardless of who has the responsibility for administering it. One might ask why integration is necessary.

Well, in the first place, both employers and employees will probably object to paying into a private plan and a government plan. As I mentioned earlier, we have to look at the effect of integration from the point of view of what, for some people, is going to be the total of these three pensions they will receive—a federal pension, an old age security payment plus a pension from a private plan. It does not appear to be fair that one would just simply deduct from a private plan the amounts that would be payable under a national plan, because this would mean that the employee would receive no benefits from this piece of social legislation. In other words, he has looked after himself to X so far, and the state comes along and gives him an opportunity to advance that X by another area; why should he lose that benefit?

These are some of the problems that I see. The other very large problem is the enormous variety of pension plans we have in this province. It may be necessary to devise a great many different means of integrating these plans, sir, because if there is a variety of plans, then what will serve as a satisfactory level of integration for one plan might very well not serve as a level of integration in another plan.

So that is where we stand at the present time and I hope that the hon. members will be able to work out where we stand, from these few remarks, and see where we do not stand as well, and see the areas in which we have not yet the answers—in which the answers have not been forthcoming. They will be forthcoming in due course. I think we have made great progress since last September. I am not concerned with the speed with which we have moved, I think we have accomplished a great deal and I think there is more still to accomplish. That is where we stand today.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few brief remarks on this subject. I do not intend to go into as much detail as the hon. Prime Minister but I should like to start with a categorical statement which I think will be accepted for the intrinsic validity that it has among all Canadians, except perhaps those who sit opposite and to the left and who support those who sit opposite.

If we are to have a national pension plan in this country it will be as a result of the tremendous act of national statesmanship of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. hon. Lester B. Pearson.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The second categorical statement I will make, Mr. Speaker, is that some day somebody will write a book and the model will be *The Education of Henry Adams*, a very famous classic. They will call it "The Education of John Parmenter Roberts." Because out of this pension business, I am sure his education went on at a great pace and more expeditiously than he could ever have hoped.

From the outset in this whole pension business, the hon. Prime Minister of this province seemed to deal with detail and trivia. I should not say trivia, but he seemed to be obsessed with detail. As I said before, I drew the contrast between him and the Prime Minister of Quebec, in relation to the municipal loan fund and I said in respect of that, that one could see the difference between the approach to a national issue as a matter of principle and as a matter of detail. In the municipal loan fund, the Premier of Quebec always took the position that "I will have no part of your municipal loan fund in Quebec, because municipalities are a creature of the province and the federal government may not come in and interfere with those things that are a matter of exclusive jurisdiction with us." The hon. Prime Minister of this province took the position—although I never can get it straight which it was—that they favoured small municipalities at the expense of big ones, or big ones at the—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We take the position we would not accept it because it would not work in Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Always the matter of details. The reason, of course, that Quebec was always willing to be left out and I do not put words in Mr. Pearson's mouth when I express these thoughts. I do not speak for him, but I put it forward as an educated guess that the reason that Quebec was always willing to be left out by the federal government was that large amounts of capital for investment for the development of that province were not available in the way they are in Ontario.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Why? Tell us why!

Mr. Sopha: Well, let us not go into the question of why. They are not.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, yes. Tell us!

Mr. Sopha: They are not.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member is not going—

Mr. Sopha: That has no bearing. The large amounts of capital were not available and the federal government was always willing to leave Quebec out to operate its own pension scheme on a properly operated basis, and to use the capital that it would accumulate through the operation of a pension scheme without joining in a national scheme.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member knows as well as we do that was not the reason.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. The same considerations never applied to Ontario.

Now, the next thing of importance to realize is that the hon. Prime Minister of this province seemed to be obsessed with the idea of what is going to happen to the existing plans. That seemed to obsess him. It seemed to be a fetish with him. He seemed to be committed to a scheme run by private insurance companies.

We do not need to repeat objections we made a year ago about the bill that was tendered before this House and how long it would take for the full benefits to accrue to the people of this province, or the fact that under that bill only half the people of the province would be covered. All of those are matters of history now. I am not going into the history.

However, finally, at the end of March, the hon. Prime Minister marched his small army, his satraps, down to Quebec. Now I want to make this point, Mr. Speaker, that nowadays, in the constitutional relationship in this country, it seems that we have ten Balkan states, and when we have a meeting with the central government, then the ten provincial Premiers assemble their small army and they descend on the place where the meeting is going to be held and they act as if they are sovereigns of independent countries.

They get down there and the first thing we read—and I followed these things very closely—the first thing we read was that Ontario's Prime Minister exhibited some petulance. He was petulant. If Quebec can be left out, then so can we; we can stay out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I will take my bat and ball home and I will not play. That was the first thing.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Will the hon. member promise?

Mr. Sopha: Then the next thing we notice, Mr. Lesage unfolded his scheme and the hon. Prime Minister of this province had a look at it and he said, "My, that is wonderful; that is just what we need in Ontario, that is better than anything I have seen since; I think I will take that one home."

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Tell me, just quote where I ever said that.

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Quote where I ever said, my, that is wonderful, that is just what we need in Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: I am not quoting, I am paraphrasing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: It is a fair summary of what the hon. Prime Minister said.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): The hon. member is making it up.

Mr. Sopha: No, he became enamoured of Mr. Lesage's scheme and he said "I will take that back and we will have a look at that and maybe we will have that in Ontario."

The point was, when he arrived back in Ontario he was in a bad position, because Quebec was going to be left out—and for reasons that Canadians from coast to coast could fully accept and understand, because of the special characteristics of the Quebec economy, the special pressures that exist on Mr. Lesage which do not exist on the hon. Prime Minister of this province—and he was in a bad way. Then, to sum it all up, and here was the *coup de grace*, he sat around in the orchard long enough and finally the apple fell into his mouth and now we are going to have a national pension plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I just make one comment with reference to what my hon. friend said? I would never in any way attempt to take any of the credit from Mr. Pearson for what has been done in the course of these negotiations. I do not think that anything in my remarks would indicate that I did in any way. I do not think he is necessarily seeking great kudos, and I certainly do not think I am, and I would not want to have any remark of mine taken as deprecating anything the Prime Minister of Canada has done on the national scene.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister this evening provided us with what I would call a complete and unabridged history of the great pension negotiations, leaving out only those portions that the hon. Prime Minister would like to forget. His position was not quite as noble and virtuous, nor as consistent, as he led us to believe. His statement, I may say, was not quite as non-political as he attempted to suggest.

The difficulty that I saw in these negotiations and in the development of this matter, Mr. Speaker, was that on more than one occasion, the whole concept of a Canada Pension Plan, almost foundered. In my opinion the blame, at least in part, rested on the hon. Prime Minister of this province for his failure to take a clear-cut, forthright stand. His position pretty well through the piece, until now—and I think everybody is agreed we are going to go ahead with some form of national plan—his position could very well have been summed up in a paraphrase of a statement once made by another political leader in Canada with whom the hon. gentleman opposite has much in common. I would say that the hon. Prime Minister's position for months was: a Canada Pension Plan if necessary, but not necessarily a Canada Pension Plan. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that was not the kind of leadership we needed in the situation.

True, as the hon. Prime Minister said, he made many general statements about being prepared to co-operate with Ottawa, but at the same time he was always cavilling about some detail, as my hon. friend from Sudbury pointed out. He was very concerned about the cost; he was very concerned that the rates might become impossible 50 years hence; he was very concerned about people who would not be contributing and therefore would not be getting benefit; he was very concerned that some people would get more benefit than their contributions merited. Always, he was cavilling about some detail of the plan.

Our position from the beginning, from the day that the federal government announced it was interested in this matter, was simply this. We did not suggest that the hon. Prime Minister should accept a plan sight unseen; all we asked him to do, and I think he should have done it, was to state, clearly and unequivocally, that he was in favour of the principle of a national pension plan, he wanted it and he would sit down right then and there and negotiate the details with Ottawa, instead of always objecting to some detail.

There was a period last fall, prior to Christmas and a little beyond, when the insurance companies were really putting the heat on the federal government to wreck the whole concept. To be honest about it, at that period it was hard to know where the hon. Prime Minister of this province stood. I think he would have helped to stiffen the backbone of the federal government which was wobbling badly at the time, if he had come out point blank and said, "The insurance companies might as well pack up, they are out of the picture, we now have the way to the real solution of this problem, which is a Canada Pension Plan." But no, he was quibbling. He was using the same sort of criticisms as they were—

Mr. Dunlop: Will the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. Speaker: Will the member answer a question?

Mr. Bryden: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in the hon. member's view on this point. What might have happened to the state of our union had Ontario unequivocally accepted a plan which is unequivocally unacceptable to Quebec?

Mr. Bryden: Well, I think the question is based on about three false premises, Mr. Speaker, and it would take a little too long to try to straighten out the premises. However, I will try to answer it at least as far as I think the basic intent is concerned. I believe that this province should persistently take a position of co-operation with the federal government, should take it clearly and unequivocally and I say this now in a non-political sense. I do not care what government is in office here, I do not care what government is in office in Ottawa; I think we have a responsibility of leadership in the Canadian Confederation. At the same time I think we should accept the fact that there is a totally different situation in the province of Quebec from that which exists in this province and that it is not our job to comment on their position.

However, let me get back to the pension plan—

Mr. Dunlop: He did not answer the question.

Mr. Bryden: There was no question. The question was an argument, and it was a very weak one.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): You were weaseling.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister of Health, I know, is a great authority on weaseling but he should not attribute to others his own qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We could not help it after watching you.

An hon. member: He is trying to ruffle your feathers now.

Mr. Bryden: In addition, Mr. Speaker, I think that the federal plan has certain undesirable features in it to an important degree because of the influence of the hon. Prime Minister of this province.

Several hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald: What are you protesting about? You should listen. You may hear something.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Prime Minister has been objecting persistently. I regretted to hear him state the same objection tonight, although in the mouth of another man, to the fairly rapid maturity of the plan, the effect of which is to give benefits out of proportion to their contributions to some of the older people, the people in the 55 to 65 age group. He was quite positively, and I would say almost vehemently, opposed to that feature in a statement he issued a month or two ago.

He now is retreating behind the words of Dr. Clark, but I hope he is not going to pursue that objection to the plan. I think it is a heartless attitude to take. I described it before as a calculating-machine attitude and that is what it is. I believe that the older age groups should get it. The people who did not have the chance over the years to contribute to the plan should get benefits out of proportion to their contributions, somewhat higher than in proportion to their contributions, and I hope that the hon. Prime Minister will drop that objection. I thought he had dropped it but now we have it coming in the back door again, and I am a little alarmed.

My basic criticism of the position he took was his insistence through the piece that the plan be funded. In fact, originally, I think, his position, as far as one could gather from his rather unclear statements, was that he wanted the whole thing funded.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I never took that position.

Mr. Bryden: Well, at any rate he was objecting to the lack of funding in the federal plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I really was objecting to the lack of any investigation into what the lack of funding would mean to the economy. That really was my objection.

Mr. Bryden: Well, we can see now—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It was never indicated to me that any study had been made of it and we were not furnished with any information as to what it would mean.

Mr. Bryden: At any rate we now can see what his position has produced. It has meant that the contributions that people have to make are much larger than they would have been in relation to the benefits they are going to receive. Let us bear in mind that these contributions are regressive. They are proportionate up to a certain income level, but at that level there is a ceiling. They bear most heavily on the lower income groups. As a result, I suggest, of the position taken by the hon. Prime Minister of our province, there is now going to be a substantial volume of investment funds accumulated under this plan and these investment funds are going to come primarily out of the pockets of the lower income groups, the very people who can least afford to put them up.

He also argued at great length with Ottawa as to whether or not 50 per cent of the investment funds or 90 per cent of the investment funds would come back to Ontario; as it turned out he is now getting 100 per cent as a result of the intervention of Premier Lesage. So what is happening? We are putting a tax on the little man to provide investment funds for this province. That is what is happening.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, where would it go otherwise?

An hon. member: The federal government.

Mr. Bryden: Why are the investment funds not raised from the people who have the money rather than from the little guy who has nothing?

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): We are all little guys.

Mr. Bryden: The man with an income of under \$4,800—he is the man who proportionately will pay the most.

Mr. Dunlop: Would the hon. member allow another question?

Mr. Bryden: By all means.

Mr. Dunlop: Did the original Canada Pension Plan bear any less hard on the little man than what we understand to be the new plan? The original plan bore on those with maximum earnings of \$4,500, but we understand that the present plan is \$6,000. Now I would like the hon. member to explain how that change which bears more on people of higher incomes has been in any way a regressive step?

Mr. Bryden: It certainly has been. In relation to what he gets, the little fellow is paying a higher percentage than he would otherwise have paid. Already one per cent has been tacked on to his income tax up to a limit of taxable income of \$3,000 for the increase in the old age security. He is still going to pay approximately the same contributions to the pension plan without any increase in benefits. As a result there is going to be a fund available which this province is going to use for investment purposes. I do not deny that we have a great need for investment funds, I just do not think we should get them by enforcing saving upon people who cannot afford to save. This, I submit, is a—

Mr. Dunlop: That one per cent was tacked on by the government of Canada to increase the \$65 to \$75 as a result of Quebec going out of the scheme. I wish the hon. member would master some facts.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. gentleman wants to make a speech there are all sorts of opportunities for him to do it. But if he makes a speech perhaps he should master some facts. The facts of the matter are that the contributions in effect now have been increased and it was Ontario that was forever pushing for some funding. I admit that the Quebec approach from the beginning has been for even more funding. I am not letting them out of the picture, but Ontario was pushing for more funding and as a result, the little guy is being compelled to save money that is going to have to come out of his food allowance or housing allowance in order to provide investment funds, when in my opinion there are better ways of providing investment funds.

Mr. Peck: What does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. Bryden: We have been raising substantial amounts of investment funds in this province already. Let the people who have money to invest, invest it. Do not force the

little fellow who has not got money to invest it.

Mr. Peck: We are all the little fellows.

Mr. Bryden: I know for a fact that anybody in this House is earning more than—or is being paid, I will not say earning—more than \$4,800 a year. That I know for a fact, so we are not all little fellows in that sense.

However, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is not necessary to thresh over old straw. I regard one or two of these most recent developments as regrettable. I do, however, regard the overall development as welcome. I think it is most desirable, as I have said all the time, that we should have a Canada Pension Plan.

I hope now that the hurdles have been cleared and even though there are details to be worked out, we are going to have, in fact, a Canada Pension Plan even if it is defective in detail. Once we have the principle established we can always work on improving the details at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I will give credit to the hon. Prime Minister for this. I give credit to him for a great many things, but there is one thing in particular that I would like to single out. I would give credit to him for having seen the light at last, and having abandoned entirely his concept that we can handle social security in the pension field through private insurance companies, and for having accepted, and I think without reservation, the principle that social insurance of this kind can only be done adequately through a public universal plan. I think that is what the hon. member for Sudbury referred to as the "Education of John Parmenter Roberts."

I think that when a man is willing to change his mind it is a credit to him. It took quite a lot of pushing but he did change his mind. He has seen the folly of his position of a year or two ago.

I would like to leave one last thought with the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Now that he has seen the folly of the proposition that old age security can be adequately provided for through private plans, I would like to suggest to him that he might also consider the same principle in relation to Medicare and car insurance. He should complete his education by admitting that the only real way to handle either Medicare or car insurance is also through a public plan.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to know a lot about the pension plan, but I am one of those kind of people who believe, and some of the things that we have heard here tonight have been most misleading

as far as pensions and the benefits of the pension plan are concerned.

We have heard a lot of things said about the fact that the hon. Prime Minister has been misguided, that he has been led down the garden path. I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the advantage of portable pensions in the province of Ontario is attributable to one man only and that is to the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if there is a group of people in this House who are supposed to be interested in the welfare of the workers of the province, it is the famous group of seven across the way and who are they complaining about? The man who is responsible for portable pensions in Ontario and now in all of Canada, because of his actions, is the hon. Prime Minister of our province today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have heard a lot of editorials read. We have heard a lot of quotes from newspapers here and there. I would like to read a quote from Thomas Green that appeared in the Winnipeg *Tribune*, and it reads as follows:

WHAT OTHERS SAY: "ROBARTS DID IT"

The real hero of the pension drama, if there was one, was Premier John Roberts of Ontario. If Canadians in all provinces are paid uniform pensions in the years ahead, they may thank the quiet-spoken earnest man who now occupies the corner office on the second floor in Queen's Park.

He is the one chiefly responsible—

Mr. Sopha: Is that from the Dalton Camp agency?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friends do not like to hear the truth. This is what they do not want to hear. I continue:

He is the one chiefly responsible, not Prime Minister Pearson or Premier Jean Lesage of Quebec. Roberts was the key piece in the pension jigsaw. If he had succumbed to the Ottawa pressure during the Ontario election campaign and had accepted the LaMarsh version of the Canada Pension Plan, at least two different schemes would have come into force, one in Quebec and another in the rest of Canada.

If he had buckled under to federal pressures after the Dominion-provincial conference last November when he was being accused of scuttling the plan for national pensions, the same thing would have happened. Ottawa could have gone ahead with its scheme without Jean Lesage but it could not proceed without Jean Lesage and John Robarts, in spite of the brave boast to the contrary that came from the federal government. Robarts' firmness was therefore a major factor in causing Mr. Pearson to negotiate with Quebec.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an article which did not appear in the press in Ontario. This appeared in the *Winnipeg Tribune*, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when all of the things are said about the pension plan we will look to the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario as being the real author of pensions in Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to enter this debate and I shall not enter it for any great length of time, but I just want to draw your attention to the fact that a few moments ago the hon. Prime Minister said, "I am not detracting one iota from what the Prime Minister of Canada has achieved." Then one of his minions from the front bench gets up and says, "The real man who did it was John Robarts, everybody else is out."

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: I will give you a very short and unabridged version of what happened in pensions, in my view, in this country, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Prime Minister and the insurance companies pushed—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, a year ago this government was in favour of private pension plans through the insurance companies—essentially the insurance companies' position. The pressure of the insurance lobby at Ottawa and the pressure of the stand of the government here in the province of Ontario beat those weaklings at Ottawa down from the original promise of \$167 a month—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. members just make a noise and do not even follow what is being said. What I am saying, and perhaps they will listen and agree with me this time, is that the insurance companies beat the Liberals at Ottawa down from their original

offer after the 1962 campaign—when it was made by Paul Martin—of \$167 a month or \$2,000 a year, to Judy's version a year ago of \$100, and then down to \$75 in the bill. We were in danger in this country of having no pension. The insurance companies were driving us right down into the ground.

If you have to give anybody any credit for rescuing the situation, it was a group of people in Quebec City who suddenly unveiled the Lesage plan. It was so far ahead of what the Ontario government was offering and what Ottawa was offering, that they had to come back with a more adequate proposal. This is what rescued a pension plan for us—one that is at least tolerably acceptable.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the tub-thumping Minister of Agriculture that he might follow the tactical advice of his own Prime Minister and not try to detract from other people and stop in a political fashion, trying to claim the kudos for his own leader. His own leader waffled all over the lot and stood with the insurance companies in beating Ottawa down for a whole year until this nation was faced with a crisis in which we were disintegrating. We were disintegrating when Quebec was pulling out. Suddenly the hon. Prime Minister of the province of Ontario said, "Well, I will pull out." And where was Canada, Mr. Speaker? Canada was disintegrating.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I advised the members before that I wanted a little bit of order in this debate. For a while I thought I was getting that order. In the last few minutes I have not been getting that order and I am going to appeal to the members once again to try not to be so heated in their arguments and come back to a reasonable debate on pensions. I am also going to warn the members that are doing the shouting that I am going to insist that they not shout across the floor at any other member who has the floor. If you ask a question, you ask the Chair. Now I am going to insist upon that rule, and I am going to ask you to debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, I had finished. I appreciate your comments that it was sad we departed from a reasoned approach to it. I trust you looked square into the eye of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, because it was he who got us off onto the unreasoned approach. I must say I was finished and I am glad that the dulcet tones of your firm control of the House can be taken as the footnote to my remarks.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on pensions.

Mr. MacDonald: Here are the insurance companies back in the picture.

Mr. Cowling: That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. I think it is about time something was said about the private insurers and the great job they are doing for the people of the province. Now, it is all very well to say we need a pension plan, we want a pension plan for everybody; but have we forgotten, Mr. Speaker, the thousands and thousands of people in our province who have provided their own pension plans—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Including ourselves!

Mr. Cowling: —through private insurers and others, and they are well satisfied with them. Now, it is fine to say let us get the government into the pension business. Let us get the government into medical care insurance. Let us get the government into the automobile insurance. What are we going to do for ourselves? How far are we going to go with socialized insurance in government? I get sick and tired of it, especially from the hon. member opposite.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cowling: Now, I agree with everything the hon. Prime Minister has said. I say again, if it was not for the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario we would not have a national plan of any kind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cowling: We are devoting a lot of time and energy to getting pensions for everybody. Let us not overlook all these people who have provided a plan for themselves. The thing I am interested in is the integration into a national plan of the existing plans.

I have one. You have them. We are interested, we are concerned about what is going to happen to them. The Canadian government has been in the pension business for many years. They sell the Canadian government annuity.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member has been opposed to those, too.

Mr. Cowling: I have not. I have one. It is the best \$100 worth of pension anybody can buy in Canada.

Mr. Whicher: But it is not enough.

Mr. Cowling: I know it is not enough, it is a beginning, though. It is only \$100. But the point I want to make is this, Mr. Speaker, one of the recommendations of the Glassco committee which studied economies in Ottawa was that the government should get out of the annuity business. The reason they should get out of it was because it was costing the taxpayers of Canada millions of dollars every year to supplement the owners of Canadian government annuities. That is why I bought one, because I am helping to pay for it. What does the hon. member think of that?

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. member is benefiting from it, I am regretful.

Mr. Cowling: I thought the hon. member would be, but I wanted him to know that he is helping my plan, so I thank him very much.

The private people, the insurance companies and trust companies and others who are selling pension plans in Ontario, will supplement any plan that is brought in by this government or on the national basis, but, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say again, let us not be overcome by all this talk of providing pensions for everybody and at the same time overlook the thousands and thousands of citizens of our province who have provided their own pension plan and will continue to do so regardless of what type of plan we bring in in co-operation with Ottawa. I think it is about time we took a long look at that aspect of pension plans.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. member was in control it would be a long long look.

Mr. Cowling: That is right!

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) go to the wiener roast now?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Did the member for Dovercourt wish to speak now?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I am encouraged to take part. By your ruling, previous to the last hon. speaker, we should now have calm and dignity in the House during the debates. I think I have been encouraged to speak in this debate, sir, by

the elucidation of the hon. Prime Minister concerning his stand, and I think I am encouraged to speak by the objective way with which the hon. Minister of Agriculture approached the problem. I think, sir, I am further encouraged to speak on it by the very clear and thoughtful approach, that helped us see just exactly where the government stands, on the part of the hon. member for High Park. If I could say, sir, it was typical of his usual contribution and most constructive, in his usual way, to the understanding just exactly where this government stands on the pension plan.

Mr. Peck: Now, how about the hon. member being constructive?

Mr. Thompson: I would like to say, sir, that I was asked how about being constructive. Really, sir, is not this what we have hoped, not only from the Parliament of Ontario, but the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario? He, after all, when he goes down to Ottawa, is representing the hopes and ambitions of the people of Ontario, indeed the people of Canada. We have listened to him reiterate and reiterate that he made the statement he believes in a national pension plan. But a lot of guts have got to go into developing a national pension plan, and all I can say, in connection with the contribution of the hon. Prime Minister, is that there was a great poet, John Milton, who perhaps wrote the line that best suits the hon. Prime Minister in this whole thing: "They also serve who only stand and wait."

As far as we are concerned on this side, and I think the people of Ontario, we have had some disappointment that Ontario, through its Prime Minister, appeared to raise straw men in connection with difficulties about the plan.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Did the hon. member know his pension plan was two years ahead of the national one?

Mr. Thompson: Did I say, sir, that among some of the straw men he raised, for example, was the problem of integrating existing plans in a broad national plan? I would say, sir, it struck me as peculiar that he would take, for example, Professor Clark, and refer to Professor Clark as being an authority and decide that he would quote him as issuing statements of facts. Therefore, sir, I will just take a remark by Professor Clark in connection with the problem of existing plans and the overall plan. Professor Clark said, with respect to the problem of integrating the existing plans into a national plan, and I

suggest that the hon. Prime Minister might quote this, or some of his advisers might: "Really, this was no difficulty and it could be worked out technically."

Is that not of the straw men that the hon. Prime Minister has raised?

I would say, sir, that we had hoped, on this almost final night of the session, that we might now hear from the Prime Minister of Canada what his real objections are, if he has any, to the plan—

An hon. member: A fine man!

Mr. Thompson: I meant the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario; what are the real objections, if he has any? We have not had either a clear approach from him or a constructive approach from him. I wholeheartedly agree with my hon. colleague from Sudbury when he said that the people who have contributed to get this so necessary measure, which will unite our country with benefits and contributions of equal basis across the country, and permit mobility—and we want to stress that—of Canadians from one part of Canada to the other, were the Premier of Quebec and the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada. When these men get up with this almost idolatry that they have toward the figure of a Prime Minister and quote that he was the man, the architect, I suggest to them to give us, in fact, just one constructive contribution that he made to hammering out this plan. He was silent; he ran with the ball, as I said in a previous debate; he ran and he swerved and he dodged and I congratulated him on it. But the point is that in any game at some point one has to get to the line and make a touchdown.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): The man with the ball runs the game.

Mr. Thompson: And he ran and he ran and he ran with the ball, and he ran round and round and round in a circle and the people of Ontario in this discussion tonight would have hoped to know where the hon. Prime Minister is running to with the ball and we do not know.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, is it not true that the man with the ball generally runs the game?

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): I have seen plenty that fumbled through.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House only a relatively few months but I have found this the most disappointing debate of that short career in the Legislature. What has disappointed me very much is the intentional distortion of facts, or if not, the unintentional distortion which might follow from an ignorance which I hope would not be characteristic of hon. members of the House on the opposite side. I have particular reference to the remarks of the hon. members for Sudbury, for Woodbine, and very recently for Dovercourt. I will not outline the distortions; I think they are intentional because I do not think they are that ill-informed.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): What has this got to do with pensions?

Mr. Dunlop: What disappointed me more were the remarks of the hon. member for York South, for whom I have a high regard—his apparent inability to recognize on the part of the hon. Prime Minister, the magnanimity of his remarks toward the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada.

As to the principle of the bill before us, there was, as we know, a defect which grew in the orderly evolution of private pension plans. This was the lack of sufficient vesting to protect the interests of those who participated when they moved from job to job. Regardless of what the hon. members may say about the origin of The Pension Benefits Act, one of its original and main purposes was to make sure that people in existing pension plans could have an adequate position of vesting, and could move from one job to another without losing their interests. That was one of the original purposes and that purpose is still with us in the bill before us now, and thank God it is.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE COLLECTION AGENCIES ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Collection Agencies Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MORTGAGE BROKERS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

USED CAR DEALERS AND SALESMEN

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 109, An Act to provide for the registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOURIST ESTABLISHMENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart, in the absence of hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information), moves second reading of Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Tourist Establishments Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart, in the absence of hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education), moves second reading of Bill No. 143, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The fourth order, committee of the whole House; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

THE COLLECTION AGENCIES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Collection Agencies Act.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 103 reported.

THE MORTGAGE BROKERS REGISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 104 reported.

THE REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Sections 1 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 105 reported.

USED CAR DEALERS AND SALESMEN

House in committee on Bill No. 109, An Act to provide for the registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen.

Sections 1 to 23, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 109 reported.

THE TOURIST ESTABLISHMENTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Tourist Establishments Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 138 reported.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, when I discussed this bill on second reading I indicated my disappointment that the government has still not seen fit in section 14 of the Act to make any provision whereby an employee who is covered by a plan, can inspect the information return which under the Act must be filed by the employer, with the pensions commission. I consider this to be a grave weakness in the Act, which otherwise—as far as its provisions relating to the security of the funds are concerned—is quite satisfactory.

I suggest that an employee who is covered by a pension plan and whose money is going into the pension plan has as much right as the employer or anyone else to know what is happening to his money, how it is being invested, what sort of refunds, if any, are coming to the employer from an insurance company which may be underwriting the plan on behalf of the group. I believe also that a representative of a trade union that represents employees covered by the plan has a right to get that information. There are

too many cases where employers are not actually making the contributions that they are claiming to be making. They are getting what amount to kick-backs which are called dividends from insurance companies. Most insurance companies now provide dividends on policies. I would say that if such dividends become available under a private pension plan, they should be to the joint benefit of the employer and the employees in proportion to the contributions that they make to the plan.

But there is no way now of finding out what is going on in most of these plans. There is a great deal of suspicion as to what is probably going on but it is a closely guarded secret and the government is going to permit it to continue to be a closely guarded secret under the legislation that is now before us. The one change in the existing situation will be that an employer must not only file an initial prospectus of his plan but year by year he must file an information return in the prescribed form indicating what has been happening under the plan during the year. This is a very important provision, I am not objecting to the provision. I am just objecting to the failure to put in an additional provision to the effect that a person who has a direct interest in a plan or his union representative should have access to that information.

We raised this point with the government last year. The hon. Prime Minister on the various points we raised last year took the position that "We were still feeling our way and thinking about these things." In effect he said, "Let us try it out for the present and see how it works and if it is found not to be satisfactory, we will change it." Admittedly, the law has not yet come into operation so he has not had any practical experience with it, but he has had a year now to think about it. I think that the proposition that I am putting before him is a reasonable one, and one that he should now be prepared to accept.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that subsection 4 of the proposed new section 14 to be enacted by clause 2 of Bill No. 140—when you deal with these amending statutes it is sometimes hard to describe the precise clause you are talking about, and for the information of hon. members I will mention that the clause I am talking about is clause 4 at the bottom of page 2 of the bill—which provides for the filing of information returns and I am moving, Mr. Speaker, that subsection 4 be amended by adding thereto the following:

and any employee covered by the pension plan or any duly authorized repre-

sentative of a trade union representing employees covered by the pension plan, shall be entitled to inspect such information return and extract information from it during the regular office hours of the commission.

Mr. Chairman: Members have heard the amendment. All those in favour say "aye."

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak against the amendment. There is a provision in section 19 which permits the individual who is covered by a pension plan to get full information from the company concerning his own position in the plan and the whole purpose of this Act is to provide portability of pensions.

It is not a disclosure Act. We are not gathering this information together in this Act for the purpose of disclosing it. We are gathering it together in order that we may satisfy ourselves that these plans are being properly operated for those people who are the beneficiaries of them and the employee is given an opportunity to obtain information as far as his own position is concerned.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I want to make a brief comment here. Some six years ago a number of members who are now sitting on the Treasury benches, and I, plus some from the Liberal Party, were in the select committee looking into The Labour Relations Act. We had many representations made to us of difficulties that developed in labour-management relations in collective bargaining because of the fact that the Act was so set up that pensions—even when there was a contribution by the employee—were, in effect, the private concern of management. The investment of the funds, exactly how they were handled, was a secret concern that management could withhold from the union or from the individual worker. We made a recommendation that this should be brought to an end. Now that was just six or seven years ago.

In the fullness of time presumably it will get through to this government.

A year ago we discussed this matter and the hon. Prime Minister pointed out precisely what he pointed out now, that the individual can go to the company and find out what he is entitled to. That is not the point, Mr. Chairman. The point is that a group of individuals who are contributors to a pension plan surely have the right to find out the details with regard to the financial position of their plan and all the other factors with regard to it.

Why should this be the exclusive prerogative of management? Last year the hon. Prime Minister explained this and said he would ponder the other point. He has been pondering it for a year. Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no doubt now that the conclusion is that the government is determined to have this information withheld from the employees and available only to the company.

In other words, here is a clear-cut, unmistakable pro-management bias. The proposition that people who are investing money in their own pension plan should be denied details as to the handling of that money, is an intolerable one and I find it difficult to believe that the government would have the face to put through an Act like this, after two years of discussion on it. It is just so blatantly prejudiced and biased, sir, that I have difficulty in figuring out how they would have the face to do so.

Therefore, I think there is no alternative but to move this amendment and record the government's position.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment say "aye".

All those opposed to the amendment say "nay."

In my opinion the motion is lost.

Call in the members.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 23, the "nays" 54.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this section re-enacts with changes made necessary by other amendments embodied in the bill, section 18 of the Act. I think at this stage one can say, in view of what has now been taken out of the Act, that section 18 is the key section of the Act. It is the section that, in effect, guarantees portability. It provides for vesting—and I will accept the hon. Prime Minister's correction—vesting and locking in of contributions to be held and become available to certain employees in the form of deferred annuities. I stated on second reading that, in my opinion, there should be full portability. In other words, contributions should be vested and locked in—I will accept it both ways—from the date an employee becomes a member of a pension plan.

I will not now repeat the arguments I made not long ago on second reading in favour of

that proposition. It seems to me that the validity of the proposition is, in any case, self-evident. I rise now only because we have reached the spot in the bill where it would be possible to make a quite simple amendment to alter the watered-down and inadequate portability that the government favours, or has favoured until now, and substitute the principle of full portability.

If hon. members will take a look at clause (a) on page 3 of the bill, clause (a) of subsection 1 of section 18 of the Act as it is being re-enacted, they will see that in its governing clause it provides:

A member of the plan who has attained the age of 45 years and who has been an employee of the employer for a continuous period of ten years in entitled upon termination of his employment prior to his attaining retirement age to a deferred life annuity equal to—

and then the conditions are specified in a number of sub-clauses. I suggest that we should now accept the principle of full portability. To do so all we have to do is strike out of clause (a) the words starting with “who” in the first line and all the words following down to “a continuous period of ten years.” Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that clause (a) of subsection 1 of the proposed new section 18 to be enacted by clause 4 of Bill No. 140, be amended by striking out the following words in the first, second, third and fourth lines:

Who has attained the age of 45 years and who has been an employee of the employer for a continuous period of ten years.

We will provide full portability if we take that out. It will then read, Mr. Chairman:

A member of the plan is entitled upon termination of his employment prior to his attaining retirement age to a deferred annuity equal to—

of the pension benefits provided in certain specified ways.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am going to oppose this amendment and I am not going to repeat the arguments I made on second reading. We have debated this, discussed this and I would only ask that these provisions in this Act are better than the provisions that were in the old federal Income Tax Act. My hon. friend is aware of that. He appeared to be in favour of that. These are superior to the provisions that were there, but in any event the basic argument is that we want to get this plan working, with all the complications that it will

have, and in the course of time no doubt improvements will be made.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, from our viewpoint, after a consultation with my hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) and my hon. colleagues, in connection with this amendment it would seem to me the principle of the bill itself, I would hope, has something to do with mobility. We feel that the hon. member for Woodbine is emphasizing, as he did this afternoon, the necessity—which I am sure, as he said, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) appreciates—for mobility in our society. In view of the difficulty for a man of 45 in our society to take up another job, and of a number of those points so ably expressed by the hon. member for Woodbine, I would suggest and hope that the government would also agree with us and vote for the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very simple proposition. If you vote against this amendment you are not in favour of portable pensions. That sums it up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment please say “aye.”

All those opposed to the amendment please say “nay.”

In my opinion the nays have it.

Call in the members.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 23, the nays 54.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Sections 4 to 9, inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 140 reported.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 141, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 141 reported.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 143, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Hon W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to section 9. I move that section 9 be struck out and the following substituted:

9. Section 38 of The Teachers' Superannuation Act is amended by striking out "and as apportionable to the date of death" in the second line so that the section shall read as follows: "Every allowance is payable in monthly instalments."

This change in wording further simplifies the administration by referring the payments-in-advance feature until the current review of integrated data processing application permits the adjusting of existing schedules.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is a very good amendment.

Section 9, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 10 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 143 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report one bill with amendment and certain bills without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendments and one bill with amendment.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The first order.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading, upon motion.

Bill No. 4, The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act.

Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Industrial Standards Act.

Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Bailiffs Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to repeal The Investigation of Titles Act.

Bill No. 46, An Act to repeal The Custody of Documents Act.

Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Bill No. 64, An Act to set aside a certain tax sale of land in the township of Herschel for the relief of Wallace Bullied and Norah Bullied.

Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Notaries Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 67, An Act to repeal The Vaccination Act.

Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.

Bill No. 75, An Act to establish the Ontario Law Reform Commission.

Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Bill No. 86, An Act to repeal The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grants Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, there is one brief point I would like to make that has not yet been drawn to the

attention of the House in connection with Bill No. 99. There was a great deal of debate and the majority resolved that the holding of *in-camera* sessions will be at the direction, as it were, of the witness. In other words, in trying to cope with as reluctant and as tough characters as are the leaders of organized crime, we have decided that they will have the right as to whether or not this will be an *in-camera* session.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it is my understanding that there could be no debate on third reading of a bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Where did the hon. member get that?

Mr. Speaker: There can be a short debate.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You can even move amendments.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. We have a self-appointed obstructionist here.

The contrast that I wanted to draw to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, is that in this same bill we have clauses with regard to how you are going to cope with a policeman when he has been charged and is going to be brought before the police commission and disciplinary action may be taken. In fact, his future livelihood may well be at stake. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention that when that kind of session is held, the policeman has no alternative; it will be an *in-camera* session. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the policemen of this province, the people on whom we count for law enforcement, have fewer rights than the leaders of organized crime when they are brought before the police commission for investigation. I think this is a rather anomalous situation that I ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) to ponder for the next year when he considers amendments to the Act.

Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Mortgages Act.

Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Short Forms of Mortgages Act.

Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Race Tracks Tax Act.

Bill No. 115, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Bill No. 118, An Act to provide homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care.

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Bill No. 123, An Act to provide for the establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization.

Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, 1955.

Bill No. 126, An Act to establish The Department of University Affairs.

Bill No. 127, An Act to incorporate The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation.

Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Bill No. 133, An Act to incorporate the University of Guelph.

Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Bill No. 135, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Bill No. 136, An Act to incorporate the Sheridan Park Corporation.

Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Hotel Fire Safety Act.

Bill No. 142, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Collection Agencies Act.

Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act.

Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Bill No. 109, An Act to provide for the registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen.

Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Tourist Establishments Act.

Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 141, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Bill No. 143, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Bill No. Pr17, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the conclusion of the Budget debate and the appointment of the committees, and His Honour will be standing by.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 8, 1964

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1964

CONTENTS

Friday, May 8, 1964

Motions to reappoint and appoint select committees, Mr. Robarts	3037
Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts	3039
Conclusion of the debate on the Budget, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Robarts	3040
Resolution re grant out of consolidated revenue fund, concurred in	3063
Act granting certain sums of money to Her Majesty for public service, first, second, third readings, Mr. Allan	3063
Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor	3063
Prorogation speech, the Lieutenant-Governor	3065
Prorogation	3071

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1964

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today in the east gallery, students from Regent Heights Public School, Scarborough, and in the west gallery, students from St. John the Evangelist Separate School, Weston, and St. Mary's Separate School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

On motion by hon. J. P. Robarts, seconded by hon. J. N. Allan.

ordered, that the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts be re-appointed with the same powers and duties as heretofore, its membership being expanded as follows:

Mr. Beckett (chairman), Messrs. Cowling, Evans, Farquhar, Gomme, Gordon, Hodgson (Scarborough East), Olde, Pittcock, Reuter, Singer, Whitney and Young.

On motion by hon. Mr. Robarts, seconded by hon. Mr. Allan,

ordered, that the select committee on the cost of credit be reappointed with the same powers and duties as heretofore but with its membership expanded as follows:

Mr. Price (chairman), Messrs. Bukator, Edwards, Hamilton, Kerr, Lawrence (St. George), Letherby, MacDonald, Oliver, Reilly, Rowe, Whicher and White.

On motion by hon. Mr. Robarts, seconded by hon. Mr. Allan,

ordered, that a select committee of this House be appointed to conduct a comprehensive inquiry into and report upon the special needs of youth with particular reference to educational, cultural, recreational, and employment opportunities, as well as the health, welfare and sports facilities now available to youth, and the steps to be taken which in the opinion of the committee would ensure a wider par-

ticipation by youth in the life of the community;

To conduct hearings for the purpose of receiving representations from organizations and individuals engaged in youth activities and to hold meetings to study the experience of others in the youth field; and to engage the necessary staff to provide study papers and research materials;

And, that the select committee shall consist of 14 members and shall have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to appoint or employ counsel and secretary and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendances before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants;

The membership of the committee to be as follows:

Mr. Apps (chairman), Messrs. Brown, Butler, Ewen, Gaunt, Lewis (Scarborough West), McKeough, McNeil, Morningstar, Newman, Peck, Troy, Welch and Wells.

On motion by hon. Mr. Robarts, seconded by hon. Mr. Allan,

ordered, that a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and review the problems inherent in the field of aging in Ontario which are of major concern to older citizens and to all of our people, having particular regard to the size, distribution and composition of the older population of the province and the promotion, development and creation of opportunities for self-help to their own satisfaction and advantages as members of society as a whole, including preparation for retirement leisure and the benefit of educational opportunities in later life;

And without limiting the generality of the foregoing, to inquire into and review current policies which have a bearing on

aging and the economy, involving employment, income - maintenance, and health measures, services and facilities of organizations, government and otherwise, including government-sponsored programmes on housing, long-term care, and other related services;

To conduct hearings for the purpose of receiving representations from organizations and individuals, particularly from those who work with older people, and to hold meetings to study the experience of others in the field of gerontology;

To engage the necessary staff to provide study papers and research materials;

And to that end, after due consideration, to make such recommendations as the committee deems to be appropriate;

And that the select committee shall consist of 14 members and shall have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to appoint or employ counsel and secretary and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendances before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants;

The membership of the committee to be as follows:

Mr. Carruthers (chairman), Messrs. Carton, Davison, Dunlop, Knox, Lawrence (Russell), Mrs. Pritchard, Messrs. Racine, Sandercock, Trotter, Villeneuve, Walker, Worton and Yakabuski.

On motion by hon. Mr. Robarts, seconded by hon. Mr. Allan,

ordered, that a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and report upon methods of stimulating prospecting and mining exploration and development in Ontario and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, such matters as the services available to the mining industry, regulations governing the financing of mining prospect and developments, the effects of mining taxation on the growth of the industry, health measures in the mining industry, and any other related factors the study of which would bring about renewed interest and activity in that industry and thus strengthen the economic position of the northern communities and Ontario as a whole.

And, that the select committee shall consist of 13 members and shall have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to appoint or employ counsel and secretary and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendances before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The membership of the committee to be as follows:

Mr. Brunelle (Chairman), Messrs. Bales, Demers, Eagleson, Freeman, Henderson, Hodgson (Victoria), Mackenzie, Noden, Rollins, Sopha, Spence and Taylor.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Prime Minister and ask whether, in his opinion, the terms of reference are wide enough to include the part played by stock exchanges?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I would think so, Mr. Speaker, because I included in the terms of reference the—I do not know the exact term—but I wanted the method of financing to be open to investigation by the committee and I believe it is included in this.

It was my intent that the committee would have power to look at that aspect of the mining industry as well as others. I think, if this is examined, it will be found to be included.

Mr. Sopha: We will have the advantage of referring to the hon. Prime Minister's remarks in *Hansard* if this problem comes up.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course the hon. member will.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I want to make a statement. I notice hon. members have been given wide privileges so I want to refer to something akin to the committee on youth. Last night in the press it was announced that a very fine young gentleman from Ferris in my riding was named as the outstanding young man in the National Hockey League for a combination of skill and sportsmanship. He is Kenny Wharram.

Kenny, I think, is an outstanding example to the youth of this nation, and also the nation to the south of us, because he is not a big man but he has all that it takes to make a real champion and I can to some extent bask in reflected glory because Kenny was one of those with whom I had some connection on his way to stardom.

There is one more thing. It has to do with our history. On August 4 of this year, we will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the beginning of World War I and many, many people in this great province of Ontario gave their lives in that great war and I think that day, August 4, will be a great memorial day for the people of this nation.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to file answers to questions numbered 15, 17 and 18 on the order paper.

The hon. Prime Minister tabled answers to questions as follows:

15. *Mr. D. C. MacDonald* (York South): Inquiry of the Ministry—1. Did any Minister of the Crown during the months of August and September 1963, appear in person and turn over, either to representatives of municipal bodies or to executives of private voluntary organizations in the communities of Terrace Bay, Gull Bay, Geraldton, Macdiarmid, Nakina, Longlac, Manitouwadge or Beardmore, in the riding of Port Arthur, any cheques or letters confirming payments from the provincial Treasury? 2. If so, (a) who was the Minister; (b) what were the organizations; and (c) what was the authorization for such practice either in statute or regulation, or in any constitutional reference confirming the practice?

Answer by the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrobe):

1. Yes.

2. (a) The hon. G. C. Wardrobe; (b) Treasurer, township of Terrace Bay, for Terrace Bay Swimming Pool and Athletic Field, Indian Council, Gull Bay Indian Reserve, for Community Hall; (c) Under The Representation Act, service to all the people of the Port Arthur riding in northwestern Ontario.

17. *Mr. D. C. MacDonald* (York South): Inquiry of the Ministry—1. What hotels, inns, taverns, restaurants or public houses in the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto were granted licences by the Ontario Liquor Licensing Board during the years 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963?

2. Who was the lawyer, or legal firm, representing the successful applicants in each case before the Ontario Liquor Licensing Board?

Answer by the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko):

1. and 2. 1960: Danforth Hotel, J. E. Eberle; Capriccio Restaurant, N. J. DeLella; Hungarian Village Restaurant, S. A. Bjarnason; Four Seasons Hotel, Paul Henry; Carson Hotel, W. S. Dingwall; Csarda Tavern, A. M. Ferriss, QC; Fifth Avenue Tavern, S. H. Brown, QC; Les Cavaliers Tavern, Nixon Berry, QC; Seaway Hotel, E. A. Goodman, QC; L'Europe Restaurant, C. K. Keyfetz, QC; Ciccone's Tavern, Geo. B. Bagwell, QC; Steak Pit Tavern, S. H. Brown QC; Le Baron Steak House Restaurant, Paul A. H. Hess, QC; George's Hotel, L. Herman, QC; Andore Hotel, C. K. Keyfetz, QC; Babloor Tavern, W. S. Dingwall.

1961: Nikko Gardens Restaurant, J. D. Hilton, QC; Canadiana Motor Hotel, none; Windsor Arms Hotel, none; L'Aiglon Tavern, S. H. Brown, QC; Old Angelo's Tavern, none; York Pioneer Tavern, E. A. Jupp; Constellation Hotel; J. B. Conlin, QC; Loyalist Hotel, S. H. Brown, QC; Peppio's Tavern, E. A. Jupp; Lido Steak House Tavern, J. B. Conlin, QC; Chez Moi Tavern, Geo. B. Bagwell, QC.

1962: Old Spain Tavern, W. S. Morden, QC; Kwongchow Chop Suey Tavern, L. C. Hart, QC; Mario's Restaurant, none; Capri Tavern, none; Barberian Steak House Restaurant, J. C. Fleming; Palm Plaza Restaurant Tavern, P. D. Isbister, QC; Fisher Hotel, H. H. Solway; The Old Mill Tavern, J. C. McTague, QC; Valhalla Inn Hotel, W. S. Jamieson, QC; Scott's Restaurant Tavern, D. G. Milne, QC; Executive Motor Hotel, S. H. Brown, QC; Ascot Hotel, C. S. Frost, QC; Little Italy Restaurant, J. D. Hudson; Mayfair Restaurant Tavern, M. B. Romanick, QC; Hollywood Tavern, none; Cloverleaf Hotel, D. R. Atkinson, QC; St. Regis Hotel, J. Szczeglik (Welland); Skyline Hotel, P. D. Isbister, QC; Four Seasons on Park Hotel, Paul Henry, QC; Pickfair Restaurant Tavern, J. P. Bassel, QC; Constellation Hotel, J. B. Conlin, QC; The Jockey Club Tavern, P. D. Isbister, QC; L'Europe Restaurant Tavern, C. K. Keyfetz, QC; Dutch Sister's Inn Tavern, R. F. May, QC; Cambridge Hotel, A. Singer, QC.

1963: La Scala Tavern, C. D. Beccario; Tiroler House Tavern, M. Olanick; Busca's Restaurant Tavern, Roland Tanner; Java

Restaurant Tavern, D. Vanek, QC; Mr. Tony's Place Tavern, V. K. Colebourn; Fran's Restaurant Tavern, S. H. Brown, QC; Del Monica Restaurant Tavern, none; Balkan Restaurant, R. Rohmer, QC; Le Provencal Tavern, J. L. C. Jenner; Hotel Pierre, W. E. MacLatchy; Cafe Jules Tavern, J. H. Campbell, QC; Canadeuro Tavern, H. C. Kerr; Panonia Restaurant, H. Graner, QC; Cyrano's Tavern, D. F. Meyrick; Diana Sweets Tavern, M. Des Brisay, QC; Latina Restaurant Tavern, D. S. Dignam; Saxony Tavern, J. R. Casey; Fifeshore Hotel, D. B. Goodman, QC; Motorway Hotel, E. A. Jupp; Four Seasons Hotel, Paul Henry; Conroy Hotel, none; Steak Pit Tavern, none; Holiday Inn Hotel, C. M. Neiman; Le Gourmet Tavern, D. B. Black; Fisher Hotel, H. H. Solway; Nikko Gardens Tavern, John A. Gordon; Forum Tavern, V. K. Colebourn; Eastwood Park Hotel, none; Rib 'N Beef Tavern, D. A. Bales, QC; Piazzis Romi Tavern, D. J. Walker, QC; Canadiana Hotel, none; Guild Inn Hotel, none.

18. *Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine)*—Inquiry of the Ministry—1. Will the cost of the dinner and dance, scheduled for Thursday, March 19, 1964, to which the Prime Minister and Members of the Government have invited the Press Gallery of Ontario and other Press, Radio and Television guests, be defrayed out of public funds? 2. If so, (a) what is the estimated cost; and (b) out of what appropriation will it be paid?

Answer by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts):

1. Cost of dance and entertainment—No. Cost of food—Yes.
2. (a) \$1,423.96; (b) Vote 1701, item 5.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, as we move into the traditional windup of the debate, we are provided with an opportunity to review a session which is coming to a close, I am informed, today.

In many respects, Mr. Speaker, it has been a very remarkable session. Normally, the session of a Legislature following an election is a rather tame affair. Indeed, early in March this year I remarked on the frequency with

which there appeared in the newspapers, articles to the effect that little was happening at Queen's Park, it was all very dull. In retrospect, for the last six or eight weeks I think no one could say that Queen's Park has not been a place of considerable interest, and indeed excitement.

I want to say, in my overall comments in regard to this session, that I think our basic problems arise from the fact that we are still unwilling to devote enough time to the business of this province. I notice in the paper this morning a tabulation which shows that this year's session, assuming it closes today, will be for 70 days; 52 of them, I believe, before Easter and 18 of them since. That is three more days than the session a year ago which, in the experience of the last generation or so, was the longest session, during which we sat for 67 days.

But again, as the newspaper story this morning reminded us, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to recall that more than 40 years ago this Legislature, on two succeeding years, met for 81 days and 71 days; so that even when the business of the province was represented by a Budget that was down in the few tens of millions of dollars, they were spending something approaching four months time to do that business.

I think it is also rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note the fact that in the province of Quebec, which is the only other jurisdiction in Canada with a comparable legislative load, in the year 1960-61, the Legislature sat for 107 days. In 1962 it sat for 93 days; in 1963 it sat for 92 days. In other words, it was sitting for some two to three or four weeks beyond the four months period which I have often suggested in this House would be an appropriate length of time for us to be devoting to the business of the province.

I reiterate that suggestion, because I think some of the difficulties that we got into this year—and I hope without rubbing any salt into the wounds that this will be a point that will be acknowledged by the government more than anybody else—arose from an unwillingness to do adequate work at committee, caucus and even Cabinet levels until it is discovered that issues of an explosive nature had finally gotten out on to the floor of the House.

I was interested in an editorial in the *Toronto Telegram*, following the whole Cass affair, which had this as its opening paragraph:

When everything is added up, what makes a democratic system work is simply work.

And I submit to the hon. members that this is the answer to the issue.

I would hope that the government would be willing to give some consideration to ways and means by which it might be possible to provide to all the members of the House, and perhaps particularly the backbenchers on the government side, a more meaningful participation in the work of the House so that they would not be overcome by the boredom which tends to create in this House on occasion an atmosphere of "Let's get the whole thing over with and go home."

One of the arguments that was used by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) last fall, when we had a rather heated discussion on the question of a fall session, was that he felt a fall session was broken by a Christmas recess, and made it very difficult to plan. I was very interested in seeing exactly how the hon. Prime Minister was able to implement the planning on the pattern that he, himself, chose—namely, a session that would begin in the middle of January. I think it is rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that of the 140-odd bills which finally found their way onto the order paper during that session, no more than about 60 of them had been introduced by March 1, some six weeks after the Legislature had been called.

So I am led, at least on this level, to the conclusion that skipping the fall session, and permitting all the planning which would be possible by uninterrupted departmental work in the fall and the early part of the year, still did not make it possible for the government to get even half of the bills on the order paper in the first six weeks of the session so that they would be there for the study of both the members and the public who might be interested in them.

Indeed, I think this whole tendency to rush the business, creating an atmosphere of "Let us get this over with and go home," was perhaps best illustrated when we were dealing with the very important estimates of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), estimates which represented something in excess of over \$400 million.

In the middle of those estimates, sir, the hon. Minister, because of pressures on him from behind the scenes in his own party, had to come in and say that he hoped we might be able to speed the estimate up during the course of that evening's performance.

I suggest that is not the way we should be conducting the business of the province. I plead once again with the hon. Prime Minister, and with the House, to recognize the fact that if we are going to do justice to

the business of the province with a budget of well over \$1.25 billion—which, as I have so often indicated, is larger than the budget of the federal House of Commons in the latter part of the thirties—it cannot be done in less than four months, which is at least a minimum of 80 sitting days. That would be getting back to what was done by one of the best governments we have ever had in this province 40 years ago, namely, the Farmer Labour government.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman — Mr. Speaker, rather — we have been in committee for so long perhaps you will forgive me for persisting in referring to you as Mr. Chairman — I want to turn to one or two other aspects of the session's operations.

First, the question of committees. I think that the combining of committees, in the fashion the hon. Prime Minister did this year, was a step in the right direction. I think when we had 18 committees we were trying to go in too many directions at the same time. There were too many committee meetings being held on the same morning and it was impossible for the members to get to them. I think this, generally, resulted in a lower standard of work being done.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we still do not have an effective operation of committees, though we may have the basis for it. For example, I recall one time going into a committee—and when I name it, surely it is obvious how important a committee it is, namely, the committee on education, health and welfare, a committee which represents departments which in turn have jurisdiction over the spending of some \$600 million or \$700 million or \$800 million in this province every year. Indeed, if one takes the hospital services commission, it is perhaps even more than that.

The first meeting of this committee, Mr. Speaker, was sometime well into March. And there was a very ironical little situation when the chairman—and I do not say this critically of him except for the timing of it, if he had anything to do with it—extolled the importance of this committee. This was, he said, a very important body. But there was the obvious contradiction in the fact that if it was a very important committee, then it should have been called for its first meeting earlier than the month of March.

I submit to the hon. Prime Minister, just as we have said about the public accounts committee and other committees, that if our committees are going to do the job, and if

they sit down to examine what their job may be, they can find work to do from the opening weeks of the session instead of getting under way when we are about half-way through the session.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is another aspect of committee work to which I want to draw the attention of the House in the strongest possible protest. We have on the order paper two bills, one dealing with Westminster College and one dealing with Rochdale College. My hon. colleague from Yorkview (Mr. Young) referred to this yesterday. These bills came before the private bills committee, they were discussed in considerable detail, there was rather a sharp division of opinion, and finally they were passed.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Westminster, by a big majority.

Mr. MacDonald: As my hon. colleague from Woodbine reminds me, Mr. Speaker, the Westminster bill was by a huge majority. The bills came back and they are sitting on the order paper; and I can only conclude at this stage of discussion, Mr. Speaker, that it is the government's intention that these bills will die on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, this is unforgiveable short-circuiting of the legislative process. We have people who go through the normal requirements of bringing in a private bill—there is a petition, and other committee requirements before it comes into the private bills committee. It is discussed; it is voted on; it is passed; and it is sent back here as part of the work of this Legislature, because the committee is a part of this Legislature. Then somebody behind the scenes intervenes and decides that these bills are going to be killed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you this question: Who did this? Who is responsible for killing these bills?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. member is asking the wrong man.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I put the question to Mr. Speaker and then he can redirect it to whomever it should be redirected.

Mr. Singer: It might not get an answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am just pausing for a moment in the hope that we will get an answer. In the earlier part of this session we had quite a vigorous display from some of the newer hon. members of the House in the back benches expressing new ideas, and acting as though they were going to be a ginger group within this government.

Well, the ginger has been directed primarily in recent weeks at the Toronto Stock Exchange and not to what has been going on in this House. Because where are the people who spoke with such vigour in the earlier days in the session; where are those people today? When they stood up and they fought—I put it to the hon. member for London South (Mr. White) who sponsored the Westminster bill and got it passed with a big majority: Why does he sit in his seat silent today, when somebody—

Mr. Bryden: When the rights of this Legislature—

Mr. MacDonald: When the rights of this Legislature are being violated?

An hon. member: It sounds like an echo chamber.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, conceivably it is the emptiness in some portions of the chamber which create the echo. We have had a great deal of discussion, Mr. Speaker, during the course of this session about the exercise of arbitrary power. Indeed, sir, there is one Cabinet Minister absent in this government because of the mismanagement of arbitrary power, and yet, here is the most blatant exercise of the arbitrary power—a short-circuiting of the official procedures of this Legislature.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): You just had a bad night.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not have a bad night. You are having a bad day.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the intervention of the hon. Minister of Labour is rather a strange one. When people of this province follow the necessary regulations to get a private bill introduced, and then suddenly somebody unknown, some lobbyist, somebody within the government, frustrates the operation of the law why should the hon. Minister of Labour—a lawyer—treat it lightly and say that I perchance had a bad night?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is just the overstatement you continually make.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not making an overstatement. I ask this House what has happened to the legitimate rights of a group of people who brought their case before this House, referred it to a private bills committee where it was passed and then somebody had killed it?

Now instead of interrupting, I invite anybody who chooses to rise and explain this

situation. In fact, I will give it in a moment or so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this appears to be a laughing matter. Mr. Speaker, contempt of this House and its procedure is a laughing matter.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of an incident some ten years ago in this Legislature, back about the year 1952, when the government brought in a bill. It was introduced by the then hon. George Dunbar, a very endearing creature. It was a bill authorized by this government to change the business assessment on chain stores so that the assessment would be related to the volume of business rather than the frontage. It was to get a more equitable business tax from these larger businesses as compared with smaller businesses and the government, with Mr. Dunbar bringing the bill into the House, sent it out to the committee. Unfortunately there was a weekend intervening and in that weekend the chain store lobby got into action with the result that government members killed the government bill. It died and it has never been revived.

Now the question I ask—and again I direct it to the benign countenance of the hon. member for London South in the back benches there: Who killed this bill, the bill that he sponsored and on which he now sits silent? Well, we will let those who wonder what happens at Queen's Park pursue the issue, and I can assure them that we will assist them.

There is another area of the session's work, Mr. Speaker, that I want to speak about briefly, and that is the whole question of bills and resolutions put on the order paper in the name of private members. Once again we have made absolutely no progress. I assume we are moving to the close of this Legislature and most of the bills and resolutions that have been put on the order paper are treated with the usual indignity and discourtesy of not being called, of being ignored, of dying there once again.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The hon. member is quite wrong.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I invite anybody to take a look at the number of bills and resolutions on the order paper. How many of them have been called? Indeed, even those that were called were once again called in the late hours of the night, 10.30 and 11 o'clock—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would point out, if I may, that I called some of these resolutions and the hon. member who had them on the order paper stood up in this House and said: "Well, we got all this in during the estimates." Now we spent hours and hours on the estimates and every point covered by these matters was debated during the estimates. Some of the bills have been called, the only problem is that we really cannot discuss everything four times.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, just let me take one example. I have a bill on the question of lowering the voting age on the order paper. We have not discussed that four times.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, we had a long debate on another resolution dealing with it.

Mr. Singer: And many other things.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker I just would like to suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that since his Throne Speech this year included that rather intriguing phrase about the "all-encompassing participation" of youth, then I trust that on the youth committee he will perhaps refer to this issue of the question of lowering of the voting age—because his own definition of the all-encompassing participation of youth was in terms of the number of young men who are getting into politics as evidenced in the last election. I hope that some of these other matters will be referred to committees where they will be looked into in detail.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest again that there is another way that has been tried and proven to be an efficient, orderly way of dealing with the bills and resolutions on the order paper, in the name not only of Opposition members but of government backbenchers. That is the procedure of setting aside a specified time, a half an hour or an hour, once a week or, for whatever interval you choose, so that these will be dealt with in rotation and we will know when they are coming up. The person in whose name it stands will have an opportunity to prepare and not be called in suddenly at 10.30 or 11 o'clock at night.

This, I submit, will give an opportunity for some of the government members who have indicated some refreshing new ideas to put these ideas in the form of a resolution or a bill, to have them debated and give them an opportunity to express their views. Indeed, it will give the government an opportunity to fly kites on policies through some of its own back bench members. This is the orderly, and I suggest

the traditional, way in our Parliament of dealing with this kind of thing. I hope that sometime soon we can be persuaded to move towards it in this House here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to a final aspect of this year's session, something I have been able to deal with only in passing during the course of the session, and that is the consequences of your ruling on reading a statement of claim insofar as the business of the House is concerned. I am referring to the ruling you made following the reading of a statement of claim against Melchers which I made in the House. I am not disputing the ruling, but I want to draw to the attention of the House the serious consequences that this raises for dealing with the business of the House in the fashion which traditionally has been regarded as the responsibility of the members of the Legislature. I am going to quote from a few of the paragraphs in one of the ablest comments on this whole situation, namely that of Ron Haggart in the *Toronto Daily Star*. His summation was:

The ruling which Mr. Speaker Morrow then made on Friday morning is a calamity for free discussion in the place in Ontario which should be most free, the Legislature. Indeed he—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is this not using this Budget debate as a subterfuge to debate and question a ruling of the Speaker in the House?

Mr. Bryden: He has accepted the ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: I have accepted the ruling of the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well the hon. member is still debating.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not. Mr. Speaker, I have accepted the rule and I am now drawing to the attention of the House the consequences of that ruling, and I invite you to reflect on some of the observations of people who have looked into this whole matter.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): This is the third time around on this.

Mr. Bryden: It has not been dealt with yet.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, the first time I have been able to deal with it in some substance.

As Mr. Haggart stated in his column:

If the *Toronto Daily Star*, the *Telegram* and Mr. Speaker Morrow have their way

any vital question of public policy which happens also to be the subject of a private dispute can be bottled up forever and prohibited from public discussion by the simple expedient of having the private disputants file the writ then adjourning the case forever without it coming to trial.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it was rather interesting to follow the development of thought in the editorial offices of the *Star* on this, because they started by saying that it was unfair and then they ended up, after Mr. Haggart had entered the picture, by saying that if in a few months the Court had not acted, that then the House should assume its responsibilities in dealing with this matter.

Presumably what was wrong at one stage will become right at a later stage. There is perhaps a point in their observations.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It is not always easy to follow.

Mr. MacDonald: At least give the courts time to adjudicate on this private dispute. But this is not simply a private dispute. This is a dispute that impinges on the public welfare of the province of Ontario.

Then Mr. Haggart turned to one or two cases, which I think should be pondered by the hon. members of this House because we are now in the position that the members can pick up a newspaper—and I have a number of them in my file which I invite hon. members to read if they are interested—which spells out the details of a case as reported from a statement of claim. It is presented in considerable detail for the public to read. Yet if I were to rise in this House now, Mr. Speaker, and attempt even to read that newspaper clipping, because of your ruling I would be out of order.

Now, this is infringing on even normal rights of free speech, let alone the broader rights of free speech which are normally the rights in any Parliament or Legislature. This is what I want to point out in the cases to which Ron Haggart drew attention.

It is just for such a reason that great leeway is given to elected members to speak the truth as they see it. More than 50 years ago an aggrieved citizen named Ward sued Alderman Sam McBride. The Ontario Court of Appeal upheld McBride's rights, in fact his duty to speak out, and Mr. Justice Riddell said of the elected representatives:

They should show no fear, favour or affection. It is their right and their duty to speak their minds fully and clearly with-

out evasion or equivocation. They should show no fear, favour or affection and it is their duty as well as their right to use all legitimate means, oratorical or otherwise, to impress their fellow legislators of the righteousness of their views.

They have no need to be mealy-mouthed and should call a spade a spade, nor should they in such a case as this necessarily confine their arguments to the immediate facts. So in the present instance the defendant has the right as an alderman to say anything, however false, which he honestly believes to be true.

Now, that is the end of the quotation from Mr. Justice Riddell.

Mr. Singer: Riddell.

Mr. MacDonald: Riddell; sorry if I am mispronouncing the name. Mr. Haggart commented:

Does the *Toronto Star* really believe that politicians speaking in the privileged sanctuary of the Legislature should confine their discussion of disputed facts to those facts proven in the court of law?

What then does the *Toronto Star* say to George Wiggs, the military critic of the British Labour party, who had only a rumour to go on and who rose to ask a question in the House of Commons saying: "In actual fact these great press lords, these men who control great instruments of public opinion and of power, do not have the guts to discharge the duty that they are now claiming for themselves. That being the case I rightly use the privilege of the House of Commons, that is what it is given to me for, to ask the Home Secretary."

And with that the lid was off the Profumo case.

Mr. Sopha: Quite a difference.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, when you have a case which in the first instance may be a dispute between individuals but in fact relates to issues which impinge very seriously on the public welfare of the province, I invite you, Mr. Speaker, to examine the consequences of the ruling which I recognize you made in accordance with the rule of the House but which I submit is going to be a serious infringement on the necessary free speech of any Legislature, particularly this Legislature in the future.

Let me turn to one or two related issues concerning policy. I want to begin with a comment that was made by the hon. member

for London South during the course of the Budget debate on February 26. He was speaking about the SIU trusteeship and he had this to say:

I am distraught, sir, that there were no voices raised against the SIU trusteeship plan introduced by Ottawa. It may have been the best solution to the problem, but I am shocked that there was no voice of dissent raised in this country and that the four parties represented in Ottawa would not stand up and question its merits, having in mind that it is the first time in the history of the free union movement that a government has imposed this kind of trusteeship over a free collection of its workers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the hon. member that he has put his finger on a very delicate issue.

I suspect I am accurately reflecting the views of some people in all parties and, I will say, all the people in the New Democratic Party, who came to the decision they did, in support of the SIU trusteeship, only after profound misgivings and soul-searching. Rightly or wrongly they came to the decision that there was no other way of coping with the situation. However, Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued that somebody in this House should have risen and pointed to the dangers in this kind of principle.

For years I have been trying to point out in this House that this government's control over free collective bargaining, as it is exercised on the farm front through The Farm Products Marketing Act, is precisely the kind of thing which has been done in the SIU trusteeship. In other words, through the amendments of the so-called Bill No. 86 some years ago, this government has taken unto itself the power through its agency, the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board, to intervene in the operation of a local marketing board which represents a group of farmers—indeed to say to them regarding the raising of their money, the spending of their money, the regulations and the operation of their collective bargaining, that if they do not do as they are told they will be put under trusteeship. Indeed, I quoted, in the instance of the tobacco situation some weeks ago, during the course of the Throne debate, an instance where, in the case of the tobacco board, it was told that such and such would be done or else it would be put under trusteeship.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention the consequences flowing from this. I have here a clipping from the *Simcoe*

Reformer of Friday, April 10, which is headlined: "Tobacco board found guilty of grave sale Act violation." In other words what had happened here was that Stanley Smith, the former president of the tobacco board, had taken the tobacco board into court because of its grading procedures this particular year and he got a conviction. I am sure he was not so much interested in putting the tobacco board on the spot, but he was interested in clarifying the situation. And I want to draw to the attention of the hon. members of this House precisely what happened during the course of the testimony in the court hearing.

You will find on February 19, in the report of the *Simcoe Reformer* of the court hearing, the following excerpt, which I am going to quote into the record without comment at the moment.

Director Rene Strobbe of district five was called as a witness by the prosecution. He told the court that the method of grading had been changed from the previous year. Mr. Strobbe said, "I was at the auction the day that the flat 46 was sold and was talking to Mr. Smith." He told the court that a resolution was passed by the tobacco board on November 5 which stated that the method of grading tobacco for the 1963 crop was to be the same as the previous year.

He was asked, by Mr. Harris, who had changed the grading policy as the resolution was unanimously approved by the tobacco board. Mr. Stobbe replied that The Department of Agriculture called the chairman and told him the method that was to be used to grade this crop. "In other words, your board had no alternative," said Mr. Harris.

Lawyer Stafford asked, "Was there ever any written notice of this order placed before a meeting of the tobacco board?" Mr. Strobbe replied, "Not to my knowledge, and I have not seen a written order."

Mr. Harris then produced a letter which he claimed was sent by the department to the tobacco board but Mr. Stafford refused to allow it to be placed in evidence. Magistrate Barnum commented, "It looks to me that the book says one thing and the man on the other end of the telephone comes along and says it another way."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, here you have testimony in the course of a trial on which there is now a conviction against the tobacco board for its grade procedures—testimony which was never denied—to the effect that the grade procedures for which they have

now been convicted were made on the direction of The Department of Agriculture. This is just how far we have gone in implementing a concept of trusteeship in which the government intervenes and, in effect, violates the normal rights of free collective bargaining at least on the agricultural front.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Why does the hon. member not go on and tell the whole story?

Mr. MacDonald: I have told the whole story.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He has not told the whole story.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): How much was the fine?

Mr. MacDonald: The fine was only \$10.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A nominal fine.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I agree, Mr. Speaker. We are not dealing with fines. This is the reason why I said Mr. Smith had taken the case—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Did not Mr. Smith and Mr. Strobbe get defeated in an election?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You do not know?

Mr. MacDonald: No.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, yes, you do.

Mr. MacDonald: But once again this is irrelevant.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You said that they were not trying to put the tobacco board—

Mr. MacDonald: Once again, Mr. Speaker, this is not relevant. We are talking about the law, and the violation of the law was imposed by direction of The Department of Agriculture on the tobacco board, and it was taken to the courts and they were convicted. Sure, it was a nominal fine; but the fact of the matter is that they were convicted. They were forced, under direction of The Department of Agriculture, to violate the law.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, will my hon. friend permit me to tell the real story?

Mr. MacDonald: In your time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can do it right now. If you want to tell the facts, the facts are completely irrelevant to what you are saying.

I think it is a complete distortion of the facts, and typical of the hon. member and his party.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: I think in the course of this morning we will leave this as a task for the hon. Minister of Agriculture next year.

However, Mr. Speaker, I just invite the hon. member for London South and other government hon. members to notice the inconsistencies in principle in approach to the process of collective bargaining. I was most interested this year to take a look at a couple of bills which were brought in by The Department of Agriculture. One is Bill No. 82; and in section five, referring to the collective bargaining in the milk industry, it points out that when collective bargaining by the representatives of the producers and distributors:

—has proceeded for 14 days or sooner if the representatives of either party are satisfied that agreement cannot be reached in respect of one or more matters of collective bargaining under section 23, they may by notice to the representatives of the other party and to the board require all matters on which agreement has not been reached to be referred to the board.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, here is a solution to the problem of the refusal to bargain in good faith. This government has been searching for this solution on the trade union front. They were confronted with it in Trenton; indeed the civil servants now feel that they are confronted in their bargaining with the government itself at the present time.

Repeatedly, every year, we have cases of what is construed by the workers as a refusal by management to bargain in good faith. Or on some occasions it is construed by management as a refusal by the workers to bargain in good faith. We have in our law a stipulation that you must bargain in good faith, but it is meaningless; and yet here on the agricultural front, the government has the answer. If after 14 days either party comes to the conclusion that there is no solution available, then they can move forward to the next stage. I invite the government to be consistent in the application of its principles.

Indeed, we have another bill which was brought in—The Farm Products Marketing Act, Bill No. 83. We amended a subsection which requires producers of the farm products to pay a licence fee to the association. In other words, whether they like it or not, if they are producers they must pay for a licence from the association; they cannot be a free-loader.

What is the basic principle, Mr. Speaker? It is essentially the same basic principle as a person being a member of the union so that he could have a check-off of union dues. Indeed, there has come before this government the proposition of revocable check-off of union dues so that it will be voluntarily agreed by each one. Indeed, this plea has been put once again to the government through the hon. Minister of Labour. And I think it is pretty well known that some Cabinet colleagues, including the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), have argued—at least in front of delegations and I assume he did the same thing when he got in front of the Cabinet—that he was in favour of amendments to The Labour Relations Act to grant what is now granted in six or seven of the other Canadian provinces: the right to revocable check-off of union dues. But the government brought in its amendments to The Labour Relations Act and once again we have not got it. Why this inconsistency in the application of principles?

We are coming to a long and, I trust, leisurely summer in which I invite particularly the hon. member for London South to reflect on the application of these principles and perhaps come back and give us the benefit of his reflections next session.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I have to leave these matters to the farmer from York South.

Mr. MacDonald: You know there were a lot of people on that side of the House, even lawyers, who said, "I will have to leave matters pertaining to the police commission to the Attorney General." And did they get their fingers burned! Collectively and singly. So perhaps with four months session, with the odd evening of leisurely preoccupation with the business of the province, you would get into these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I turn briefly to another matter I have been espousing in the last week or so in this province and that is the issue of a few little people out in the Woodstock area who are being pushed around by a local agency which is the recipient of grants from this government. It was rather ironical last week, in fact just a week ago today, Mr. Speaker, that the very day on which the hon. Prime Minister announced he was setting up a Royal commission to examine the many ways in which the individual rights can be encroached upon by the arbitrary exercise of power, I had come to my office three of the 46 property owners who are about to be ousted from their property for the building

of the so-called Gordon Pittock dam. Incidentally, it is a project they all very earnestly support; they are very much in support of it.

I listened to the pleas of these people and I put out a press release. The comments from the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Pittock), who is the chairman of the Upper Thames River Authority, was that the land had been assessed by professional assessors. I had noted in my release, on the basis of the evidence given to me, that there had been an approach to the authority through Donald Middleton of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, in an effort to get an independent evaluator to take a look at the situation. Once again, sir, in spite of the representations and the support of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the authority has refused. Indeed, the group had asked that they as a committee be allowed to sit down and iron out some of these differences. The authority has refused.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that every time you have to expropriate property you are going to have one or two people who will try, if I may put it in very blunt terms, to gouge the public Treasury to get more than they are entitled to. I acknowledge that this is a problem you always face. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if you have 46 people who are going to be expropriated, and to whom offers have been given by the authority and only 12 of them have accepted—14 now, two more in the interval, the hon. Minister says—in other words, 60 per cent or more have refused, then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it is quite possible that there is some validity in the case that the offers being made are not reasonable offers.

Indeed, I want to bring the picture up to date with a telegram which I received on Monday morning, commenting on the chairman of the authority and his observations on Friday that there had been a professional assessment:

IN REFERENCE TO REPLY BY GORDON PITTOCK IN TORONTO DAILY STAR DATED SATURDAY THAT LAND HAD BEEN EVALUATED PROFESSIONALLY. ONE MAN WAS LOCAL BANKER AND RETIRED PREMATURELY. HE THEN SOLD FARM MACHINERY WITH LIMITED SUCCESS THEN TRIED REAL ESTATE. ABILITY AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THIS MAN LIMITED. HE IS STILL WORKING FOR AUTHORITY AS LAND BUYER. OTHER TWO APPRAISERS FROM OUT OF THE AREA. ONE A LOG BUYER RETIRED STILL WORKING FOR AUTHORITY AS LAND BUYER. OTHER APPRAISER AUCTIONEER IS STILL EMPLOYED SELLING PROPERTY FOR AUTHORITY LEFT FROM OTHER PROJECT. THESE APPRAISERS TRAVEL TOGETHER. SPENT ONE

hour on three hundred acre farm and looked in no buildings. were half mile from property buildings appraised. Upper Thames Valley has refused to meet a committee of the property owners to discuss the problem. If land owner says he should have more money he is told to arbitrate. They have not negotiated as only one price offered. The properties cannot be replaced at the prices offered. Properties appraised one and one-half years ago and prices have risen locally since. All local banks have refused to loan money on upper Thames River Authority written offers. So far five people have not been paid on date promised others are afraid to be caught in the same circumstances. Appraisers and buyers for upper Thames made derogatory remarks about properties and showed definite bias. Authority will not discuss size or reason of amounts or units to them. Signed by Bill Goodwin, Gord Harwood, Ross Hewitt, Wayne Gardhouse and Stan Down, five of the 46 people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that in light of that kind of a record the hon. Minister should be intervening rather than letting the rights of these little people be overridden in the fashion that they are. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Oxford, when I raised another point in this connection a week or two ago—to the effect that he had given them a commitment that they would not be ousted without at least two years' notice so that they could buy alternative property—said that he gave them that commitment in 1962 and that was two years ago.

I have on my files now two affidavits from people who contend that he made that commitment at the East Zorro township meeting in 1963, not 1962 as he said to the House. It is a very mixed and unsatisfactory picture, and perhaps it is one that just underlines the need for establishing a Royal commission that would protect the rights of the little man as he gets pushed around by the arbitrary exercise of power by the government or some of its agencies.

Now in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to two aspects of the Budget and the raising of money. This is of concern to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. The government contends that it is striving to balance its revenues and its expenditures. It refuses to raise money where there is a legitimate case for doing so.

If I may, I will return to an old theme of mine in this House, the resources revenues.

Our revenues from the whole mining industry during the past year have been \$11.3 million. We had reports given recently to the annual meeting of the International Nickel Company that its net profit after taxes for roughly the same period were \$106.3 million. This, incidentally, was an increase from \$94.2 million the year before.

In other words, the increase in one year in International Nickel's profits after taxes is greater than the mining revenue of this province from the whole industry, including International Nickel. Now on the basis of simple justice, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the public interest, this is completely indefensible, I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Little wonder that when the *Windsor Star* on April 17 was congratulating the north on the recent discovery in the Timmins area it had this to say:

Mineral and timber resources in Ontario have been exploited and developed principally for the profit of the private investors. True these, via taxes, have made substantial contributions to the federal and provincial coffers, but these haven't been anything like the same proportion as in Alberta.

Now if I may just interject here, Mr. Speaker, Alberta's high revenues are not so much from taxes as they are from the outright sale of oil resources.

In fact, Saskatchewan's record of resources taxes, which did not cripple development, is one worthy of examination. But the *Windsor Star's* conclusion is a pertinent one nonetheless.

Had this province raised as much as the western provinces Ontario would have had need for less revenue from other forms of taxation, and been able to get by with less public debt while at the same time offering more in the way of service. It is rather queer that Ontario receives little more in direct revenue from the forest industry than she pays out in fire protection services at the expense of the taxpayer.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, this government's expenditures in servicing the forest industry actually exceeds the revenue in most years. So the net effect is that the people in the province are subsidizing the forest industry instead of receiving revenue from our timber resources upon which the industry exists.

Now there is one area—

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): If I may interrupt on that—

Mr. MacDonald: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister may ask the member for York South if he would care to answer a question.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would just like to correct him, Mr. Speaker, because the statement he made that fire fighting costs exceed the revenues is completely wrong.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is completely wrong as always.

Mr. MacDonald: Now let me turn, Mr. Speaker, to a final area in which this government, I want to submit to this House, is not raising revenues as it should be. This deals with two problems at once, a revenue one and the whole operations of the Jockey Club on which I have done a little bit of research work. This is perhaps something of concern to many of the hon. gentlemen.

The Jockey Club has established a virtual monopoly in Ontario racing, and it has been able to do so with the approval of the government through the Ontario Racing Commission. The contrast was very striking earlier this year when the Labatt's brewing firm was up for sale. E. P. Taylor, through Canadian Breweries, did not even dare put in a bid—although there was some public announcement that they considered it, but did not think it was a wise thing to do—for fear of the consequences under The Combines Act. Yet E. P. Taylor, through the Jockey Club, has been able to establish a monopoly control over racing; and do so not only with impunity, but with the provincial government aiding and abetting him in his efforts.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Wait till the hon. member reads the *Windsor Star*. There is a \$5 million proposal there.

Mr. MacDonald: I am talking about monopoly at the moment, or virtual monopoly.

I now wish to present to the House the results of some research on the apparent results of the monopoly operation of the Jockey Club. I am tabling a second copy of this material, so that it will be available for examination by anyone who may be interested. This research covers the years 1959-63 inclusive.

Let me state, first, conclusions which emerge from this research, and then I shall proceed to document them.

From the monopoly position which the government has in effect granted to the Jockey Club, racing is now operated for the benefit of a few horsemen in the province, to

the detriment of the many. The "stake" and "allowance" races are so arranged by the Jockey Club that the few enjoy profitable operations, while the many sustain consistent losses. The situation becomes even more questionable when it is noted that among the few who enjoy the profitable operations are a significant number of the directors of the Jockey Club, so that in effect they are in a position to reap profits from racing which they themselves arrange.

Finally, and of particular concern to us in this Legislature, the government persists in financial arrangements with the Jockey Club which result in the public Treasury being deprived of many millions of dollars which, on the basis of the law in other jurisdictions, it should be enjoying. In considering the Budget, this is a matter of immediate concern to us as legislators.

In going back to document these conclusions, let me say that in the interests of time I shall use only the figures for 1963. I might add that the conclusions which emerge from the 1963 figures are substantially the same as those emerging for the four previous years for which statistics have been tabled.

In 1963, there were 73 stake races arranged by the Jockey Club. I am informed that there are some 1,400 horses racing in Ontario, yet analysis of the results reveal that all the stake races were won by 47 horses. Thus, while the purse distribution for the year was \$4,020,300, a very large proportion of that amount, \$1,027,220, went to the owners of the 47 horses who won all the 73 stake races, leaving only \$2,993,080 for all the others. Furthermore, five of the 37 men who owned these 47 stake horses were directors of the Jockey Club.

Furthermore, analysis of what happens in these stake races reveals that the Jockey Club is operated in the interests of the few horsemen, rather than in the interests of the shareholders of the OJC, because consistently over the years, the Jockey Club has lost money on stake races.

For example, in 1963 the betting pool for the 73 stake races was \$7,480,520. The Jockey Club's nine per cent take therefore represents \$684,008. Yet the purses paid out—with most of them being shared by a few owners—represented \$837,500, so that the shareholders of the Jockey Club experienced an overall loss of \$153,492 on these races which provided rich gains for a few horsemen, among them five Jockey Club directors.

Let us carry the analysis a step further. In 1963, the 73 stake races were won—first, second and third places—by 113 horses owned

by 70 men. The total purse was \$4,020,300. Of that amount, \$1,568,005 was shared by the 70 owners of the 113 stake horses, leaving a balance of only \$2,452,295 for all of the rest of the horsemen in Ontario.

If one estimates—and I am reliably informed that this is accurate—the cost of maintaining a horse at a conservative average of \$3,000 a year, that means that the cost of upkeep for the 113 stake horses was \$339,000, leaving their owners a profit of \$1,229,005; while the upkeep of the remaining 1,287 other horses would be \$3,861,000, representing a loss to the owners of \$1,408,705.

To the few who hath, a great deal is given —by the Jockey Club which is dominated by that few—and the rest of the horsemen sustain the regular losses. In fact, in 1963, 67 owners shared all of the stake purses, finishing first, second or third, and among them hon. members will find a very liberal sprinkling of Jockey Club directors.

Let us turn now to a comparison with other tracks in North America. New Orleans, I am informed, is the one most comparable to those in Ontario operated under the Jockey Club. For example, the average amount wagered per day at New Orleans, in the year 1960, was \$411,306; the average in Ontario was \$460,281. From that amount, it is interesting to note that the profit to the track in New Orleans was \$12,671 per day, while in Ontario the profits to the Jockey Club are \$22,108 per day.

Thus Ontario is permitted by government policy to make \$9,457 more per day than New Orleans, even though New Orleans has only 84 racing days, and Ontario has 196 racing days.

Now we begin to see where sympathetic government policies make it possible for the Jockey Club to add to its profits at the expense of the public purse. In the United States, all uncashed tickets go to the state; in Ontario, the money remains with the Jockey Club, a figure that must now represent a sizeable amount. I think we were given that amount in the committee once but it was not recorded anywhere officially to my knowledge.

Furthermore, in the United States, breakages are usually split 50-50 between the track and the state. I might explain that the term breakages is used to describe the uneven amounts of money that are not paid out, since the practice is to pay off to the nearest 10 cents. During the years, 1956-61, the breakages in Ontario amounted to a total of \$3,189,303—all of which was added to the

profits of the Jockey Club, with none going to the government Treasury.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, how the Jockey Club, under the direction of E. P. Taylor, has been able to increase the daily earnings to the few who share stake races, while maintaining it at the same, or a lower figure, for all other horsemen. For example, in 1955, before E. P. Taylor took over, the daily average purse was \$15,603, of which amount \$2,015 was taken off the top for stake horses, leaving \$13,588 for all others. In 1959, after E. P. Taylor had taken over, the daily average purse distribution was up to \$18,798 from the \$15,603, of which amount \$6,180 was taken off the top for the stake horses, leaving an even lower figure—as compared with 1955—of only \$12,618 for all others. Since 1959, the amount taken off the top for the few stake horses has continued to climb. By 1963, the daily average of purse distribution had risen to \$20,512, with \$8,000 being taken off the top for the stake horses, and the same figure of \$12,512 for all other races.

For some years now, hon. members will be aware that we have had an annual discussion in the standing committee on government commissions as to whether or not the nine per cent for the Jockey Club and only six per cent for the government Treasury, of the fifteen per cent take of the betting pool, should be changed to bring more revenue to the public Treasury.

In view of what I have just spelled out, Mr. Speaker, I think the case is conclusive. When racing was "small business" in Ontario, there may have been some justification for a nine-to-six split in favour of the Jockey Club. But racing today is "big business," with 196 racing days, so the income to the Jockey Club would be adequate with a lower cut. It is significant to note that racing in Winnipeg, with only 40 days, operates on a nine per cent; yet here in Ontario, with 196 days, we still give the Jockey Club nine per cent and it is much lower in many American states. The public Treasury is entitled to millions more of this money instead of swelling the profits of the Jockey Club, whose monopoly operations are conducted to meet the interests of the few who dominate racing in this province, even at the expense of the shareholders who sustain the regular losses on stake racing days.

In considering this picture, let me recall that my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, was finally given the answer to his question concerning the amounts of money that went to the few who dominate racing, from the approximately \$70,000 a year grant

to thoroughbred breeders. The reply indicated that, for the year ending March 31, 1963, there were only eight breeders receiving over \$1,000; and, of these eight, one was E. P. Taylor, who received \$18,385. In the year ending March 31, 1964, there were ten receiving over \$1,000, all of them in the \$1,000 to \$2,000 bracket, while E. P. Taylor received a cool \$20,996.

Mr. Speaker, it is beyond my comprehension how the government can defend this subsidization of the rich man's hobby from the public Treasury. And when that situation is considered in light of the whole monopoly operation of the Jockey Club, for the profit of a few and the losses of the many horsemen in the province, I think the time has come for the provincial Treasury to quit complaining about high outlays and limited revenues, and do something about protecting the public interest. And for that reason, when we have a vote somewhat later, and not too much later, we have no alternative but to vote non-confidence in the government's handling of the revenues of this province as represented by the Budget.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is the day, if not the hour, when Kipling would have said that the tumult and the shouting dies and the captains and the kings depart. We have been here, as has been said by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), for a longer period of time than any other Legislature in the past 40 years, I believe. And, like the hon. member for York South, I want to deal this morning with what has gone on in the session in an objective sort of way. I do not want to try to thresh old straw, I do not want to revive debates which have gone on in the Legislature. To me the record of this Legislature has been written. It is on record. It is in *Hansard*; and, for one, I am content and my party is content to let it be and let it speak for itself for those who care to analyze it in the days that lie ahead.

It is true, as the hon. member for York South has said, that it was expected that this session of the Legislature would be a routine sort of a sitting, inasmuch as the government had come back from an election campaign with strengthened numbers in the House, and inasmuch as in the session prior to the election they had brought in a considerable number of new pieces of legislation. I do not think that the coming election, of course, had anything to do with this influx of legislation but it was there nevertheless; so, when the first session after an election takes places, it is reasonable to assume that the government will

back away from very much in the way of new legislation.

That new legislation will come as the government gets nearer to the next election. Apparently, it is thought to be political and, in fact, it is almost proven to be political, that what is done in a legislative way following an election does not have too much effect or too much impact on the next election contest, so that this session set out to be a rather routine affair. But I want to analyze the session and to say to the House and to the province that two or three fundamental things came out of this session which makes it stand out in my mind, and I think in the minds of all thinking people, as a very outstanding session.

We have had, as the House will recall, very careful scrutiny of the estimates of the various Ministers of the Crown and I am proud of the part that the Opposition has played in scrutinizing the estimates and putting forward proposed legislation by way of resolutions and private bills on the order paper. That is the proper, the fundamental and the historic role of Oppositions down through the years. But in addition to that it can be said that oftentimes the Opposition Party—or parties, as hon. members would like to call them, it does not matter to me this morning because I am speaking of opposition as such—and the work they do in the Legislature becomes more or less routine and is not accepted by the public in the nature of being spectacular; it is what is expected of them. But in this session I am going to say to the House this morning, or this afternoon, that the Opposition, to me at least, and to the House and to the public, emerged to the position and to the place that they should have long ago occupied in the public mind. They are now, I think, recognized as having the ability and having the position to play a dominant role in government.

We have always been wont to say that the Opposition is less important than the government in the governmental scheme of things. We have said that, but somehow or other we have said it with our tongue in our cheek, but in this session it fell upon the Opposition to provide the atmosphere and to create the image that an Opposition is really just as important as the government itself and that it can and does, when the occasion arises, have a terrific impact upon government legislation, both in opposing legislation that in our judgment is not for the public good and in proposing measures of legislation which we feel, if it were enacted, would be for the public good.

Of course what I am basing my claim on this morning is in relation to Bill No. 99 and other things that I will speak about in a moment or so. I do not want to discuss Bill No. 99 or its merits or demerits. That is a page of history that we will read over and over again and the government will make reference to, I am sure, from time to time as the months go by. But in relation to Bill No. 99, the Opposition in this House was able to play their traditional role and was able to emphasize that traditional role to the public to the point that in this session, more than any other I have been in, the Opposition have been able to take their proper place. Not that they have not taken their proper place in past sessions, but they have been able, in this session, to stress their ability to take their proper place and to get it across to the people of the province and to the media that disseminates news throughout this province of Ontario.

In that debate in relation to Bill No. 99, the Opposition were able to stop the government in their tracks. They were able to bring them to their knees. In fact, it could be said that Napoleon's retreat from Moscow many years ago was an orderly withdrawal in comparison to the utter rout of the government forces before the enlightened onslaught of outraged Opposition members in this House.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in that analysis that I make this afternoon, I say it not only to pat ourselves on the back but I say it for this purpose, that I think because of this incident we have as an Opposition assumed our proper role in the public mind. And that is not only for our good, it is for the good of the government, it is for the good of the people of this province. I think the people, perhaps more than at any other time, now feel that they have in the Opposition in this House those people, those men, who are intelligent, who are able to appraise and to analyze legislation and if they feel that they are being mitigated against and that the public need is not being served, they have the courage to get up and say so and fight until the public will is preserved. That was our position in relation to this bill and it will be our position in relation to all other matters that come before us.

I would say too that what happened in relation to Bill No. 99 has had a salutary effect in other phases of our activities during this session. I say to hon. members it is my opinion that I doubt very much if we would have ever had the McCrur commission had it not been for the debate that centred around Bill No. 99. I believe that the

McRuer commission is an outcome of the debate in respect to Bill No. 99.

Now for many years in this House, as older hon. members will recall, I have argued for just such a commission. I have felt that we should examine the government's activities fully, and their rights and powers, and see how these rights trampled on the rights of the individuals. I have argued that we should look closely into the powers of commissions and boards that we have appointed in great numbers in this province of Ontario. So I am glad at this time, glad that Mr. Justice McRuer is going to examine fully all aspects of these things that we have talked about for years. But I suggest again that we would not have this commission being formed at the present time were it not for the emanations that came from the debate in respect to Bill No. 99.

In another regard I want to say this, with respect to hospital beds—I say this with deference to my friend, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond)—there is not a doubt in my mind but that the continued analysis of our lack of hospital beds in this province forced by members of my party and of the NDP over this last two months has at last roused the hon. Minister of Health to action where there was inactivity before. The criticism has brought the hon. Minister to an appreciation of the government's responsibility in this matter for the first time. Before that time he seemed to very effectively shelve that responsibility and pass it off on the other side.

But the determination of Opposition members in this Legislature, I say, has brought home to the hon. Minister that he has, as a member of the government, a tremendous responsibility to supply hospital beds for people who are sick in this province. As a result of this activity on the part of my hon. colleagues and my hon. colleagues to the left, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister, I think, is moving now, reluctantly perhaps, but moving in the right direction. I do not think he would have moved had it not been for the criticisms levelled at him by the hon. members of the Opposition.

So taking it all in all, I am very proud of the record of the Opposition in this session of the Legislature. I want to say here and now that I am particularly proud of the co-operation and the support of my hon. colleagues during this session of the Legislature. All of us, I think, appreciate that this party came back from the last election with something less than complete victory in their pocket.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That is one way of putting it.

Mr. Oliver: In fact we came back without a leader, and it was a situation that was disturbing, not only to this party but to the Legislature as a whole which felt that there should be an Opposition which could oppose and constructively suggest to the government.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): It is still a problem.

Mr. Oliver: No, it is not a problem now. I think the hon. member is underestimating when he says that. I really do, because in this session of the Legislature, and my hon. friend knows it, my hon. colleagues have taken their full part in the discussion of all public questions which have come up. They have made their points known and I suggest to you that we have played, along with our hon. friends to the left, a constructive and a real vitalizing part so far as an Opposition is concerned.

I want to go back to my friend the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) for a moment, and I am bringing to mind some of the things my hon. friend from York South has said about committees and about the conduct of the House itself. I would be less than fair if I did not say to my friend the hon. Prime Minister that in his conduct of proceedings in this House there has been an improvement in the last year or so. There is no question about that. I mean we would be less than frank if we did not say that. That comes, Mr. Speaker, from the lips of one who lived under "czarist" rule in this province for a number of years in relation to these matters.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I thought you sat on these benches here under "czarist" rule.

Mr. Oliver: Oh, no, no. It was under a benevolent democracy; there is no question about that. It was not a dictatorship at all.

But I say seriously that there have been improvements made. My hon. friend has tried at least to improve the workings of the Legislature within this Chamber. He has tried to meet, in a measure, reasonable suggestions that were made.

An hon. member: That will be his epitaph!

Mr. Oliver: Yes, that may be the thing he is known for best; I do not know. I wanted to say this before I went to the matter having to do with my hon. friend further—

An hon. member: The epitaph.

Mr. Oliver: I want to make reference, while I am in a mood to commend, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts). He does not know that I think he is a pretty good administrator in this government; I think he is. And I think it should be said—I mean the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner).

That was, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most unfortunate mistake; but I wanted to say this, and I think it should be said on the part of public men, that I have regretted and my party has regretted and we have been almost ashamed of the treatment my hon. friend has received this last few days. We in this House are able to recognize courage when we see it, and my hon. friend in a certain committee of the House exhibited that courage. It so happened that the exhibition of that courage coincided with our views in respect to that particular matter. To have what I think is very unfair criticism levelled at my hon. friend, as he stood up for what he thought was right, then I say to you that that should be made mention of by those who recognize the situation and appreciate it.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in respect to committees of the House, two or three things. We have this year, indeed this morning, appointed five new select committees. For this I commend the government. The government in this province has become so big and so complex that to delegate some of the responsibilities to committees is a good thing; I commend the government for it. I notice, to my pleasure, that in the reading of the list of the members and the chairman attached thereto, unless I misread it or did not hear it correctly—and I think I did hear it correctly—there is not one Cabinet Minister as chairman of a committee. Had that been done this morning I was going to have really reprimanded the hon. Prime Minister. I think—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Sorry to disappoint you.

Mr. Oliver: No, no, it was not disappointing me; but I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that having a Cabinet Minister as chairman of a committee is a retrograde step. A Minister has not the time in the first place; and he is very apt to reflect government thinking and government policy to too great a degree so that the committee could not have an untrammelled view of the whole situation. I hope that we do not go back to that condition.

I want to say a word about the public accounts committee and my hon. friend from St. George. I believe it was yesterday that there was laid on our desk a copy of the report of their activities during the session of the Legislature. I thought it was a very good report. Some of the recommendations are very worthwhile. But I want to point out to the House, and to the hon. Prime Minister, that some day we are going to have to waken up to the responsibility we have to provide greater scrutiny of public accounts and of the affairs of government than we provide during the session of the Legislature.

The public accounts committee, in my judgment, should sit between sessions of the Legislature, and should have the time and the opportunity to go wholly into these matters. We are running a business in this province now and we should act like good big business men, and approach these problems in a businesslike way. To try to do this when the session of the Legislature is on, presents, I am sure, what everyone would agree are very tactical limitations and obstacles.

I know that my two hon. colleagues who went on the committee—the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) oftentimes went to that committee because it diligently did its work during the session—went to the committee when they should have been doing something else.

There was not, and there cannot be, the opportunity to give full scope and full analysis to the problems which come before that committee while the session is on and while the members are engaged in the work of other committees. I say to the hon. Prime Minister that one thing I think he should do at the next session of the Legislature is make provision for a committee which will sit between sessions, to have the powers and the duties and the responsibilities as encountered this year by the committee headed by the hon. member for St. George.

Under the circumstances, and within the limitations imposed upon this committee this year, I think they did a remarkably good job; but it is impossible, and it takes away from the effective working of other committees, and the effective working of the House as a whole, to ask this committee to sit almost constantly during the session of the Legislature. There is not any reason, in my judgment, why that committee should not sit between the sessions of the Legislature when it would have ample time, full opportunity, to fully analyze these great questions and prob-

lems and bring back to the people of this House its analysis, its deductions and its conclusions. I hope my hon. friend will give that some thought.

Another thing I want to say is with regard to the rules of the House. I feel that the time has come when we should set up a select committee of this House to go into the rules of this House itself. I want to say to the hon. Prime Minister, and I think he will agree with me, that it has been a long time since the rules of this House have been revised. Great changes have taken place and in other jurisdictions the rules have been revised two or three times since ours were revised with respect to this Legislature.

Incidents have happened in this session of the Legislature. I do not want to enumerate them or to evaluate them or to pronounce upon them, but I just want to say that over the years we are continually feeling the need for a revision of the rules of this Legislature so that they may conform with the present-day needs of the legislators themselves. At Ottawa they are almost continually revising the rules. At the present time I understand they are seriously going into this problem.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They had better.

Mr. Oliver: Well, maybe they had better but we had better here, too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Oliver: I wanted to point out that, in Ottawa, one of the subcommittees engaged in revising the rules is headed, I understand, by that veteran parliamentarian from Winnipeg, Mr. Knowles. I think they are seriously tackling the problem of bringing their rules up to date, more in conformity with the needs of the times.

I can remember when there was a committee in this House established to assess the rules and to bring in a new set of rules. It was something like the committee on commissions. It fell down on its work, and I do not think the report was ever presented to the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Oliver: No, you let it die and no amount of—

An hon. member: You let it die. You were too busy—

Mr. Oliver: That was perhaps most unfortunate, but I wanted to say this, and I think it should be said—

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Sorry to disappoint you.

Mr. Oliver: No, it was not disappointing to me.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) was on this committee with others, and it was brought in.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Oliver: Well, my friend, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, might have it right this time. We will let him have his hour; at the moment I do not want to get into a dispute. I do not know what he is talking about actually. I do not know whether he does or not.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that at the next session of the Legislature I feel there should be a select committee to study the problem of the electoral reform in Ontario. I am telling you in lots of time so you can prepare for it. To me it is most important that we bring our election law up to date in this province of Ontario. I have been through a lot of elections in Ontario and I tell you that the time has come now when expenses in connection with elections must be cut down, or we are going to have it in this province that only the wealthy can afford to be legislators—and that is not the prime purpose of membership in this House.

This committee should be set up, I suggest Mr. Prime Minister, with the widest possible powers, long enough before an election so that its report can be studied, evaluated and analyzed. And I hope, trust and believe, that we should not move into another election until we have completely reformed our electoral law in this province, having to do with all the aspects of that mentioned by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson).

Then I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in respect of committees as a whole I believe that the select committees which have been appointed will do good work. I have a feeling, and it may not be shared by other hon. members of the House, that we should not get into the practice of allowing select committees to go on and on, year after year. I think the committee appointed should be given time enough and should meet often enough to assess whatever problem is put before it and report back to the next session of the Legislature unless there are very special reasons why it should not do so. I think we are getting away from the spirit and fundamental intent of these committees if

the committee members themselves feel that, "Well, we will just carry on for a while now, then we will ask the Legislature to renew our powers and we will go on and on indefinitely." I think committees should be told that the work assigned to them has to be completed within the year and that the report on their work should be given to the next session of the Legislature. It seems to me that this would bring not only dispatch but a better understanding and a better appreciation of what committees really mean.

So far as the legislation which has been brought down this year is concerned we have said what we wanted to say in respect to it. It is on record; I am willing to abide by that record. As we move forward into another session we shall, of course, move into that new session with the same determination as we approached this one.

I wanted to say one more thing in respect to what my friend, the hon. member for York South said about resolutions and private members' bills. I could not agree more with him when he said there should be a place on the order paper, a specific defined place on the order paper, for the discussion of members' resolutions and private bills introduced by the members of the Opposition, or the members of the government for that matter.

An hon. member: An hour a week.

Mr. Oliver: Yes, an hour a week; or maybe more. Because I have a great appreciation—and somehow I think the hon. Prime Minister has, too—of the good that flows from resolutions introduced by the members on the opposite side of the House. They have not been introduced frivolously; they have been introduced because those members felt that that resolution pointed the way to either removing a grievance or setting out a better procedure, or changing policy so that more people would be helped and the general good served.

A lot of thought goes into the preparation of these resolutions and these private bills, and I am sure it can be proven that much of the legislation governments introduce from time to time really have their birth in these resolutions and private bills introduced by the members of the Opposition. Government members would be the last ones to admit that. At the time they throw it off to one side, they dismiss it with hardly a wave of the hand and yet, as night follows day or as day follows night, they invariably find that government legislation in the next year, or the year after, reflects the thinking contained

in those resolutions and in those private bills. So I say, if we believe that—and I do—then it should become a more important part of the proceedings of the House than it has been up until this time.

I hope that at the next session of the Legislature we will have, as has been suggested by the hon. member for York South, a real opportunity to express our views because we represent people, too; we have ideas as to how the people should be served by legislation and we should have an opportunity, a stated time.

The other thing about it is that the practice has been in this House to allow these resolutions and private members' bills to go along, in the main, toward the end of the session. There could surely be a more orderly disposition of the feelings of the Opposition as expressed in these resolutions than to bundle them all up at the tail-end of a session and perhaps, even as my hon. friend said, not call them at all.

We have three more years in this Legislature. We have time yet to make it, insofar as the business of the House, the running of the House is concerned, the best Legislature we have ever had in this province. The opportunity is there, and the lead is there, and all we need is the willingness to grasp the opportunity and the necessity. I urge upon the hon. Prime Minister not only to give that passing thought, but very serious consideration.

I have no more to say this morning. We are now moving very close to the end of a session and we have, as I say, discussed all the things we wanted to discuss. We have not left undone any of the things we should have done, and I think we have done all the things that we should have done; and because we have proceeded in that manner I think we have made a great contribution—perhaps it will not be admitted on the other side—but a great contribution to the welfare of this province.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I, too, will echo some of the sentiments expressed about this last debate in this session. When I think of it I think particularly of the new hon. members who came in here "bright-eyed and bushy-tailed" and ready to go, and I think they are probably a little wiser in the ways of our democracy. I think that they have added a good deal to the proceedings of this House and, from what I have seen I would prognosticate that they will add a good deal more in the future. I hope I will be able to make what few remarks

I have to make without any interruptions from Woodbine.

I am quite prepared to answer any questions, as always.

I think I will start by dealing with some of the comments that have been made concerning the session. I, too, am aware of the length of this session. This came as no surprise to me and I did not, as did the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), look forward to this session as being a dull one.

We have quite a record of legislation. Some 144 bills reached the order paper—those are public bills—133 of them passed. There were 34 private bills introduced; 26 of them passed. I do not think it has been a dull session. I did not anticipate that it would be, nor did we cut down our full legislation simply because it happened to be the first session after an election. This may be the way it was done in years past when other people occupied these Treasury benches, but not today.

I think we can look forward to longer and longer sessions. I have said this before, and perhaps I am being proven right, but I refuse to get into any comparisons with Quebec or with British Columbia, or particularly into comparisons with the House of Commons; because as we all know, they are having their difficulties in processing one-quarter of the legislation that we are able to deal with in this House.

We, I think, have been able to adjust our procedures as we have gone along. We have attained a degree of flexibility, and I want to make it very clear that I do not consider this Legislature to consist only of the government benches and the seats of those who support me in the government.

I am very aware of the position of the Opposition in our democratic system and I have attempted in my time of operating the House to provide opportunity for full discussion of all matters that are of concern and I do not think, even though the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) would like to stay for another month in order to say that we have been here for another month, I do not think he can say that there has been anything he wished to discuss that has not been discussed and an opportunity given so to do. We have not only bent the rules, we have badly fractured them on occasion in order to give opportunity for debate of matters that would not have otherwise reached the floor of this House at all.

My own approach to the rules and the functioning of this Legislature is that the less

formality we have in the way of rules the more effective an instrument we can develop, because we will make it fit the need of the day and the need of the hour. The difficulty with rules is that they become very rigid and then people begin to use them for purposes for which they were not intended. I have an idea that this is a part of the trouble in the House of Commons. They simply have too many rules and those who choose, on either side, to use the rules for purposes for which they were not intended, can make it difficult to conduct business.

Mr. Stanley Westall has an article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* in which he says: "Closure, spring tonic for a restless parliament." But he has one comment which certainly appealed to me when I read this this morning—if I can find it—in any event I can paraphrase it. He says really that to get business done you must have an attitude in which the members wish to get business done. And this is the way it will be done, rather than revising our rules and setting up a great number of rules and regulations which can be twisted and turned and used. If we all come into this Legislature with a full knowledge of the instrument it is and how it can be used for the people of the province, then we will have a Legislature that will function properly. Personally, I would prefer to do it that way rather than get into the rigidity of many rules.

A reference has been made to two private bills that are on the order paper and it was asked who is responsible for their disposition, and once again the inference is that there is some great bogey man walking around in the background who is pulling a lot of strings. Well, the government, of course, is responsible, because the government runs the order paper.

Now in regard to these two bills, the first one provides for something that is contrary to government policy and this was dealt with in the private bills committee. The government takes complete responsibility for leaving it on the order paper and not calling it, because it would establish a precedent which is contrary to present policy and which in the opinion of the government would cause a great deal of difficulty throughout the province. That is why it was left there.

As far as the other bill is concerned, the private bills committee did the reverse with this. We can accomplish what is wanted without a private bill and those concerned have been so informed—at least I asked that they be informed and I assume they have been.

So that is the story. There is no great ogre in the background. There is no pressure group. There is no lobby. It was purely a government decision.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Why did the government not have the courage to place its decision before the House by calling second reading of the bills?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have to take the responsibility for it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There was also some mention made of privilege in the House, and I think we must be careful of privilege. I think one should be free to say what one thinks and one believes, but I think there should be an honest belief in what one says if one is going to take advantage of privilege in the House—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think this is something that we all, as individuals who are protected by the privilege of the House, should bear in mind when we take advantage of privilege. If a member honestly believes something, then he is free to say so.

The only other point about privilege is, of course, we still live, I hope in this province and in this Legislature, by the old maxim where a man is innocent until proven guilty, and it does not fall to any individual to have to prove his innocence, his guilt should rather be proven.

Now, in regard to the time that is taken with the private members' public bills and the resolutions, I have gone over the list very carefully and I am not going to itemize it, but as I said earlier, many of these were discussed during the estimates. We have developed a procedure in the House, and I am sure my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is well aware of this, sir, because back in the days when he was a member of the government, all the estimates of the government were passed in one night and there was no procedure at all such as we presently have. Maybe that is why he enjoys this present procedure so much.

By this I mean the way we treat the estimates and the great latitude that is permitted on every vote. This is where many of these matters are discussed and debated most fully and, as I said earlier, in calling several of the resolutions as I have done, of course we always meet the plaintive cry that they are called late at night. Well, there are lots of

things called late at night. If the House is going to sit until 11 o'clock, something has to be done between 10.30 and 11. A lot of important government business is settled in this chamber in the late hours of the evening. Indeed, it is quite wrong to say that these things were called late at night, because if hon. members will check *Hansard* they will find that they were not.

Many of the hon. members who had items on the order paper indicated that they had already debated them fully and put them before the House during the course of the estimates. In fact there was almost a diffidence to introduce the matter again.

In regard to the bills on various matters dealing with elections and voting age, which the hon. member for York South mentioned, there is a resolution covering the whole matter which was debated here for an hour and a half—nearly two hours—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. member for Dovercourt's (Mr. Thompson's) resolution.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes. Now that was debated in the first week of the session. So the Opposition members cannot very well say it was all left to the last few days. I am quite prepared to provide time for these things to be debated. I am not necessarily prepared to provide time for them to be debated three or four times. That is the point. If I look at it and I see it has been dealt with, I think it is a reasonable proposition to say, "That has been dealt with here, the points of view have been put, and it is not necessary to go over it again."

As far as the committees are concerned—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. Prime Minister is not prepared to accept the principle—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course I am.

Mr. Sopha: He instructed the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) to adjourn the debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course.

Mr. Sopha: And that was the major—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): How else are we going to stop the hon. member?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot really understand the finest nuance of thought of every hon. member of the House.

The adjournment of a debate being taken as an insult is a brand-new one to me. However, if you care to speak to me about it in private, I will see if I can arrange this. But I can assure you that these matters you put on the order paper will be debated; you will have an opportunity to discuss them. This is the basic principle I operate by, that everything anyone wants to say in this House can be said and there will be a place found for them to say it.

In regard to the select committees, I can only say that I am a great believer in the select committee system. I think in our committees we perhaps get away from some of the rigid partisan positions which are taken in certain matters and in certain fields in the Legislature. They are all-party committees and the party lines break down in committees. In my view they do a good job and I think, from these committees we have appointed this morning, we can expect good results. I can assure you that, in the thinking of this government, we are agreed, unless it happened to be exceptional circumstances, that Cabinet Ministers should not sit on select committees. In any event, there never has been a Cabinet Minister sitting on a select committee, unless he was appointed while he was there, or something of that nature.

But the public accounts committee, you will realize, was an innovation. We were starting from scratch because we changed the size, the composition, and the function of that committee this year; and I, too, am pretty satisfied with how it went. I felt there was a high degree of responsibility shown by the members of the committee. This is encouraging, to the point that we will enlarge the functions of this committee after we have had a chance to analyze the report and the procedure and see the changes which might be made.

There is only one other question. That is the standing committee of the House. We revised its organization this year. I am not yet satisfied that it is functioning as it might. On the other hand, there seem to be some underlying difficulties which are hard to overcome; but it will be our intent to examine the function of them during the session to see if any further changes are necessary and might be made.

I wanted to perhaps just speak about some of the things which have happened. We have had, in my view, a very productive session. There has been a great deal done and in some very important fields. I think of what has been done primarily, and as soon as you

start assessing the function of any session, one of the first things that comes to mind is education—and particularly I think the implementation of the foundation tax plan this year is something of which we might all be proud.

It was a difficult plan to devise. It was two or three years in the making and was backed up by money you voted here, to the tune of \$285 million. I think, in terms of its results across the province in the provision of true equality of education, that the results will justify the time it took to develop and the amount of money involved.

There are other areas in which we have broken new ground. Perhaps the field of law reform is one. The establishment of the law reform commission is not particularly a startling piece of legislation. It does not create any great public impression. But when you delve into it a little bit, you will find that we have research going on in practically every area of human activity except the law. I hope to be able to make an announcement concerning it very shortly, because it is my hope to have it functioning and I think, over the years, it will make a very large contribution indeed. I foresee it will function on almost a permanent basis over a long period of time.

I want to speak for a moment about various matters which have been raised by hon. members of the Opposition in this debate.

I was rather interested in going over the comments of the financial critic for the Opposition. He asked, at one point—if I can just find his exact quotation, perhaps I know it anyway, but he said: "Are the tax rates and the general economic atmosphere such in this province that industry is avoiding us?" This is a paraphrase of his remarks.

This struck that old note of pessimism and "What is wrong with us?" that I find so disturbing in the minds of many of our people in Canada. So I just asked about some of the things which have happened in Ontario in the last year so that I can disabuse his mind of any idea that this province under this government is just backsliding and everybody is leaving. We had 173 new companies set up business in this province during 1963. We made 78 manufacturing arrangements between foreign and Ontario companies, and these manufacturing arrangements are to manufacture products in Ontario which were formerly manufactured outside the province. This was the largest number of new industries to locate in this province during the past ten years.

There were 487 Ontario manufacturing concerns who made additions to their plants

and production facilities in 1963. The gross provincial product increased 6.9 per cent in 1963 over 1962. Unemployment dropped from 4.3 per cent in 1962 to 3.8 per cent in 1963; and, as of March, 1964, was down to 2.5 per cent.

Finally, labour income in the province rose by seven per cent over 1962 to over \$9 billion, and there were 124,000 more people employed in the province as of March, 1964, than there were in March, 1963.

I suggest to you, sir, in capsule form, that that is a record of the progress of this province and is the answer to any suggestion that industry is moving out and that this is not a good place in which to live and do business.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): The hon. Prime Minister has told us everything except how much taxes we are going to have to pay.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, we will deal with taxes in a moment.

I wanted to speak for a few minutes, too, about water. I am not going to speak about this at any great length, but the question has been discussed here and debated and the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) spoke about it yesterday and the day before, and I can assure him that we share the anxieties he has expressed. As I said once before in this House, this is truly an international problem and it has to be approached. Of course there are two sections to the problem.

There is the international problem which concerns the level of the lakes and then there is the purely internal problem in this province which concerns dropping water tables and drought. The two are interrelated at least to this extent, that it is generally conceded by those who know and have the scientific knowledge that the reason for the low levels in the lake, at least in part, is because we have had an unusually dry three or four years. This drought, or this lack of rain, has had two effects. One, it has pulled down the level of water in the lakes; and two, it has pulled down the level of water in the ground.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): We are not concerned with causes, we want to know what the hon. Prime Minister is going to do.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If my hon. friend will be patient; if he has not learned anything else in his first year in this House he should have learned to be patient, because if he stays here very long he will learn to be very patient.

In any event, these are the causes and they are very great causes indeed. They involve

problems over which man at the moment has little control. There may be solutions to the level of water in the lake, I do not know, but the solution to the drought in some of our dry areas, in my view, poses even greater problems. But we have a solution, we have measures that we have taken and they have been explained to this House and I am not going to go into them again. We have taken certain measures to assist the farmers through the construction of reservoirs and farm ponds and things of that nature.

As far as the level of the lakes is concerned, we have been carrying on conversations with others concerned. In our own government, the people who are most able and have the greatest amount of knowledge and have done the most research over the years are the experts of the hydro-electric power commission, because flow of water to them is of course life blood, and the water resources commission. We have brought them together with representatives of ARDA and we have been dealing with the federal government in this water problem. We propose shortly—we are setting up the organization now—to call an international meeting. In other words, we are going to call a meeting with the federal government and with the province of Quebec, and also communicate with the states bordering on the Great Lakes, in order that we may ascertain what joint action we can take. Even a very brief analysis of the problem would indicate that no one jurisdiction can make any dent in this problem at all.

These meetings will be set up as quickly as we can arrange the machinery. We have already been in touch with the federal government. There have been two or three meetings held already in order to start this going. Where it will lead to I do not really know. Perhaps eventually it is something that should be done by the federal government. I would say this, that through the states that border the Great Lakes and are our neighbours, I am quite sure we will reach the federal government in Washington. I think it is a problem of sufficient international interest that it will involve our own federal government, it will involve the government of the United States, it will involve all the state governments and it will involve at least two provinces. To bring all these people together is going to take a little time, but that is what we propose to do.

I wanted to mention minimum wages. I think that this is a very forward piece of legislation which we have processed through this House in two steps during the last

session and this session. Of course our hon. friends opposite, and perhaps this is their traditional role and I do not blame them for taking it, but of course whatever it is it has to be more from their point of view. But I would point out to hon. members that British Columbia has a general rate of \$1 per hour for men and women and they have no exceptions. We have certain exemptions here. But apart from British Columbia, there is no province in Canada that has a higher minimum wage than we have. When we think of our neighbouring province with whom we are, at least to a certain degree, in economic competition—I am speaking of course of Quebec—and their minimum wage there is 70 cents for men and women in Metropolitan Montreal and 64 cents for the remainder of the province.

I would just point out that our minimum wage legislation has been generally very favourably received. The public response has been good. We were told for many years that it could not be done. All I have to say is that we did it and we are proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, and I know everyone is waiting for those words, I just want to make a few comments about an event which probably will take place before we re-assemble here. I might say that this has been referred to by the hon. leader of the Opposition and my remarks will be kind. We are watching the agonizing reappraisal that is taking place in the ranks opposite, and we may have a second Thompson, who knows? I must say history is wonderful, experience is wonderful. We sat here and took many, many jibes. They were all passed across this floor in a spirit of the greatest of good fun and fellowship, and I am sure that hon. members opposite will take any remarks that I may make in exactly the same spirit that they made them about two years ago. I remember all the comments about the leadership race that we had, and now I am very interested in watching their own.

It seems to me that—what have we got, five candidates already and not even a date picked yet. It is interesting to watch the change in the demeanor of people as they get into this leadership affair. You notice subtle changes in their approach to many problems, and I wish them all well.

But way back at the beginning the hon. leader of the Opposition said that this session would be characterized by a consistency, was it? Well, we were going to have a real exercise in consistency in the next few weeks, because the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr.

Could), who is one of the leadership contenders, in his magnificent address to this House, which lasted for I forget how many hours, he suggested in his speech—and this intrigued me ever since—he suggested in that speech that we would cut \$150 million out of the estimates of The Department of Highways. In order that we preserve this jewel of consistency, I assume that this is going to be done, this is going to be part of the platform, and I was wondering how it was going to be done.

First we could eliminate all the work carry-over from last year and just stop, that would save about \$60 million. Then we could eliminate all the new work proposed for this year, and that would save \$54 million. Then we could eliminate all the services associated with this work and that would save about \$26.5 million. This would leave about another \$10 million to eliminate before we got rid of the \$150 million. This could be done by cutting the annual highway maintenance right across the province by 50 per cent—that means we do half as much snow clearing and half as much sanding. And then, to complete the job, we just take the \$6 million subsidy off the Bloor-Danforth subway. If we did all those things, we would get rid of \$150 million from the estimates of The Department of Highways.

The hon. member for Bruce will be interested in this because he thinks we are starving the municipalities. We give them 47 cents out of every dollar we collect. I do not say we give it to them; we return it to them. In any event, in carrying out this proposal of one of the contenders for leadership of the party, if we were to eliminate all the aid we give to municipalities, we would save \$112 million. Then this would leave \$38 million.

We could eliminate the maintenance programme entirely. This would have some effect on school buses and things of that nature in the winter time, but nonetheless we would save the \$150 million. That would take \$15 million. Then we could stop all work on Highway 401, and the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence) would be interested in that, and the hon. members from the Windsor area. We would just completely stop all work on 401, including the Toronto by-pass.

These are just two alternatives. You could keep putting these things together for some hours and come up with some really beautiful results.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Is the hon. Prime Minister supporting him?

Mr. Sopha: Is he the hon. Prime Minister's candidate?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, no. I am just referring to this jewel of consistency; if this is going to be policy, I am just interested in how it would be done.

But in any event, I wish you all well and I will be watching with great interest. And if it should come about—I have no idea of whether this is even a possibility—but I will say this in any event. If it should come about that the hon. leader of the Opposition were not to be here as House leader when this House reconvenes, I for one will be very disappointed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I was thinking this morning about some of the discussions we had here last night. I thought perhaps I could say, in closing these remarks, that in the situation in which we find ourselves in Canada today it would be a very bad thing for all of us, from coast to coast, if we were to even in a joking way introduce partisanship into the affairs occupying men in our country in the very great events which will come upon us, and the very great events with which we have to deal. I can only say, as far as I am concerned, that I am not the least bit interested in getting any kudos for anything that may be done. I do not think the Prime Minister of Canada is, and I do not think the Prime Minister of Quebec is; in fact, neither do I think the leaders of the ten provincial governments are, or the federal government. I think it would be unwise if we were to approach some of these things from that point of view. I think our final goal, what we are after, is not a headline but a united Canada.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is as follows:

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce) moves, seconded by **Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South)**, that the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means be amended by adding thereto the following words:

That this House regrets that the Budget fails to exhibit that the government is aware of the urgent need to encourage, develop and expand the foundations of the economy of this province.

And this House regrets that the Budget indicates the government is content with the makeshift policies of the past rather

than to adopt a broad, new, imaginative outlook paralleled with measures that would eliminate areas of poverty within the province, widely expand opportunities for expansion of existing industries and promote the establishment of new industries, using our great natural resources, increase the real wealth of our people and greatly increase our population.

And this House regrets that instead of being offered an energetic and vigorous economic programme, for our great province, our citizens are merely being asked to bear increased taxation and they and their children to assume an even greater debt burden.

The vote will be on the amendment. As many as are in favour of the amendment, say "aye".

As many as are opposed, say "nay".

The amendment was negated on the following division:

YEAS	NAYS
Braithwaite	Allan
Bryden	Apps
Bukator	Auld
Davison	Bales
Farquhar	Beckett
Freeman	Boyer
Gaunt	Brunelle
Gisborn	Butler
Gordon	Carruthers
Lewis	Cass
(Scarborough West)	Cecile
MacDonald	Connell
Nixon	Cowling
Oliver	Davis
Paterson	Demers
Sargent	Downer
Singer	Dunlop
Sopha	Dymond
Spence	Eagleson
Thompson	Edwards
Trotter	Evans
Troy	Gomme
Whicher	Grossman
Worton	Guindon
Young—24.	Hamilton
	Harris
	Haskett
	Henderson
	Hodgson
	(Scarborough East)
	Hodgson
	(Victoria)
	Johnston
	(Carleton)
	Kerr

NAYS

Knox
Lawrence
(St. George)
Letherby
Lewis
(Humber)
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McKeough
McNeil
Noden
Olde
Peck
Pittcock
Price
Pritchard
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Sandercock
Simonett
Spooner
Stewart
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardrobe
Wells
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yakabuski
Yaremko—69.

Clerk of the House: The "yeas" are 24; the "nays" are 69.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

Motion agreed to; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

Clerk of the House:

Resolved,

That there be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of this province a sum not exceeding \$1,249,293,000 to meet the supply to that extent granted to Her Majesty.

Resolution concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee on ways and means rise and report that it has come to a certain resolution.

Motion agreed to; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee on ways and means begs to report it has come to a certain resolution.

Report agreed to.

ACT GRANTING CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal years ending the 31st day of March, 1964 and the 31st day of March, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I will now leave the House and wait upon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed several bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill No. 4, The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964.

Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Industrial Standards Act.

Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Bailiffs Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to repeal The Investigation of Titles Act.

Bill No. 46, An Act to repeal The Custody of Documents Act.

Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Bill No. 64, An Act to set aside a certain tax sale of land in the township of Herschel for the relief of Wallace Bullied and Norah Bullied.

Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Notaries Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 67, An Act to repeal The Vaccination Act.

Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act.

Bill No. 75, An Act to establish the Ontario Law Reform Commission.

Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Bill No. 86, An Act to repeal The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grants Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Collection Agencies Act.

Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act.

Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Mortgages Act.

Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Short Forms of Mortgages Act.

Bill No. 109, An Act to provide for the registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen.

Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Race Tracks Tax Act.

Bill No. 115, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Bill No. 118, An Act to provide homes for persons requiring special residential and sheltered care.

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Bill No. 123, An Act to provide for the establishment of local roads boards in territory without municipal organization.

Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Ontario Hurricane Relief Fund Act, 1955.

Bill No. 126, An Act to establish The Department of University Affairs.

Bill No. 127, An Act to incorporate The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation.

Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Bill No. 133, An Act to incorporate the University of Guelph.

Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Bill No. 135, An Act to incorporate the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Bill No. 136, An Act to incorporate The Sheridan Park Corporation.

Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Tourist Establishments Act.

Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Hotel Fire Safety Act.

Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 141, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Bill No. 142, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Bill No. 143, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Bill No. Pr17, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

To these Acts the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

Mr. Speaker: May it please your Honour: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the legislative assembly of the

province of Ontario, in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government and humbly beg to present for Your Honour's acceptance a bill intituled, An Act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal years ending March 31, 1964 and March 31, 1965.

To this Act the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accept their benevolence and assent to this bill in Her Majesty's name.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the province was then pleased to deliver the following gracious speech.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and hon. members of the legislative assembly of Ontario, during this second session of the 27th Parliament, hon. members have accomplished much in the way of legislation, the Budget review, the study of the estimates of the departments and the reports of the various departments, commissions and committees. I commend you for the arduous work you have carried out during the last few months.

The legislation that you have passed will lead to further opportunities and benefits for all the people of Ontario and will ensure that their rights are more fully protected. Many of the bills approved by the House were designed to modernize the administrative functions of the departments and their branches in the light of present needs and to bring up to date the provisions of our earlier legislative enactments. As a result, two new departments have been established and the activities of a number of others reorganized in whole or in part, while many of our statutes have been considerably revised. Among the measures that have comprised the government's programme and that have received your lengthy consideration have been the following:

University development: this session marked the beginning of a new era in government-university relationships with the passage of Acts creating The Department of University Affairs and the Ontario universities capital aid corporation, which, in conjunction with the existing advisory committee on university affairs, will give consideration to university matters. The formation of the new

department will enable the government and the universities to maintain constant communication on matters of mutual concern and to undertake fundamental studies in areas related to provincial assistance to higher education and the co-ordination of future growth. The new corporation will permit the province to spread the tremendous costs of capital expansion over a longer period of time while placing the procedures for capital assistance on a year-round basis, thus facilitating the planning and development of our universities.

Two further Acts enable the province to continue its programme of university development and expansion, to meet the needs of rapidly increasing enrolments. New charters were approved for Brock University and the University of Guelph. The first created an entirely new institution to serve the people of the Niagara peninsula. The latter arose from the solid foundations already existing in the federated colleges of The Department of Agriculture at Guelph.

Grants to the universities for operating purposes, totalling nearly \$48 million, were approved by the House.

Education: several statutes of great importance in the field of education, including Acts amending The Public Schools Act and The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act were approved by the House. The establishment of the township school area as the general unit for the administration of the rural and small urban public schools and the requirement that all parts of a county be included in a high school district will lead to more effective educational opportunities for pupils living in rural communities. Public school consultative committees will be appointed in every county to consider the enlarging of county school areas. Provision has also been made for crediting the attendance of pupils for grant purposes on days when weather conditions interfere with the normal operation of the schools.

The Ontario foundation tax plan has been implemented and you have voted the sum of \$285 million for general legislative grants to be paid the various school boards in the province.

Amendments to The Schools Administration Act will enable a school board consisting of more than three trustees to pay an honorarium on an established scale to its members, if the board so desires.

Funds have been voted to enable free textbooks to be provided to Grade 9 and 10 students, beginning in September of this year.

Vocational centres are being constructed at Ottawa, London and Sault Ste. Marie, while a new institute of technology is being built at Ottawa and an addition is being planned at Kirkland Lake.

Financial arrangements have been made for defraying the cost of operating schools for retarded children through the province paying a large percentage of the expenditures, with the remaining small balance coming from the local municipalities. This new legislation removes the necessity of raising money for this purpose through donations from the public.

Health: to assist further in the provision of hospital accommodation, The Public Hospitals Act was amended to permit low cost loans, up to a maximum of \$5,000 per bed, to active treatment general hospitals. Funds were provided to enable hospital construction grants to be increased to approximately \$5,300 per bed.

A forward step was the legislation to provide homes for special care, for those discharged from Ontario hospitals for the mentally ill, but without home or family. This will enable the Ontario hospitals to carry on their normal function and, at the same time, will provide a more homelike setting for these patients.

A new principle, in keeping with modern concepts of treatment and care of the mentally disturbed, was seen with the establishment of a board to operate the institute of psychiatry, now under construction in Toronto.

A new programme was set up to assist municipalities with their air pollution control problems, whereby a board of health instituting an approved programme of control will be eligible for grant assistance.

Public welfare: hon. members have given approval to several amendments to The Mothers' Allowances Act, reducing the waiting period for the granting of these allowances. A deserted mother may be granted an allowance after three months, instead of six months as previously. The allowance to unmarried mothers may be paid when the child is three months old, instead of six months. Mothers whose husbands are imprisoned may obtain the allowance when the husband enters prison, instead of having to wait till the husband has served six months.

By an amendment to The Day Nurseries Act, the province has extended to nine years the age of children for which it will share with municipalities in the costs of providing day nursery care, where the mothers are

employed outside the home. Previously, the provincial contribution was limited to the costs of day nursery care for pre-school children.

Pension plans: The Pension Benefits Act was amended to repeal all of its provisions dealing with standard pensions, so that there is no longer a requirement to establish a minimum pension plan. The parts of the Act pertaining to supplementary pension plans and solvency requirements were retained. In addition, the portability rules for supplementary plans were extended to all pension plans, regardless of the number of employees.

The pension plans for our public employees—as set out in The Public Service Superannuation Act and The Teachers' Superannuation Act—were changed to bring them into line with the provisions of the amended Pension Benefits Act.

Your government is awaiting with a great deal of interest, more details of the revised Canada Pension Plan.

Housing: The Ontario Housing Corporation Act is legislation of major significance and its passing will enable the government to take full advantage of changes proposed in the federal housing statute. The first task of the housing corporation will be to eliminate bottlenecks in the housing programmes and to assist those families whose incomes are such that they cannot obtain adequate accommodation on the private market. The housing corporation will be given the responsibility of evolving and putting into effect the arrangements necessary to ensure that rental housing in Metropolitan Toronto and other areas of the province is substantially increased.

Labour: in the field of labour legislation, important new programmes have increased the rights of our working men and women. A comprehensive minimum wage programme, designed to prevent exploitation of the province's labour force, is being brought into effect throughout the province. It provides for a general minimum wage rate of \$1 an hour, to be introduced by stages in all parts of the province.

The important amendments made in The Industrial Standards Act will increase both its usefulness and its flexibility as a means whereby employers and employees can negotiate and establish fair working standards for their industry or trade.

With the passage of the new Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, the basis has been established for a complete modernization of the apprentice training sys-

tem and its introduction into new areas of industry where today's economic developments urgently require highly-skilled manpower.

Significant steps were taken to protect the safety of working people throughout the province. The Industrial Safety Act constitutes a complete modernization of the former Factory, Shop and Office Building Act. The Workmen's Compensation Act was amended not only to expand its benefits, but also to promote safer practices in industry and to effect a closer co-ordination of safety education programmes.

Amendments were made to The Labour Relations Act to simplify and expedite certain of its procedures, mainly in the area of conciliation.

Administration of justice: the desirability to protect the public in certain fields has been met by the introduction of a number of important statutes.

The Ontario Law Reform Commission has been established with an unrestricted discretion to investigate into and report upon any laws of the province which, in the opinion of the commission, might be revised or otherwise made more consistent with the society in which we live. While the commission may take under advisement matters which are referred to it by the Attorney General, it is not restricted in any way as to the laws it may review.

Under the provisions of The Used Car Dealers Act, a system of licensing used car dealers and salesmen will be set up. This Act will provide a means of supervision, the administration of which will be assisted by the industry itself.

The House has made uniform those licensing procedures which are presently available for the assistance of the public and which relate to real estate and business brokers, mortgage brokers and collection agencies.

Our system for the administration of justice has been further improved. Provision has been made in The Magistrates Act for the appointment of a chief magistrate who will be of assistance in the organization of the work in all of the magistrates courts in the province. This office will perform a function similar to that of the chief judge of the county courts. The Crown Attorneys Act provides for the appointment of special Crown attorneys who may be utilized in any part of the province.

Provision has been made for hearings by the Ontario police commission, to assist municipalities and boards of police commissioners

in determining the adequacy of their police and law enforcement services. These and other amendments which are contained in The Police Act should materially assist in maintaining law and order throughout our municipalities and in continuing to keep criminal forces at bay. The bargaining procedures which are available for the police forces of the province have been improved.

Municipal affairs: the amendments that have been introduced to municipal legislation are designed generally to improve, and make more efficient, administration in the province.

The Assessment Act amendments authorize the appointment of district assessors who will carry out the assessment for all the municipalities and localities in a district. The system of county assessment commissioners and district assessors will provide the machinery by which uniform assessment of real property throughout the province may be more expeditiously achieved. Another amendment will ensure that owners of land subject to tax sale proceedings will receive actual notice of their right to redeem.

Amendments to The Department of Municipal Affairs Act will give the department clear authority to investigate any of the affairs of a municipality on its own initiative. These powers are in addition to the powers to conduct an audit into the financial affairs of a municipality upon petition of a certain number of ratepayers. The department, as a result of a provincially-ordered municipal audit or of an inquiry or investigation, will be able to make orders requiring the municipality to correct any errors or deficiencies disclosed by such inquiries.

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act was amended to authorize agreements with any governmental authority to carry out studies of the entire Metropolitan Toronto planning area.

Amendments to The Municipal Act clarify the powers of the Ontario Municipal Board when dealing with annexations, so as to permit the creation of urban service areas. A municipality or a local board is given the power, with the approval of the municipal board, to expropriate from another municipality or local board with similar powers of expropriation, to prevent the possibility of important projects being held up indefinitely. A new section designed to prevent irresponsible persons from preying on the public will permit the municipal licensing of chimney repair men and persons in the business of repairing or renovating buildings or constructing fallout shelters. The present limitations

on expenditures for publicity purposes based on assessment have been removed and a limit of \$60,000 substituted.

Amendments to The Planning Act provide for the transfer from planning boards to committees of adjustment the power to consent to the conveyance of land, where a by-law for subdivision control is in effect, and certain powers to impose conditions to the consent are clarified. The effect is to leave with planning boards their prime function of dealing with an official plan, while a committee of adjustment will have the complete machinery for handling consents to conveyances, whereas previously only a rejected or an objecting applicant could appeal.

Municipal councils are authorized to pass by-laws setting out standards for maintenance and occupancy of residential property and requiring it to be maintained to comply with those standards. A committee may extend the time during which such repairs or maintenance have to be done. This legislation gives municipalities the means to prevent the creation or extension of blighted areas.

Economic development: hon. members have given approval to the government's economic development programme, which has contributed greatly to the present prosperous state of the Ontario economy. Additional funds have been voted for the promotion of manufacturing exports, which have been rising at an annual average rate of more than 20 per cent for the past three years, and for financial and research assistance to manufacturing and other industries. This assistance has contributed to increased production and employment in the economy to the extent that, by March, unemployment had fallen to its lowest level in seven years, and employment had increased by 124,000 from the previous year.

Legislation was passed to establish the Sheridan Park Corporation, which will ensure that the area centred in the Ontario Research Community on the fringe of Metropolitan Toronto will be devoted solely to creating the largest industrial research complex in Canada.

Energy and resources management: One of the most important duties of the new Department of Energy and Resources Management involves a provincial water management programme, co-ordinating the efforts of the agricultural rehabilitation and development directorate, the conservation authorities and the Ontario Water Resources Commission. The last two of these have been made the responsibility of the Minister of the expanded department. As a result of the plans

made by the government to relieve the water shortage in certain areas, a new three-point provincial programme in regard to Ontario's water problems and resources has been effected. Under it, the government will give increased financial support in three fields: the construction of water supply reservoirs, the construction of farm ponds, and an emergency rural water supply for drought-stricken areas.

The Energy Act and The Ontario Energy Board Act were revised and updated in the light of experience, in order to improve administration. The Ontario Energy Board Act was changed to clarify the powers of the board, an interpretation section was added, its provisions relating to the storage of gas were strengthened and the pipeline provisions were broadened to deal expressly with pipeline stations. The procedures for appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor in council from orders and decisions of the energy board were brought into line with those of the Ontario Municipal Board, thus bringing about uniformity of practice in these matters.

Agriculture: several Acts designed to maintain the modern concept of the family farm and to strengthen the position of the rural producer were introduced. The Junior Farmer Establishment Act was amended to increase maximum loans to junior farmers to \$40,000 from \$20,000. Over 500 loans have been made since the Act was amended in the 1962-1963 session of the Legislature.

The Farm Products Marketing Act was amended to enable farm producer associations to raise funds for improved marketing of their commodities through promotion, education and research. The apple growers, after a vote, have already availed themselves of this new provision of the Act.

The Department of Agriculture Act was amended to provide assistance through bank loans, guaranteed by the government, to farmers required to haul emergency water supplies.

To strengthen the agricultural rehabilitation and development organization in Ontario and to develop effective local programmes, ARDA committees are being formed in every county and will provide a direct link with the Ontario ARDA directorate.

A barberry eradication programme will be initiated this year by The Department of Agriculture, while a study and research programme to deal with the problem of damage to crops by blackbirds has been established.

A mastitis control programme will be initiated this year to deal with this disease,

which seriously affects milk production among some of the dairy herds of Ontario.

Under an amendment to The Plant Diseases Act, municipalities may pass by-laws enabling them to administer and pay the cost of programmes to combat designated diseases, such as Dutch elm disease.

Lands and forests: members have voted large sums to enable The Department of Lands and Forests to expand its forest and park development and wildlife protection programmes and to open additional parks, waterfowl hunting areas and public fishing ponds. The innate qualities for forest protection and fire-fighting of the Ontario Indian will be further recognized in the organization for forest protection this year, with their inclusion in special fire-fighting units. The number of junior forest rangers will be increased to 1,600, distributed in 66 ranger camps in northern Ontario.

Amendments were approved to The Crown Timber Act to modernize some of the procedures in regard to licences, and to The Game and Fish Act to improve practices involved in the sport of hunting.

Mining: the recent mining discoveries in northern Ontario have been most gratifying and it is to be hoped that they will result in an early expansion of our mineral production. The systematic mapping carried out at intervals by The Department of Mines in the Timmins area and the compilation map of that mining district recently prepared have been, and will continue to be, of great assistance in the widespread explorations taking place. Two geological field parties are being diverted to the new discovery area.

Funds were voted to increase the department's survey and mapping programmes, to carry out a new programme of seismic exploration along Hudson and James bays, and to permit a continuation of the airborne magnetometer surveys.

The Mining Act was amended to modernize some of its procedures in line with present-day practices.

Highways: with respect to the new legislation affecting the highways of Ontario, the underlying purpose has been to facilitate the granting of still greater financial assistance to the municipalities. Agreements with municipalities providing for a more generous provincial sharing of the costs of controlled-access urban expressways or freeways were authorized. The contribution of a city or separated town to a suburban roads commission will be based on the local assessment as adjusted by the provincial equalizing factor,

thus permitting a more uniform sharing of costs.

An amendment to The Highway Improvement Act will enable roads that are partly in territory without municipal organization, as well as those wholly in such areas, to be designated as tertiary roads.

The Local Roads Board Act enables the formation of such boards on a voluntary basis, in place of the present statute labour boards. The new Act will make possible a more efficient and equitable method of administering some 5,000 miles of public roads in those parts of the province that are without municipal organization. The rate of financial contribution by the province will vary between 66.66 per cent and 80 per cent, compared with the standard 50 per cent basis applicable to the statute labour boards. In addition, Department of Highways staff will perform the work laid out by the representatives of the local people who will be elected to the local roads board.

Funds have been voted for the one-third subsidy on construction of the right-of-way for the Bloor-Danforth subway in Metropolitan Toronto, and for the purchase of a further \$20 million worth of debentures for subway construction purposes. The Metropolitan Toronto Transportation Committee has expanded its fields of study.

An agreement has been made with the federal government whereby it will pay about 38 per cent of the costs of the crossings involved in the twinning of the Welland canal.

Transport: as the mandatory impounding of motor vehicles following conviction for certain offences has, in some circumstances, led to hardship for the members of an offender's family, The Highway Traffic Act was amended to remove mandatory impounding and to replace it with provision for discretionary impounding by a magistrate or judge. In the interests of greater traffic safety and to ensure that a motorist travelling through different municipalities in Ontario will not be met with conflicting laws, the Act was also amended to provide for uniform regulation of traffic at pedestrian crossovers. Buses may proceed without stopping at railway crossings protected by warning lights, as is presently permitted when the crossing is protected by gates. Urban municipalities have been given the authority to increase the speed limit on limited access highways within their jurisdiction to 60 miles per hour.

Tourism and information: in line with its expanded responsibilities and reorganized administration, the name of The Department of

Travel and Publicity was changed to Tourism and Information. Regulations under The Tourist Establishment Act, administered by the department, were altered during the current session to make them more effective.

For the first time, the department has published major travel publications in both of Canada's official languages, as the first part of its programme of reorganization of publications. Copies of the department's advertising schedules have been sent to regional tourist councils, chambers of commerce and other interested bodies in an attempt to secure co-operative advertising in local, national and U.S. media.

The department, in conjunction with the University of Western Ontario, will commence the reconstruction of Fort Ste. Marie I during the summer of 1964, with the anticipated date of completion being 1967. It is the site of the first white settlement in Canada west of Quebec City and already attracts a quarter of a million tourists each year. The work on the fort is the first stage of the reconstruction of the historical and archaeological sites in the area.

Tax-sharing arrangements: in the field of federal-provincial relations, the government welcomes the new improvements that have been made in our tax-sharing arrangements with the federal government. These improvements, which provide the province with a larger share of the succession duty and personal income tax fields, represent a more adequate recognition of the increasing burden of provincial responsibilities.

At the conference last November, the federal government undertook to increase the abatement of federal tax in the succession duty field from 50 per cent to 75 per cent, effective April 1, 1964. At the request of my government and the government of our sister province of Quebec, the federal government agreed to compensate these two provinces in the current fiscal year by direct payment of an amount equivalent to the 25 per cent abatement. This arrangement has enabled the government to defer amendments to The Succession Duty Act until the Ontario committee on taxation has completed its inquiry into the provincial tax structure.

In April of this year, following the conference in Quebec City, the federal government announced an acceleration in the rate of federal withdrawal from the individual income tax field over the remaining two years of the current tax-sharing arrangements. The federal abatement, which is 18 per cent in the current fiscal year, was formerly scheduled

to rise by a point a year—to 19 per cent next year and 20 per cent in the following year. The acceleration will now be increased to three points a year, and the federal abatement will rise to 21 per cent next year and to 24 per cent in 1966.

On the basis of current tax yields, it is estimated that the improvements in the provincial share of the succession duty and of individual income tax fields will produce, when fully implemented, an additional tax revenue to the province of \$57 million a year, in addition to the increases under the present arrangements. In view of its expanding responsibilities, the government is gratified by this upward adjustment in its share of the major fields of direct taxation.

Committees: an interim report of the select committee on consumer credit was received and the committee's life was extended to enable it to continue its work. The select committee on municipal legislation is continuing its extensive review of the municipal laws of this province. Select committees on youth, aging and mining have been set up and their reports on the matters involved in these important fields will be awaited with a great deal of interest.

A Royal commission on civil liberties and human rights was established to inquire into the ways that these rights can be strengthened and guaranteed. The Royal commission on redistribution is continuing its work.

These measures and the many others you have approved, as well as the funds you have voted for the operations of the government, will promote the continuing development of the province and increase the rights, opportunities and security of our people.

My thanks go to the hon. members, whose untiring labours were so generously given, and to our civil servants, for their invaluable work.

May Divine Providence guide you in the days to come.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of the legislative assembly, it is the will and pleasure of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor that this legislative assembly be prorogued and this legislative assembly is accordingly prorogued.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

The House prorogued at 2.00 o'clock, p.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

